

WESTERN CAROLINIAN.

VOL. IV.]

SALISBURY, N. C. TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 1824.

[NO. 202.]

PRINTED

BY PHILLO WHITE,

Publisher of the *Western Carolinian*.

The terms of the *Western Carolinian* will hereafter be as follows: Three Dollars a year, payable in advance.

Advertisements will be inserted at fifty cents per square for the first insertion, and twenty-five cents for each subsequent one.

All letters addressed to the Editor, must be post-paid, or they will not be attended to.

Forte Piano, for Sale.

A FIRST rate second-hand Piano, is offered for sale, very low. For terms, &c. apply to MICHAEL BROWN. Salisbury, Feb. 16, 1824.

List of Letters

REMAINING in the Post Office at Concord, N. C. North-Carolina, the 1st day of April, 1824.

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Benjamin Alexander | Henry Linker |
| Abijah Alexander | Henry Leason. |
| John Anderson | Rev. Elam J. Morrison |
| Osnund Alexander. | Rev. Robert McCulloch |
| Alexander Bain | Robert McCulloch |
| Warren Barker | Abraham L. Masters |
| Elizabeth Benson | Jas. & Arthur Meek |
| Daniel Blackwelder | Abraham C. Miller, 2 |
| Josiah Bradshaw. | William McClaren |
| Noah Corzine, 2 | John McKinley |
| Samuel Corzine | Hugh S. McCaleb |
| Andrew Corzine | Archibald Morrison |
| Hugh Campbell | Rev. Gen. M ^r Wharton |
| Thomas Ciser | James McCaleb. |
| William Cenoy | William Newel. |
| William Ceaton. | Thomas Paving-r |
| Alexander Dorton | Benjamin Plunket |
| Owen Dry. | Ezra Parks. |
| John Furr | Mary Roland |
| Mitchel Fleming | Jane Russel. |
| William Fleming | Nathaniel Sims |
| Robert Ferguson | Christopher Sides |
| Allison Fleming. | Samuel Shinn |
| Francis Glass | Martha A. Smith |
| William Glover. | John Sugg |
| Mary Huie | Asa Smith. |
| Dr. Elam Harris | Lewis Tucker |
| Abner Hagans | Peter Teter. |
| Eli Honeycut | Francis Vannerson. |
| Catharine Hagler | James D. White |
| Franklin Harris | James Welch |
| John House. | George Whitley. |
| John Johnson | John Yawman. |
| Benjamin S. Johnson. | |

D. STORKE, J. P. M.

List of Letters

REMAINING in the Post Office at Salisbury, N. C. on the 31st day of March A. D. 1824.

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Peter Albright | James Kincaid |
| John Adams | Elizabeth Kilpatrick. |
| Stokes Aderton | Daniel Keizer |
| Margaret Allison. | Martin Leszor |
| Thos. Brackin | Alex. Lanson |
| Moses Brown | Sam ^l Luckey |
| Cornelius Buckhanon | Harman Latham |
| Caty Bullen | Isaac Lintzer, 2 |
| Lavin Bates | Hiram D. Lovessy |
| Jno. D. Balo | Joseph Lottiger |
| Rice C. Ballard | William Miller |
| N. A. Bryan | Wm. Montgomery |
| John Blackburn | Mariah McKenzie |
| James W. Bryan, 2 | George Miller |
| Jonathan Barber | Felix McLarin |
| William Barber | William M ^r Arge |
| Adam Beck | David M ^r Makin |
| Spencer Benson | Edw. M ^r Waly |
| William Black. | Col. D. M ^r Guire |
| James Caruthers | Jona Martin |
| Levy Cambell | John M ^r Lumny |
| John Carigan | George M. Murr |
| John Caughenour | William Mahaly |
| John Cambell | John Morrow |
| William Chapman | Edward M ^r Lister |
| Joseph Cowan | Nancy M ^r Lister |
| John Coats | Henry Myers |
| Joseph Castloun | John Martin |
| John Carigan | Clarissa Morrill |
| George Cambell | Jno. M ^r Neely, 2. |
| Stanly Chaffin | Jno. D. Norris, 2 |
| Conrad Casper | Leroy Napier. |
| Benj. Cowan | Samuel Price |
| A. H. Chaffin | Anthony Peeler |
| Erastus Case. | Samuel E. Phillips |
| Aquiler Davenport | Enoch Phillips |
| John R. Donel | Valentine Pence |
| Joseph Dobbins. | Jesse Park. |
| No. Elliott | Samuel Riblia |
| William Eddreth | Philip Rice |
| Philip Eagle. | John Ridinger |
| Robert Foster | Rodias Riley |
| Wm. Flemming | L. R. Rose |
| Abraham Fox | John Ried |
| John H. Freeling | Nathan Riley |
| Brief H. Ferguson. | Harry H. Robison. |
| George W. Geimes | Henry Sossaman |
| Samuel Gardner | John Steel |
| James Grimes | William Smith |
| Ich'd. Gillespie | David Stewart |
| Charles Glover | Leroy Smart |
| Charles Griffith | George Smith |
| Alex. P. Graham. | William Stephenson |
| Joseph Graham. | Daniel Swink |
| Joseph Hall, 2 | Philip Shaver |
| James A. Hendricks | William H. Steelman |
| James Hunter | Epes Spain |
| George Hoover | Robert Spence |
| Henry Hartman | John Simmons |
| Henry Harrison | George Smith |
| ary Hatch | Edmund Southard |
| Ich'd. Harris | John Stirewalt |
| Samuel Hughey | Jeremiah Seamands. |
| yan Hotchkiss, 2 | Hiram Turner |
| Enj. Hughey | Samuel Taylor |
| hn. Hyde | Mrs. Mary Todd |
| Elizabeth Hicks. | Benj. Tennon |
| bert Johnston | Mary A. Townsend. |
| ohn Jacobson | Robert Wood |
| hn Johnston. | Richmond Wall, 2 |
| hn Knight | Mary Wall |
| Endle Klutts | Joel Wren |
| omas Kent | Jacob Weaver |
| arns Kimble | Absolem Wall |
| ac Knight | James Wright. |

SAMUEL REEVES, P. M.

Printing of every description, PROMPTLY executed at this office, in a style of workmanship corresponding with the improvements of the present day.

COMMUNICATION.

Mr. White: As I have always understood that your paper professed to be an indifferent dispenser of justice to all men and all parties, I take the liberty of asking you to copy into your columns a piece from the *National Intelligencer*, signed "A Virginian." It is so good an answer to the wholesale proscription dealt out in the address of the Washington caucus, that I am solicitous it should be read by all your patrons.

To the Editors of the *National Intelligencer*.

Gentlemen: The argument most pertinaciouslly urged, and apparently most relied on, by the members and advocates of the late congressional caucus, is, its necessity for maintaining the union and ascendancy of the democratic party. The fact, that this argument is urged exclusively by the adherents of one of the candidates for the presidential chair, who justify the belief, that it was resorted to merely for the purpose of adding to his strength, by reviving and enlisting in his behalf feelings which have no longer any foundation in principle; and which, in the minds of intelligent and disinterested politicians of all parties, have long since been superseded by a spirit of tolerant and more expanded patriotism. Taking it for granted, however, that there are at least some amongst those who have given it their sanction, sincere in their belief of its importance in promoting, not merely the election of their favorite candidate, but the general welfare of the nation, I beg leave, in the course of a very few remarks, to submit to an intelligent community, the considerations which ought, in my opinion, to deprive this argument of all its force.

When the people of any country are divided in opinion, as to the constitution under which they live, or the principles upon which the government ought to be administered, it is very natural, and certainly very proper, that those who think alike, should take the necessary measures for promoting union among themselves, and for giving ascendancy to their favorite principles. Thus organized, and thus acting, they constitute a party, but not a faction. They look to the interest of their country, and not to self aggrandizement. And if, amongst the measures of concert and party discipline, which are adopted, they think fit to secure the more important offices, either of profit or honor, in the hands of their own adherents, to the exclusion of their political opponents, they do no more than may be justified on every principle of sound discretion and real patriot-

ism. Such has actually been the case in the United States. From the first organization of the government, down to the termination of the late war, this country has been divided into two great political parties, differing, at all times, either as to the excellence of the constitution itself, the spirit in which it was to be construed, or the general principles of which the government of its creation ought to be administered. Neither party has yielded to the other, in the zeal with which it has sought to procure concert among its members, or to give ascendancy to its principles. And, although we may lament the occasional inconsistencies, and the dangerous excesses into which both have been unavoidably betrayed, by an indiscriminate support on the one hand, and an indiscriminate opposition on the other, to the measures of the existing administration, we cannot, for a moment, admit, that the majority of either actuated by any other than the purest, the most patriotic, and the most disinterested motives. A contrary belief would be in direct hostility with the principle to which, as republicans, we all accede, that the great mass of the people, however they may be deceived, are, nevertheless, honest in their intentions.

Such is believed to be the view which every intelligent and candid man must take, in relation to the operations of the two parties into which we have been divided. Nor is it at all affected by the fact, that selfish and designing men have sometimes been associated with, and, occasionally, perhaps, admitted into the confidence of both. This is a misfortune inseparable from the frailties of our nature, and ought in truth, to increase the spirit of toler-

ation with which we should look on the errors into which all have occasionally been betrayed.

What has hitherto been said, is, of course, applicable only to parties separated from each other by some actual difference of principle. Parties are, under any circumstances, evils. They beget excitement, interrupt social and political harmony, and not unfrequently exclude from the service of the government, the best feelings and the best talents of the nation. These inconveniences, however, are tolerated, as the result of the imperfection of human institutions, and of the impossibility of procuring the general assent of mankind to any proposition not susceptible of mathematical demonstration. They are necessary and unavoidable sacrifices to principle—and to principle only.

Whenever any number of individuals, on the contrary, differing essentially among themselves, combine, for the purpose of perpetuating an unmeaning name, continuing distinctions ungrounded in principle, and entailing on the nation the evils inseparable from parties, such individuals constitute a faction. Animated by no patriotic feeling, they seek only to narrow the competition for office; and, in order to increase the chances of their own elevation, are willing to keep alive forever the flame of political contention, and to deprive the country of the services of many of its most valuable citizens.

If the Catholics of Ireland maintained at this day the doctrines of their ancestors; if they now contended for the supremacy of the Pope, and held themselves bound to obey his mandates, in opposition to the constitution and laws of their own country, who would condemn the political disqualifications under which they labor? Who would not, on the contrary, consider them as the enactments of wisdom, and as safeguards, drawn by the statesmen of England, around the laws and the liberties of their country? But these absurdities of faith have passed away forever. The Irish Catholic contends for no more than the right of worshipping his maker in his own way. He yields a ready and unqualified obedience to the laws under which he lives; he pays his taxes to the government; he fights the battles of his king; and yet he is denied the right of participation in the offices and the honors of his country. Is this liberty? Is it toleration? Or is it not, rather, the most rancorous and unjustifiable persecution.

And yet, it would puzzle the most ingenious casuist to designate wherein it differs, in effect, from the spirit which breathes throughout the appeal, but lately made, in behalf of Mr. Crawford. The authors of that appeal, unwilling to present their candidate to the nation, have sought to make him the president of a party. Feelings long since forgotten, are revived; landmarks, decayed and abandoned, are re-established. And a vain effort is made, to rally around the same standard, individuals bound together by no common tie, to the exclusion of others, who are peaceably and honorably engaged with the great body of the nation, and without reference to either names or persons, in maintaining the best principles, and in placing on the surest foundation, the best institutions of the country. Had such an appeal been made at any period preceding the election of Mr. Monroe, it would have constituted no object of complaint. It would then have been an honorable stand in support of principle, and not a feeble attempt at political persecution.

I appeal to you, gentlemen, to say what there is in the principles of the Federal party, to require, or to justify the proscription with which they are threatened? Looking to the past, you will sometimes, it is true, find them the advocates of false doctrines and erroneous principles. Under the influence of party zeal, too, they have been occasionally betrayed into an opposition to measures which subsequent conviction has convinced them were calculated to promote the interests of their country. But have their opponents been uniformly right, and, at all times, consistent politicians? Very few of them, it is presumed, will, at

this day, justify their opposition to the Federal Constitution. And if the fact, that, in the Convention, Mr. Hamilton proposed a President and a Senate for life, is to cast an indelible reproach on himself, and on those who afterwards "delighted to honor him," will it be forgotten that Mr. Madison and Edmund Randolph, always high in the confidence of the democratic party, not only voted for these very measures, but actually proposed themselves to give to the general government a veto on every state law? These facts are adverted to, not in the spirit of reproach, but to show that errors of judgment, in relation even to the most important measures, ought not to be considered (as in reality they have not been by the American people) evidences of an incurable defective principle. The fact is, that a few years operation of the constitution relieved the operations both of his friends and its enemies; and, consecrated, as it is, at this day, in the affections of every American, it is no longer one of those points on which the Federal and Democratic parties can never be arrayed against each other.

The foreign policy of the government, until the termination of the late war, was a theme of endless controversy between the two parties. It is no longer so. There is a general concurrence of sentiment as to the system of foreign intercourse that ought to be adopted; or, if there be a difference, it is between individuals, rather than parties. On a late important occasion, Mr. Clay and Mr. Webster have coincided in opinion, while the views of both have been resisted by a large majority of Congress, without reference to former party divisions.

Even in relation to our past policy, about which we were once so much at variance, there is now a general concurrence of sentiment. Or, if we differ at all, it is in relation to points peculiar to the times in which they originated, and which it is hardly possible should ever again disturb our repose. Who does not now acknowledge the wisdom and propriety of General Washington's proclamation of neutrality? Who doubts that the country was essentially benefitted by the adoption of Mr. Jay's treaty? Whose bosom does not burn with indignation at the recital of the indolence of Genet? Who hesitates to approve the manly stand which was made by the second administration against the outrages of France? Who does not condemn the violent opposition which was made to the measures of defence and hostility, required by the times? Who now contends that Great Britain had done us no essential injury before the late war? Who doubts that the character of the country was very much elevated by that war? Who thinks it unbecom-

ing a moral and religious people, because opposed to its declaration, to have rejoiced at its successes? Who does not lament the indiscriminate opposition made to the measures of defence and hostility which it required? And, above all, who does not, unhesitatingly, subscribe to the sentiment of the lamented Deatur, and exclaim, in his language, "May our country always be right in her controversies with other nations; but always successful, whether right or wrong?" On those points at least, there is no longer a difference of opinion, requiring that either party should be held up to the nation as unworthy of its confidence.

It cannot be forgotten with what zeal the funding system, originating with General Hamilton, was opposed by his political enemies. It has since received the sanction of every administration. The navy, too, was a theme of obloquy and reproach to its earliest patrons. It is now the favorite of the nation. No measure, perhaps, contributed more to widen the breach between the parties, and to fix their character, than the establishment of the first National Bank. A similar institution, with a large capital and a more intimate connection with the government, has since been called into existence by the opponents of the first. An unsuccessful experiment has been made on commercial restrictions, as weapons of war. They have given way (it is presumed forever) to "powder, ball, and trusty blade." In fact, gentlemen,

if you will look through the past history of our country, you will find that most of the subjects of contention have either passed away forever, or that a change in the condition of our country, or the honest convictions of our minds, have brought us to think so nearly alike, that it is impossible we should again be arrayed against each other, as parties, organized for the support of principle. And, I repeat it, that those who would entail on us the acknowledged evils of party spirit, merely to perpetuate a name, or to diminish an honorable competition for office, in order to increase the chances of their own elevation, are neither more nor less than a faction.

I have recurred to the past, not for the purpose, nor in the expectation, of exciting an angry emotion. I never would recur to it, but to draw from it lessons of wisdom for the future. In the hasty review which has been taken, do we not see enough to convince us of the imperfections of the human judgment, and of the errors into which the best of us are but too apt to fall, under the influence of high party excitement? And, should not this teach us to temper our zeal, and to look, with candor and liberality, on the acts of those from whom we may happen, for the time, to differ?

Under the influence of this spirit, then, let us turn our eyes, for a moment to the future. What points are there in advance of us, on which the old parties are likely again to be brought into collision? I am willing to take your own explanation of the term "republicanism," made sometime during the last year, as an exposition of the true policy of our country. If I am not mistaken, (for the paper containing it is not by me,) I yielded a ready assent to almost every doctrine it advanced. And, in doing so, I have no doubt that I accorded with the great majority of the nation. But there are principles in that expose, the most important, perhaps, it contains, that will always meet with a decided opposition in the nation, and in its councils. The sources and character of that opposition you will readily understand, by reference to speeches on Appropriation, Army, and Fortification Bills; to the columns of the *Richmond Enquirer*; to Mr. Madison's celebrated report, in '98; and to the speeches of the greater part of the Virginian members, on the Internal Improvement Bill, that has lately passed the house of representatives. In this opposition, I venture to assert that very few federalists will be found. And I must entirely have misunderstood the character of that party, if its members are not, henceforward, arrayed on the side of any administration, organized on the principles, and pursuing the policy, you have recommended.

Why then is a party, no longer bound together by similar sentiments, no longer advocating the same principles, and no longer capable of uniting in the same policy, to be recognized? Why are those who, like yourselves, profess to be the advocates of a liberal construction of the constitution, and of a fair, manly, and generous system of public measures, to be separated from men, who concur with them in sentiment, and to be associated with others, who differ from them in almost every point? Could Mr. Clay and Mr. Calhoun, or even your own favorite Mr. Crawford, if his sentiments have been correctly estimated, sit at the same board with Mr. Holmes, Mr. Chandler, Mr. Lowrie, and Mr. Cocke? Or would they find themselves harmonizing better with Mr. Barbour, Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Archer? Imagine to yourselves a council composed of all the gentlemen that have been named. The powers of Burke alone could faithfully pourtray its character. It is enough for us to know, that liberal sentiment and national feeling would sink powerless at the feet of false economy and state usurpation.

And yet, such is the union which the members and advocates of the caucus would effect—an union, which would exclude Mr. Webster from the councils of his country, while it would admit Mr. Holmes, of Maine, to its highest honors—an union, which would have substituted for the present