

PROGRESS OF REASON.

From the United States Telegraph.

THE NORTHERN PRESS.

We are glad to see a more friendly tone assumed by the northern press towards those of the South, who have differed from them on some important points of policy. Now that the heat of the controversy is over, and that they can look at what is passing and what has passed with an eye less prejudiced by opinions of interest, they are beginning to see with a clearer vision. Better feelings prevail, and they are beginning really to think, as the Boston Sentinel expresses it, "that the intentions of both parties (Nullifiers and Nationals) are correct and honest."

Much is gained when the North thinks thus. All we want is for them to think and judge candidly of our acts and of our principles; and we fear not but that all the party outcry that has been, that we want to dissolve the Union, will vanish into air, and the people will see that we truly value the Union, and that we show this when we earnestly contend for measures and principles, without which we sincerely fear the Union will not be of long duration.

We do think that the people of the North must acknowledge that their press has a much more patriotic appearance with such sentiments in their columns, than when they are filled with denunciations of a large section of the States as seeking a dissolution of the Union.

It certainly would have no small effect in turning away the thoughts of any, if there were any so ignorant of their true interest, as to wish a dissolution of the Union.

It was but the other day that we re-published, from the Boston Courier, an article avowing sentiments that it gave us very great pleasure to see in that quarter. To-day we publish an article from the Boston Sentinel, an article on State Rights, which exhibits a feeling that ought to be encouraged.

STATE RIGHTS.

Many of the leading Southern papers, and particularly those of South Carolina, are continually discussing the principles of "State Rights," and waging a paper warfare against those who do not take part with them in the contest. Now we apprehend that this is all a controversy about words, and nothing else,—*one et preterea nihil*. As to real practical State Rights, the Southern States are no people peculiar in sustaining them. There are no people more devoted to them than the people of the Northern States. Let any one State Right be violated, and the north would be roused at once against the aggression. It is, then, a mere difference of opinion as to what constitutes a breach of State Rights.

The Carolina doctrine is, that the National Government has no right to impose duties on foreign imports for the protection of domestic industry. The people of the northern, the middle, and the western States, think differently, and are willing to sustain the Government in the same enactment of such duties. In short, what a large portion of the southern people hold to be a violation of State Rights, a large portion of the rest of the Union consider to be a violation of no right at all, but the mere discharge of a constitutional duty of Congress. It is then an abuse of terms, to pretend that the rights of the South are different from the rights of the North. All that can be said is, that the Carolinians are strenuous in support of what they deem true State Rights, and their opponents are equally determined to sustain their own construction of those principles. It is a mere difference of opinion as to terms and principles, on points, concerning which honest and intelligent men may differ in construction.

Let us take it for granted that the motives and intentions of both parties are correct and honest, but that they disagree only in matters of opinion. Under these circumstances, all questions ought to be settled by the competent judicial authorities. In the meantime, let honest men of both parties unite in opposition to an administration that has set the laws and the Constitution at open defiance; an administration that has seized upon the whole public money of the nation, and assigned its custody and temporary use and benefit to partisan agents; an administration that has converted the post office into a vast machine for electing corrupt persons, and thereby squandered away hundreds of thousands of dollars upon unprincipled partisans. Let all high-minded and intelligent men leave off quarrelling about constitution subtleties and imaginary grievances, and exert all their energies in resisting the obvious aggression of a partisan government, and the country will soon settle down in harmony and general prosperity.

From the Philadelphia National Gazette.

Mr. Editor: Will you permit me, through the columns of the Gazette, briefly to state a few principles of the State Rights Party, whose objects and views as a party appear to be misunderstood by yourself and some of your correspondents.

The first grand leading object—the polar star of this party, to whose patriotism a just tribute is at least beginning to be paid—is to prevent a case of what is called Nullification from ever again arising to disturb the harmony of the Union. This we propose to do, not by exciting resistance and then putting it down by force; but we think that we have hit upon a much more effectual way, not original with us indeed, but lying at the very foundation of our Federal compact—and which alone can perpetuate our Union; we mean by compromise, conciliation, and a strict construction of the Constitution. If the Federal Congress keep within its prescribed limits—exercise no doubtful powers—no powers not expressly delegated—there will be no reason to despair of the Republic. But open the port of construction upon the illustrious ocean beyond, and launch forth upon its boisterous surface without chart or compass, and a man need be neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet to foresee that the ship of state will be soon wrecked. With such a principle of administering the Federal Government, the Union will not last twenty years longer.

You appear to think that a strict construction would render the Government too weak. Have you never thought, sir, upon considering our political history, that every assumption of power not clearly within the letter of the compact has resulted and must always result in weakening the Government? Have you never thought that the true strength of the Union consists in the affection and harmony of all its members? Have you never reflected upon the truth and reasonableness of the following memorable words of Vice-President Clinch, delivered in the Senate of the United States in the course of a long life, "I have seen that government is not to be strengthened by

an assumption of doubtful powers, but by a wise and energetic execution of those which are incontestable: the former never fails to produce suspicion and distrust, whilst the latter inspires respect and confidence."

As a matter of fact simply, nullification exists.—Whether it be a rightful remedy, or not, is another and different question. There is scarcely a State of the Union which has not, by its Legislature going a step beyond even the doctrines of South Carolina, arrested the execution of Federal acts on the ground of their unconstitutionality. The great question is, what limits shall be put upon it, and how shall we hinder its occurrence?

Our doctrine is not that a State Legislature has any right to interfere, except to petition and to protest. It belongs only to the PEOPLE of the State to exercise this high act of Sovereign Authority. The Legislature, therefore, cannot precipitate the State into such a contest; but when such a "palpable, dangerous, and deliberate" violation of the compact occurs as to arouse the people to action—to induce them to throw off their natural *vis inertiae*, they possess it.

The people of a State bound together by the social compact, forming a moral person, have constituted two attorneys to exercise their inherent sovereign powers. One invested with general authority—the State Government. The other with special powers, to wit—the Federal Government. Should the latter go beyond the prescribed limits, its acts are invalid; but it only belongs to the principal to disaffirm them, which we contend to be the people of each State, and not the State Government.

Great danger is apprehended from the abuse of this power. But this danger must always exist some where. For my own part, (it is true I am a Whig,) I would much rather see it reside with those who have parted with most of their powers, and who pay to support the exercise of them, than with those who possess the powers and who receive and batten on the money.

In short, we think the General Government ought to consult the interests, not of an absolute majority, but, as far as possible, of all the parts: And we are for putting such checks upon the majority, as will prevent them from riding rough shod over the minority, as they have been too often disposed to do.

Excuse me, Mr. Editor, for one word more. We see too much reason to fear that the present excitement may end in a change of MEN merely, and not (the higher object at which we aim,) a change of PRINCIPLES. There are those in the community who are loud in their opposition to the present executive usurpations, who are averse simply to seeing these powers concentrated in the person of Andrew Jackson, who would, nevertheless, have no earthly objection to seeing them vested in the office of President, provided it was filled to their satisfaction. It is the latter we oppose as much as the former; and do not, I pray you, Mr. Editor, stigmatize us as "unpatriotic and selfish," if in this great contest we raise the banner of Principles, and desire to be known as, not the Anti-Jackson or Anti-Van Buren, but the Whig party; or if you please,

STATE RIGHTS.

VAN BURENISM.

drawn than the following, by Dr. Cooper's better pen. It is a small sketch, but it is an admirable one. The Doctor says:

"At the same time, it can hardly be necessary for me to repeat, what I took occasion last winter publicly to avow—my utter abhorrence of Van Burenism. By universal consent, Van Buren is admitted to be, if not the chief adviser, the approver of all the worst measures of the present administration. His election, then, to the Presidency, would entail upon us all the horrible misrule of the day, and superadd upon it the corrupt and corrupting machinery of New York tactics. If I object to the distinguished individuals above mentioned, on account of the discrepancy between their political principles and my own, I object to Mr. Van Buren because of his *vice desinendi* of all political principles. He has been for and against the Bank, Internal Improvements, and a Protective Tariff, just as the one or the other course seemed, for the moment, best calculated to produce his personal views. He is the author of that machinery which has robbed the people of his native State of all free agency in the management of their public affairs, and reduced them to the degraded condition of passive tools in the hands of designing, intriguing, office-hunting demagogues. He is the head of that church whose high priests have proclaimed to the world, as the fundamental doctrine of their creed, that the "spoils of victory" (that is, the people's offices) are the aim, as they are the just reward, of the victorious!" From such a code of political misrule, and from its authors and abettors, may God, in his mercy, ever deliver my country!

Repeated applications have been made at our office, by persons wishing to compete for mail routes, for the Post Office advertisement on the subject of carrying the mails in this State; but as neither of the papers in this city have the honor to publish it, they have, of course, been disappointed in getting a peep at it; and consequently many a worthy individual, desirous of serving the public, has been deprived of the privilege, and the government, peradventure, has lost the chance of many a *sure* bid and enterprising contractor. We cannot answer the inquiry so frequently made, "Why has Maj. Barry not ordered the advertisement to be made in one of the Raleigh papers, as has heretofore been customary?" Unless it be that there is no Van Buren-Regency-Collar-Paper printed here now; and it would not look so well in any other.—Raleigh Star.

Jingling the Gold Coins.—Some of the northern papers say that Mr. Van Buren is playing the mountebank electioneer, and is jingling the gold coins among the Dutch, and endeavoring to propitiate them by the sight of the gold. We can scarcely believe it. We might allow such a thing in Senator Benton; and as the President is infallible and can do no wrong, we may permit him to do so likewise; but it is really discreditable in the Vice President. His station ought to restrain him from any thing so disreputable.—U. S. Tel.

A Public Dinner was given to Gov. Poindexter at Vicksburg, Miss., about the first of September, which was attended by seven hundred and sixty persons—an extraordinary number, when it is understood that in the town and county there are only 300 voters.



THE CAROLINIAN.

SALISBURY: Saturday, October 11, 1834.

STATE SOVEREIGNTY.

Having now published the Articles of Confederation, and the Constitution, with its amendments, we shall proceed to make such comments, and to adduce such authorities to sustain them, as will, in our opinion, tend to give a correct exposition of the nature of our compact, and of the relative rights and powers of the General and State Governments.

Some persons entertain the opinion that the respective States stand in the same relation to the United States that the Counties do to a State; or, in other words, that the States are nothing more than mere corporations, or municipalities, that derive their powers from the General Government. A grosser political heresy can hardly be conceived. The very reverse of this is true. The General Government is the creature of the States, and possesses no power but what it derived from them.

The second article of the Confederation is, of itself, sufficient to establish our position beyond the reach of controversy, in the judgment of any one who will consider it candidly, and with such a spirit as ought to influence an unprejudiced inquirer after truth.

That article says—"Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not, by this Confederation, expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled." The word *retains*, means *keeps*—each State therefore keeps: now, if the States did not possess these attributes, would it not be absurd to talk of their keeping them? Language cannot more clearly convey the idea that, at the time the States entered into that solemn league which bore them through an arduous but successful struggle, they all considered each one individually *sovereign, free, and independent*. And in the exercise of the rights of free and independent sovereignties they met and established a Government with certain "expressly delegated" powers.

Until December, 1832, very few men of common sense, who had any regard for their reputation, would have hazarded the assertion that the States were never individually *sovereign and independent*. Without any other evidence, the second article of the Confederation, which we have quoted, would have been sufficient to confute an assertion so ridiculous, and to overwhelm with confusion him who made it. But, in an evil hour, under the influence of an unruly temper, and wrought upon by selfish office-holders and apostate politicians, the President issued the Proclamation, renouncing all his early sentiments in regard to our Governments—denying that the States ever had any separate political independence—and, in fine, arguing strenuously to prove that ours is a Consolidated Government!

When this mischievous document was published to the world, the minds of men were so much absorbed by a contemplation of the storm which was apparently ready to rush over our country, that very few could consider the doctrines avowed in it with sufficient calmness to detect their fallacy and their utter inconsistency with the political history of our Government, and with the professed principles of the President himself. A few cunning politicians of the Consolidation school seized the opportunity to renege their doctrines, backed by the authority and the popularity of the President. The whole host of venal editors and mercenary politicians joined in acclamations of praise to the old Hero for his patriotic Proclamation; and it seemed, for a while, as if doctrines, more ultra and odious than those which were put down in '96 with execrations, were about to be established by almost universal acclamation. But the clouds which darkened our horizon gradually disappeared, and the general panic gave place to the calm influence of reason. Men then began to scrutinize the Proclamation: it was found to contain many mis-statements of facts, and still more erroneous and dangerous deductions; and the President was driven to the humiliating necessity of recanting, or of explaining away, the most objectionable parts.

To prove that the States were individually sovereign when they first considered in 1776, and that their sovereignty was not impaired by that confederation, we might rely, with great security, upon the second article, and upon the whole tenor of the Confederation. But, in order to satisfy the scruples of the most incredulous, we will give a few other authorities of a later date.

In 1787 the Convention met to amend the Articles of Confederation. It is well known that the diversity of opinion was so great, in that Convention, in regard to the extent of powers proper to be given to the General Government, that serious collisions arose among the members from the different States, and the Convention was on the eve of dissolution without coming to any understanding. It is unnecessary here to enumerate the various propositions submitted for the organization of a new Government. It is sufficient to state that among others there was one to make the representation of each State, in each branch of Congress, proportionate to its population and taxation. This was wisely objected to by the members from the small States. And Judge Ellsworth, a distinguished member from Connecticut, afterwards Chief-Justice of the United States, moved that, in the Senate, each State should have an equal vote. In the course of his argument in support of the motion, Judge Ellsworth remarked—

"When, in the hour of common danger, (in 1778,) we united as equals, shall it now be urged, by some, that we must depart from this principle when the danger is over! We then associated as free and independent States."

On the same motion, Mr. Bedford, from Delaware, remarked—

"That all the States at present are equally *sovereign and independent*, has been asserted from every quarter of this house. Our deliberations here are a confirmation of this position."

Mr. Bedford went on to argue in favor of confederating on principles of equality, and distinctly declared that, sooner than submit to a plan which would crush the smaller States, they would be taken by the hand by some foreign Power.

Mr. Rufus King followed. He expressed his regret at the expression of the gentleman from Delaware.—He said—

"I am in sentiment with those who wish the preservation of State Governments. Let the Constitution we are about forming be considered as a *Commission* under which the General Government shall act, and as such it will be the guardian of State Rights."

We might multiply, almost indefinitely, authorities to show that the States were considered sovereign under the old Confederation; and we could find as many authorities for it among the old Federalists as among the old Republicans: we shall, however, quote but a few more at present.

Immediately after the adjournment of the General Convention which formed the Constitution, in 1787, the several States called together Conventions for the purpose of considering whether they would adopt or reject the new Constitution. The Convention of the State of Pennsylvania met in November 1787. Mr. James Wilson, who had just left the General Convention, of which he was a leading member, and one of that party who were in favor of reducing the power of the States, was also a member of the Pennsylvania Convention. He explained, at great length and with much ability, the various parts and objects of the new Constitution, and in the course of his remarks he said—"The United States already contain thirteen Governments mutually independent."

How could language more clearly express the individual sovereignty of the States! Eleven years before this they had declared their independence, and, by the success of their arms, they had constrained even Britain herself to acknowledge it. Hence it is evident, that, if they were independent of all foreign nations, and "mutually independent," that is to say, independent of each other, the States must have been, and continued, separately sovereign, at least up to the time they adopted the new Constitution.

If the unanimous assertion of their individual sovereignty, in the solemn league of 1776, and the other evidences adduced, be insufficient to establish the fact, then we must give up the point in despair of being able to convince those who reject the assertions of the most authentic history, and the most conclusive reasoning drawn from that history.

But it has been said that, even if the States were sovereign under the old Confederation, they relinquished their sovereignty when they adopted the Constitution.

We propose now to examine this point. In January 1788 the Convention of Massachusetts met to consider the Constitution. There, as in other Conventions, some parts of the Constitution encountered strong opposition, and especially that part which provides that the States shall be equally represented in the Senate, which is to be chosen for six years.

The objections were answered by several able men, particularly by Fisher Ames. And here we will remark, in passing, that Mr. Ames was a Federalist, and that, as a member of that party accused of being opposed to State Sovereignty, and in favor of a strong General Government, and moreover being a man of extraordinary talents and attainments, he would not have lent the sanction of his name to establish what he considered a political heresy. His high sense of honor would equally have forbid his giving an unwarrantable construction to the Constitution in order to secure its adoption by a people jealous of their rights. And what says this great man! He says—

"The State Governments are essential parts of the system, and the efficacy of this article is drawn from its tendency to their preservation. The Senators represent the SOVEREIGNTY of the States.—They are in the quality of Ambassadors of the States."

Here we have a cross acknowledgment, by a distinguished Federalist, of State Sovereignty, in terms that cannot be misunderstood. We have never met with a more striking recognition. As if "to make assurance doubly sure," and to prevent the possibility of misconception, Mr. Ames first asserts, in so many words, the sovereignty of the States, and then exemplifies his meaning by describing the characters of the Senators as that of "Ambassadors." Now, what is an Ambassador? The father of English lexicographers defines an Ambassador to be "A person sent in a public name from one Sovereign Power to another, and supposed to represent the Power from which he is sent."

Such was the candid avowal of one who in times of high political excitement was stigmatized as a black-cocked Federalist. Yet where will we look for more orthodox doctrine in regard to State Rights! Surely not among those professed friends of State Rights who sneered at Virginia when she sent Mr. Leigh as a Commissioner, or Ambassador, to the State of South Carolina on a late important occasion! Much less need we expect to find it from those apostates who have subscribed to the whole farrago of the Proclamation, and denied State Sovereignty altogether.

But to return to our quotations. In the same Convention (of Massachusetts) some of the members argued the propriety of annexing to the Constitution a Bill of Rights, declaring what rights and powers the States intended to reserve. To this it was very properly replied, that it would be inexpedient, because it would be impossible to enumerate the reserved rights. But, in order to remove the apprehensions of those who were anxious for some such restriction, the venerable President, old John Hancock, proposed the following article as an amendment to the Constitution, viz:—

"That it be explicitly declared that all powers not expressly delegated by the aforesaid Constitution are reserved to the several States, to be by them exercised."

Upon this proposition, that honest and sagacious old Whig, Samuel Adams, remarked—

"This appears to my mind, to be a summary of a bill of rights. It is consonant with the second article in the present Confederation, that each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled."

The substance of this, which Samuel Adams said was tantamount to the second article of the old Confederation, constitutes the Tenth Article of the Amendments of the Constitution.

That we may not be tediously long while treating a subject of such vast importance, we shall close our remarks at present, and resume the subject hereafter.—We shall endeavor to use the plainest possible language, and shall resort to no uncandid conclusions and unreasonable inferences—but will suffer our cause to fall if it cannot be sustained by truth and fair argument.

MAGNANIMITY.

Some Editors and other persons of the National Republican Party are constantly declaiming about the beauty of magnanimity, and urging all the Whigs to make a magnanimous surrender of their slight differences of opinion, and unite in putting down the great enemy of our Constitution—Executive assumption.

That party—the Nationals—consider themselves stronger than the State Rights Party, but not quite strong enough to subdue the Regency Van Buren Party: hence they are very willing—magnanimous souls!

to let the Nullifiers co-operate with them to effect that desirable end; and, so long as the latter—the Nullifiers—will be satisfied to play second fiddle to their leader of the band, all goes on as harmoniously as a church organ.

Now, we have always thought that, where there was a difference, not entirely irreconcilable, between men or parties, true magnanimity would require the weaker man or party to make the first sacrifice or peace-offering. If this principle be correct—and if the Nationals really believe that they are more numerous than the State Rights men—and if, moreover, they really consider the latter true Whigs—why do they not cease to denounce them, and come over and unite with them in defence of the Constitution?

The game they are playing is rather transparent to deceive the Nullifiers. The latter do not supplicate any party for their good opinion; and, although they are men, and therefore not entirely indifferent to offers, they certainly will not barter their principles to obtain office, or, it may be, merely to get into a state of probation.

We have been led to these remarks by some articles that have appeared in the Lynchburg Virginian (a paper devoted to Mr. Clay,) and copied into other papers of the National Republican Party. The articles we allude to most particularly are certain scraps from malignant effusions of Judge Smith, denouncing Nullification generally, and Mr. Calhoun, its able advocate, as the Caline or Robespierre of his country. We shall, probably, take some occasion soon to let those know, who do not already know, something about the Judge Smith, who lived in South Carolina as long as he could get an office there, and, when his shivish principles drew him down, fled to Alabama, whence, like the flying Partisan, he shoots his venomous arrows at his brave foes.

The Nationals seem to be in a disagreeable quandary. They can't get along without the help of the Nullifiers; they therefore are kind enough to call them Whigs, and praise some of their second or third rate great men, while the one who is most prominent in the field held up to public odium, in some of their prints, as a traitor. Is this the way to conciliate? Do they expect the Nullifiers to assist them—to hold the ladder for them to mount, that they may turn round from their elevation and spit upon their dupes below! We have said that the Nullifiers would not barter their principles for offices; and we will add, that they will not truckle to any party to get a release from that proscription which unjustly rests upon them. They know, and we know, that they can choose, between the other two parties, which they will serve; but, while they are ever ready to co-operate with either in opposition to the lawless measures of the other, they are for no office-seeking alliances, but will patiently rest upon their principles, and with them "sink or swim." These principles may be kept under the ban during the existence of the present Administration; possibly they may be kept down, through the influence of Executive patronage and "the spoils," until some new aggression upon the rights of the States shall arouse the people generally to a sense of their danger. In the meantime the loaves and fishes may be distributed bountifully among the hungry just as of running and successful applicants; but the day of retribution will come, when they, in their turn, will be constrained to appeal to the magnanimity of a deceived but honest people.

Till that day comes, the State Rights Party will be satisfied with the proud consciousness of their own motto; and if, unhappily, it should never come, but the General Government, or the Executive, should succeed in wresting all powers and rights from the People and the States, then the party which has firmly resisted will at least have the consolation of reflecting that, if the Constitution must fall, they are guiltless.

MOVEMENTS IN NEW YORK.

A Whig Convention was lately held at Utica, in the State of New York, for the purpose of selecting candidates to run for Governor and Lieut-Governor.

William H. Seward was nominated for the former, and Silas M. Stillwell for the latter office. The presses in favor of the Administration, and Martin Van Buren, have been exceedingly clamorous against aristocracy; but some of them, have exposed the fallaciousness of their republican principles by ridiculing the nomination of Mr. Stillwell because he was once a mechanic. They seem to have forgot that many of our most distinguished men were once mechanics.—But some of the wisest patriots and statesmen of the Revolution, are famous were mechanics: Franklin was a printer, and old Roger Sherman a shoemaker.

On the 10th ult. some Whigs in the City of New York had a meeting, attended by upwards of four thousand citizens. The Hon. Gulian C. Verplanck presided. The following resolution, introduced by Colonel Webb, Editor of the Courier and Enquirer, was unanimously adopted:

"Resolved, That the Merchants, Mechanics, Manufacturers, and others, who take an interest in the triumph of Whig Principles, be respectfully requested to close their doors after twelve o'clock on the three days of the approaching election, and devote themselves to the success of the great cause which has for its object the preservation of the Constitution, the Laws, and the Liberties of the People."

The election takes place on the first Monday in next month, and this resolution shows that the Whigs are fully sensible of the importance of the contest, and determined at least to deserve victory. Their opponents are alarmed at their energy, and one of the servile papers—the Evening Post—has attempted to intimidate them by a threat of bloodshed if the Whigs carry their resolution into effect. Pretty conduct, truly, for men professing republican principles and an extraordinary devotion to the purity of the elective franchise!

"A VOICE IN THE WEST."

We have received a letter from an esteemed friend (we regret that he differs with us in politics) requesting us to publish a communication which appeared, a few weeks ago, in the "North Carolina Journal," over the signature of "A Voice in the West."

As we do not exchange papers with the Editors of the Journal, we are not in possession of the piece alluded to, and of course cannot say, without reading it, whether we would publish it or not; for that would depend entirely upon the character of the article.

In justice, however, to our correspondent, we will give an extract from his letter, that his reasons for the request may be seen. In doing this much, we must remind our friend that, although our columns are always open to a free discussion of political principles, he must not expect them to be made a medium for communications of a partisan character adverse to our own views. We will be just, but in party warfare, where principles of vital importance depend on the issue, we will promise only as much magnanimity as our adversaries show to us. This will be our course.