The Semi-Weekly Sentinel.

VOL. 4. RALEIGH, N. C., SATURDAY AUGUST 28, 1869. NO. 8

THE SENTINEL.

"QUESTIONS"

The *Standard* is exercised because, as it says, the SENTINEL did not answer some questions propounded by it several days ago. It is our opinion that the *Standard* could have seen answers to its questions in our columns, since they were naked, if it read our remarks on its own course in regard to recent political events in Virginia and Tennessee. But these answers, it seems, are not sufficiently categorical for the *Standard*, therefore, we proceed to answer more explicitly.

1st. "Which of the Virginia candidates do the SENTINEL favor?"

Answer. The SENTINEL was in favor of Walker for Governor, and alone on the same ticket for the other offices of that State.

The SENTINEL was influenced in this preference by two considerations: First, because the Walker party were in favor of restoring to the free white men of the State all the rights of which they had theretofore been deprived by the Radical extremists, or Wells party, thus removing one of the strong objections against negro suffrage; and secondly, because we saw the *Standard* had a leaning towards the Wells faction prior to the election, and we knew, and can prove, that Gov. Holden, Dewees, Lellia and others, of the Radical leaders in this State considered the Wells party as identical with the Republican party in North Carolina, and knowing the views of *these* leaders and of the *Standard* on the subject of the removal of political disabilities, as manifested all along up to that time, we naturally felt a preference for Walker and the party which supported him over the "Wells extremists," as the *Standard* finds it popular now to denominate them.

2nd. "Does the SENTINEL support either candidate?"

Ans. The SENTINEL could not support either candidate, not being in that State, further than to exercise a preference and give its sympathy to the liberal party and its candidates, as stated above, and for the reasons given.

3rd. "If it does, when did it make its flip-flap?"

Ans. Not being versed in the slang vernacular of our neighbor, we are not sure we understand the interrogatory, but, if he will pass to ask, when our preference for Walker over Wells,—for the more liberal policy of the one over the malignant proscriptiveness of the other, commenced, we answer, many weeks before the *Standard* made its "flip flap,"—yes, as soon as the platforms were announced and the candidates nominated.

4th. "Both the candidates in Tennessee proclaim universal suffrage and claim to be Republicans; Stokes was against the carpet-baggers, Senter in favor of them. Can the SENTINEL support either of them?"

Ans. There is no difficulty in choosing the least of two evils, when one is obliged to take one or the other. The Senter party of Tennessee, promising to remove the onerous and odious proscription imposed upon a hundred thousand of her free white citizens by the administration and influence of the "god-like" Brownlow, as Holden called him not long since, we could, for the sake of this one good result, give the preference to Senter over the proscriptive Stokes, although the latter had the favor and prestige of the administration at Washington, (with which the *Standard* claims to be in full fellowship,) to back him.

5th. "If it can, when did it accomplish its summersault?"

Ans. The *Standard* is somewhat like an old fellow we know once, who thought the getting drunk was a necessary consequence of going to Muster. That paper seems to think it necessary to "accomplish a summersault" every time it takes a position on a political question presented. Which, indeed, does seem necessary with the *Standard*, as it seldom takes a position without a preliminary gymnastic exhibition of that kind.

6th. "All these parties, by adopting the universal suffrage platform, have now taken the same ground as has been occupied by the Republican party of North Carolina for over two years. The *Sentinel* has always abused all parties that supported universal suffrage. Does it now support the principles which it has before condemned?"

Ans. The *Standard* seems to forget that the "universal suffrage platform" has been enlarged so as to embrace "universal amnesty" and the removal of all political disabilities from white men hitherto proscribed—and to forget also, that the Republican party in North Carolina has not been supporting a platform with that feature in it, "for the last two years" nor, for the last two months. We contend that the Republican party was tyrannical in its proscription in the start, and that every hour of its continuance was a wrong, and we were glad to see the wrong undone, whatever the instrumentality. If a pickpocket robs you of your purse, with money and valuables in it, you are glad to get it back at the sacrifice of a reward "and no questions asked," if you can do no better. Does the *Standard* see the application?

7th. "If so, when did it turn over?"

Ans. We are not aware of having "turned over" at all. What we call turning over is, to do as the *Standard* has done: first favor Wells and then shout "for Walker;" first to oppose resolutions in the Legislature recommending the removal of disabilities, and then to advocate universal amnesty; first to pledge "the last man and the last dollar" in defence of secession, and to attack as traitors tried to make the pledge good; first to claim "universal amnesty" as its platform for the last two years, and then acknowledge in its controversy with the *Times* that its advocacy of that policy dates from the first of July; and finally, to turn in such a manner as to be with the liberal movement in Mississippi, and at the same time with the administration that opposes that policy. This is what we call turning!

We have some more answers on hand, when the "Standard" wants some it can have them.

(Pall Mall Gazette.)

PRESENTS, PERSONAL AND OFFICIAL.

Letters and newspapers from Victoria help to explain the general disgust of all classes in that part of the world at the item of £3,500 charged in the English estimates for the Duke of Edinburgh's presents. In themselves the articles, so far as they have been publicly acknowledged, appear to have been of a very paltry kind.—Their only value is the eyes of the recipients was that they came from the Queen's son as a personal gift, and this value is lost when it is known that were paid for by the British taxpayer. Moreover, when all the presents to officials and other public persons are reckoned up, only a fraction of the £3,500 is accounted for, and a member of the Legislative Assembly has given notice of a motion for an inquiry, in order to discover who received the bulk of the gifts. In short, the view of the Victorians is this—If the presents were to be paid for by the mother country they should have been bestowed openly, and on public grounds alone, and should moreover have been handsome, and worth having. If they were merely personal gifts to intimate private acquaintances, then the Duke should have paid for them himself, especially as he accepted a large quantity of costly articles in return. Meanwhile, the Indian Government is perplexed to decide what rule shall be laid down as to the Duke's presents in India. The Queen, it is said, forbids him either to give or accept anything; but this will seem very strange to the native Princes, who cannot dissociate friendship and respect from offerings.

PRUSSIA AND AUSTRIA.

Interesting Document of the King of Prussia and the Emperor of Austria.

The *Gazette of Saxony*, appearing at Leipsic, publishes two letters which, if authentic, throw a new light on the policy of the Prussian government during the few weeks which preceded the campaign of Sadowa. The first, from King William, addressed to the Emperor of Austria, and dated the 1st of June, 1866, is as follows:

We are at this moment both armed and ready to enter the field. The world believes that we shall fight each other. Let us show that German sovereigns know no hatred to each other, and that they desire only the welfare of the country. Let us unite our forces and march together across the Rhine against "the hereditary enemy of Germany." By that means we shall arrive at such a reorganization of the nation as shall satisfy the universal desires of the people! Your majesty will then unite under his sceptre the States of the South, while I shall become the master of North German and all of the French Rhenish provinces of German origin, situated on the other side of the Rhine (Alsace and Lorraine.) If we attain that object the future of Europe will be in our hands.

The answer of the Emperor of Austria was thus worded:

Your Majesty proposes to me to unite our forces now on a war footing, against France, and at the same time you appeal to my honor as a German prince and show me in perspective the possibility of a union of the Germain Southern States under Austria. As a German prince I must reply that my ideas and my feelings forbid me to deprive the confederate allies of Austria, the chiefs of German nations, of their sovereign rights.

The second letter was conveyed to Berlin by General Baron de Gablenz. "We shall," adds the *Gazette of Saxony*, "no doubt receive a denial from Berlin, if facts so positively stated can be contradicted."

"COTTON STILL KING"—If any one is still disinclined to confess the truth that "cotton is king," and a great king, too, his doubts ought to be resolved by the startling statement of the Manchester Cotton Supply Association, which is forced to acknowledge that "when the great cotton crop of 1866 was made in India, over one million three hundred thousand souls perished from starvation, produced from putting lands in cotton which should have been appropriated to bread-stuffs." So also in Egypt, it is admitted, in 1865, "when a large attempt at cotton growing was made, some 250,000 of the population perished from actual starvation." The product of American cotton last year was 2,000,000 bales. This year the amount will be 3,500,000 and next it ought to be 4,000,000 as it is discovered that white men and Chinese can grow cotton as well as colored people. As India, nor Egypt, nor Africa, nor South America can meet the needed supply of cotton, it is satisfactory to know that the United States can. Millions have been expended in exploring other fields, only to show the greater value of American cotton, which is now more of a king than before the war. Wont, indeed, without it could the United States do to the needed work of reducing to a bale extent the amount of our debt in Europe?—*Bull, Cin.*

A MEAT SHOWER.—All our Eastern and Southwestern stories about sea serpents, fire land snakes, discoveries of buried treasure, and the like, have been surpassed at Los Angeles, in southern California. At that place, according to report, on the last Sunday in July, there was a shower of blood, meat and hair, the fragments of flesh coming down in strips six or eight inches long, and presenting the appearance of having been freshly torn from living animals. Several people in that region believe the story. Though some consider it a California story, though some consider it a California story, though some consider it a California story,