

# THE CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

## BRUNER & JAMES, Editors & Proprietors.

"KEEP A CHECK UPON ALL YOUR  
RULERS."



DO THIS, AND LIBERTY IS SAFE.  
Gen'l. Harrison.

NEW SERIES,  
NUMBER 41, OF VOLUME IV.

SALISBURY, N. C., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1848.

### MR. BADGER'S SPEECH, In the Senate, January 18th.

(CONCLUDED.)

Thus, it seems to me, that not only did the President bring on the war by an unlawful and unconstitutional act, but that he prosecuted it for the purpose of conquest, and of conquest alone. But this purpose the President did not make known to Congress. He did not submit (as he should have done) to the judgment of Congress, whether they were willing to prosecute the war for the purpose of making a permanent conquest of the territory of a neighboring republic. On the contrary, he seems carefully to have concealed his design from Congress. In his special message of the 4th of August, 1846, to the Senate, he says expressly:

"The chief difficulty to be anticipated in the negotiation is the adjustment of the boundary between the parties by a line which shall at once be satisfactory and convenient to both, and such as neither will hereafter be inclined to disturb. This is the best mode of securing perpetual peace and good neighborhood between the two republics. Should the Mexican Government, in order to accomplish these objects, be willing to cede any portion of their territory to the United States, we ought to pay them a fair equivalent; a just and honorable peace, and not conquest, being our purpose in the prosecution of the war."

Now, what notion the President attaches to the term "conquest," I do not know! To me it seems plain that what had been directed to be done before this message was written, and what was afterwards done by the military and naval officers of the Government, not only without rebuke, but with the express recognition of the President of the United States, is direct, clear, and unquestionable conquest. I understand conquest in this connection as meaning the seizure of the territory of another nation by force; whether it is to be held by force, or whether a consent to our retaining it is to be extorted by the power of our arms.

Again, sir, the President's message, at the last session of Congress, expressly declares that "the war has not been waged with a view to conquest;" that "the war will continue to be prosecuted with vigor as the best means of securing peace;" and that "it is deemed proper to hold military possession of all the provinces which have been taken, until a definitive treaty of peace shall have been concluded and ratified by the two countries." And I recollect well, sir, at the last session, when a resolution was moved by a member of this body (Mr. Westcott) directing the Committee of Territories to consider as to the propriety of establishing some species of legislative authority over the territories of the enemy which had been taken into our possession, the honorable Senator from Missouri, (Mr. Benton,) who is not now in his seat, in his strong manner denounced in his place the proposition, on the ground that it attributed to the President of the United States the assumption that those portions of Mexico were territories of the United States. This honorable Senator characterized as an absurdity.

MR. WESTCOTT. Monstrosity.

MR. BADGER. Yes, monstrosity. But, sir, this year the tone of the message is materially changed. The President has got a new phrase. He now says, that he is not carrying on the war for the purpose of conquest, but "it has never been contemplated by me, as an object of the war, to make a permanent conquest of the Republic of Mexico, or to annihilate her separate existence as an independent nation." This is quite consistent with a design of temporarily conquering the whole and permanently conquering a part. Indeed, he expressly informs us that New Mexico and the Californias "should never be surrendered to Mexico." Now, it seems to me that it was the duty of the President of the United States to have explained to Congress from the first what his real purpose was. If he intended at the last session to actually conquer and retain by force—to retain, under all circumstances, the territory then acquired from Mexico—he should have so told Congress. But he told us no such thing. On the contrary, he leaves us to suppose that though these proceedings seem to look like conquest, yet still, in the Presidential mind, the conquest of any part of Mexico was not his purpose. Now, sir, we are distinctly informed that the President is of opinion that we should retain, at all hazards, New Mexico and the two Californias.

The next proposition which strikes me as being material to a just determination of the course to be pursued in reference to the bill now under the consideration of the Senate is this: that the present plan of the war, as announced by the Secretary of the War Department in his communication to the President, if carried out, must irresistibly lead to the conquest of the whole of Mexico; and I think we may reasonably conclude, judging of the future by the past, that if at this session Congress shall place in the hands of the President all the means he has asked, we shall the next session find the whole of Mexico entirely overrun and at the mercy of our troops; and we shall then have a message informing us that the President

is opinion that Congress should not consent, under any circumstances, to surrender any portion of the Mexican Republic. The Secretary of War, in his report, speaks of three plans. Why, sir, there are but two in fact, if I am capable of understanding what seems to be tolerably plain language. Human ingenuity cannot make of it more than two plans, although he has numerically divided it into three. What are they?

"Our further operations must, in my opinion, be conducted in one of the three following modes: First, to take and hold an indemnity line; to recede from all places and positions now occupied in advance of it, and cease from all aggressive operations beyond that line; second, to overrun the whole country, and hold all the principal places in it by permanent garrisons; and, third, to retain what we now possess, open the lines of communication into the interior, and extend our operations to other important places, as our means and the prospect of advantage shall indicate, keeping a disposable force always ready, within approachable limits, to annoy the enemy, to seize supplies, enforce contributions, and frustrate his efforts to collect means and assemble troops for the purpose of protracting the war."

Well, now, sir, is it not strange that numbers two and three shall be considered separate and distinct plans? The second is to overrun the whole country and hold all the principal places in it by establishing garrisons therein. What is the third? It is to retain what we possess, to open a communication with the interior, and to take other places, according as our means may enable us. Does he mean under the second plan to take more than our means will enable us to take? Under the first of the two latter of the Secretary's plans, he proposes to take all the principal places in Mexico; and, under the second of them, he proposes to keep what we have got and get all we can. Well, now the President has adopted the third of the plans reported by the Secretary, as enumerated by him, upon which the war is to be carried on, and it is upon that basis that supplies are asked, and particularly the ten regiments proposed to be raised by the bill, to assist in carrying out the operations of this war, in accordance with the views of the Secretary.

Well, sir, believing as I do that the necessary consequence of furnishing the means which are required by this bill will be to enable the Secretary of War, under the direction of the President, to make a permanent conquest of the whole of Mexico, I cannot vote for it. I am opposed to augmenting the forces for such a purpose.

How is the conquest of Mexico to be effected? How is a peace to be brought about, under this mode of prosecuting a war, except by the seizure and subjugation of the whole country? I cannot vote, sir, for any plan by which Mexico is to be conquered and annexed. Because, in the first place, it would be grossly unjust. It would, in my judgment, according to my convictions of right, be a high and flagrant wrong for us to seize upon and incorporate the territories of that Republic into our own. I believe it would fix a stigma upon the character of this people which all successive ages would not be able to wipe out.

No oblivion that thousands of years could throw over it, no darkness with which the lapse of ages could surround it, would prevent the flagrant enormity of such a measure from being apparent to posterity. How could our future historians and poets be able to relate the tale of this country's doings in regard to this feeble, unfortunate, degraded Republic? In vain would the attempt be made to close the eyes of mankind against the gross injustice of this procedure, by throwing around it the flimsy pretences which patriotism might suggest. Sir, now we have the dazzling blaze of military glory cast over these operations, and behold them in a light which may mislead and deceive us, but when the excitement of the present day shall have passed away, and they shall be looked at in the clear light of history, and their character pronounced by the voice of truth, there will be a universal verdict of condemnation given by mankind. My deliberate conviction is, that in the judgment of posterity, if we should consummate such a wrong as this, the crimson guilt of the partition of Poland would pale into absolute whiteness in the comparison. The one, it would be said, was an act perpetrated by monarchs, hereditary rulers, men born to govern, and who had been taught to regard others merely as the ministers of their power, & in whose behalf it might be urged that they only followed the example of their predecessors in seeking, by whatever means, to increase their power; but in the other case it would be declared that the act was committed by a Republican Government, based on principles of equal rights, and professing friendship and good will to all mankind, seeking for national happiness and national glory in the pursuit of the peaceful arts, engaged in the establishment of justice and tranquility, and regarding the whole human race as brethren in blood, entitled to their humanity and consideration. The writers of that distant age would find that then, as ever,

"Nor florid prose nor honeyed lies of rhyme,  
Can blazon evil deeds or consecrate a crime."

I am not willing that my country should now commit this irreparable wrong, and soil herself with this ineffaceable stain. I am opposed to the seizure and annexation of Mexico, because it is as unjust as unjust. I know there are some who entertain a different opinion, but it does seem clear to me that the accomplishment of such a measure as the incorporation of Mexico—whether her people are to be introduced into a community of rights with us or to be held as a degraded and conquered province—whether they are to sustain towards us the relation of the territories we have heretofore had, or to remain in a state of perpetual pupillage—whether the mode and form in which their future condition and character are to be established—must inevitably, in the hour of its completion, doom the Union to certain destruction.

I was glad to hear the Senator from S. Carolina farthest from me (Mr. Calhoun) take strong and decided ground against the absorption of Mexico and the destruction of her nationality. I was glad to hear his voice raised against what in my view would be one of the greatest of crimes, one of the greatest of political blunders. But I wonder, Mr. President, that it did not strike the honorable Senator that the injustice of seizing upon the whole by force was an injustice but in degree superior to seizing upon any part by force; that though the enormity of absorbing the whole of the Mexican territory strikes us with astonishment and horror, it is but because the human mind is more strongly affected and impressed by subjects which appear large, yet that in truth the seizure of one foot of Mexican soil is just as much an invasion of the eternal principles of right, as much a sacrifice of the claims of justice and the obligations which we owe our fellow-men, as the seizure of the whole. I am opposed to the conquest, by arms, of Mexico. I am opposed to wresting from her one inch of her domain by the exertion of any force which shall control her will and compel an apparently voluntary surrender, while in reality the soul of the country tenaciously adheres to that with which it clings. I am opposed to the commission by this country of such an act of injustice for the attainment of any object, be it great or small, believing, as I fully do, that a pure unsullied reputation amongst the nations of the earth is of more importance to us than any acquisition that the wide world can furnish.

It has been said—it was said on this floor at the time when the resolutions of the honorable Senator from South Carolina were before the Senate—that the proposition contained in them, which condemns the conquest of Mexico and the destruction of her nationality, was a proposition the assertion of which would be idle and fruitless, because the destruction of the nationality of Mexico is contemplated by no one. At the time when I heard the statement made, I entertained the same opinion, and expressed that opinion to the Senator himself. (Mr. Calhoun here nodded assent.) But, an attentive consideration of the report of the Secretary of War, and the means demanded by the President—a consideration of the important fact disclosed this day, that the President has refused upon this subject to communicate his views and plans in the further prosecution of the war—the fact that he has proceeded from a disavowal of all intended conquest to a simple intimation that he has never desired to conquer Mexico or destroy her nationality—these things, sir, have convinced me of the probability that the Government is now thinking, at some no distant day, actually to make the movement which the resolution of the Senator from South Carolina denounces. I was struck, sir, with the account of a recent celebration in this city of the anniversary of the battle of New Orleans. It was held here on the 11th instant, and I noticed that an honorable and distinguished member of this body (Mr. Dickinson) made an address on the occasion to the company then assembled, concluding with a sentiment which goes far ahead of the annexation of the whole of Mexico. He gave as a toast, "A more perfect Union, embracing the whole of the North American continent." I did not observe that the sentiment was received with disapprobation. I saw no mention of any qualification of the sentiment by him or others; but there it stands as the declared opinion of a representative of the great "Empire State" upon this floor—a State which, of all others, is able to succeed by physical force in the accomplishment of such a design—a design looking to a more "perfect union," not in the closer association of the members of this republic—not in a strengthening of our social relations—not in an increase of mutual attachment—but a more perfect union which is to embrace in one with us the whole of the American continent, including Mexico on the south and the entire British provinces on the north. When I see propositions of that sort coming from gentlemen of such high character, known intelligence, and distinguished position before the country, I cannot resist the conclusion that such sentiments may have an echo in the hearts of thousands.

But there are other difficulties in my

mind. I consider the further prosecution of this war upon the plan proposed by the President to the liberties of the country. I was struck by the remark made by the honorable Senator from South Carolina, (Mr. Calhoun,) that no one now hears, as in the early days of the republic, the question, "How will this measure affect our liberty?" Now we sit down and calculate calmly what amount of military force or means it is necessary to put into the hands of the President to accomplish a certain object. We ask whether we shall send him further into Mexico, at the head of an hundred thousand men, with all the means of this country at his command, by our voluntary vote, and all the means of Mexico by military and violent seizure; and yet, as the honorable Senator said, there is no inquiry as to the effect of all this upon our liberties. That remark excited in my mind a train of thought which led me to the conclusion that there is great and just ground of apprehension, if this measure is adopted, that the liberties of the country will be seriously endangered. Recollect what the President claimed on this subject in his message of last session. All that has been done heretofore in Mexico in the prosecution of this war, the President claims the right of doing because we are the conqueror. But where, I ask, does he find any authority for exercising the rights of a conqueror? If he has them, it must be irrespective and independent of the constitution of the United States. The conqueror has certain rights, and the President claims that these rights belong to him. For one, I do not admit that proposition. It is the Government of the United States and the people of the United States represented in that Government who are conquerors in every war in which we are successful. Therefore, the rights which belong to the conqueror, according to the law of nations, belong no more to the President than they do to the lowest officer who leads a band of men against the enemy. These rights belong to the country—to those who represent the sovereignty of the nation—who hold the war-power of the nation—to the Congress of the United States. The President has no other power than as he is, by the constitution, the chief military commander, whose duty it is to carry on war for the purpose and to the ends declared by those who represent the sovereignty of the nation. But the President claims that he has a right to take possession, and that having taken possession, he has a right to require from persons within the territory the oath of allegiance; submission to the regulations of his military officers; suspension of all resistance to his military authority, under pain of being treated as traitors, and made liable to punishment in their persons and in the confiscation of their goods, and to seize all the public property and revenues of the country. All this he claims as a conqueror, and wholly irrespective of any responsibility to Congress. I protest against any such doctrine.

Having now stated my views of the commencement of this war—the manner and purposes of its prosecution, and the dangerous tendency of the Executive claims of power and projects of conquest—I come to the proposition before us.—We are called upon to place at the command of the President ten regiments of regulars in addition to the present military force. For what purpose? To carry on the war with Mexico. Upon what plan? Sir, the President declines to inform us upon what plan.

MR. MANGUM. (In his seat.) His friends here decline.

MR. BADGER. A few days ago, when this subject was under consideration by the Senate, and my friend from Kentucky (Mr. Crittenden) stated in his strong and forcible manner the present condition of Mexico, and the utter and absolute want of any necessity for this additional military force, a part of a communication from General Scott was read by the honorable chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, as to the amount of force that would be required. Gen. Scott expressed the opinion that if certain purposes were contemplated it would be necessary to raise his force to fifty thousand men. I myself asked the honorable Senator on what plan, system, or basis of operation for conducting the war that estimate was made. The Senator declined to answer. Resolutions have been proposed in the other House making inquiries, and to these the President has declined giving any answer. A resolution was introduced in this body asking the President to communicate to us information on this subject, such as he might deem it consistent with the public interest to communicate to us, either confidentially or in open session. The President was asked to communicate to us information which would enable us to understand this monster project for the war, which requires this great addition to our military means; and this morning, by a vote of the majority of this body, it was determined that the question should not be put to the President, whether he has in his possession any information on this subject which he could, consistently with the public interests, communicate to us, either in open session or confidentially? Thus, by the action of the President in the one case, and his friends in the other, all information is denied us, and the

war-making power of the country is denied from all knowledge of the plans of the prosecution of the war!

Well, sir, what is the amount of military force in Mexico, to which is proposed to make this formidable addition? Without going into detail, I may say that that force at present amounts to round numbers, to forty-five thousand. Under existing laws, twenty thousand may be raised to complete the complement of regulars and volunteers, making an aggregate of sixty-five thousand. Deduct from that fifteen thousand, the count of the casualties to which the army from Michigan so often refers, you have an army of fifty thousand. Yet, it is now proposed to add to that ten regiments of regulars, with a hundred and twenty thousand volunteers—adding with the troops, of not less than seventy-five thousand to eighty thousand effective men. What is it to be accomplished by that force? Are there to be fought? That is distinctly avowed. There is no expectation of any more battles to be fought. For then, sir, do you ask these men! The honorable gentleman from Michigan says, that he wishes, by the exhibiting a large force there, to produce "a moral effect." How? Why, he means to convince the Mexicans that they are unable to resist us! Well, sir, if they are able to resist the logic of such facts, Buena Vista, Churubusco, Contreras, Cerro Gordo, think you, sir, that their credulity will yield to the mere sight of a large body of men? What, then, do you intend to do with this immense military force? They are to take possession and occupy the country, it is said, when they are there, what great object it intended that they should accomplish which this country desires to see accomplished? Do we want peace? Is it obvious to every one that peace can in this way be obtained? If peace can be coerced, we have done every thing that genius can contrive, and skill and gallantry execute to accomplish it. I believe it may be said, without exaggeration, that the history of no country has presented such a succession of brilliant military achievements as we have gained in Mexico. As a single battle, nothing but produced equal to the last battle of Taylor; and, as a succession of military operations, where can you find a parallel to the advance of Scott from Vera Cruz to the city of Mexico? If chastising defeat—overpowering, overwhelming defeat—were sufficient to bring Mexico to a disposition for peace, she would have been brought to that disposition long ago. How, then, do you propose to accomplish it by our troops? Why, they are to take possession and occupy the whole country, or, as the Secretary of War says, to take that portion of it which we have got, and occupy all the rest of which our troops will allow us to take possession. When you have got possession, what position of it do you propose to maintain? Establish every where. You maintain all the strongholds of Mexico, and her valleys are to be every where marked by the signs of military occupation. How long is this state of things to continue? Until Mexico makes peace. But, I pray you, is this the way in which the gentle sentiments of benevolence and peace are to be instilled into the Mexican bosom? True, you may compel them to submit; you may prevent her from uttering a word of complaint; you may compel her to feign compliance with your wishes; her active resentment may disappear; yet a dogged spirit of revenge and the fiercest hate will rankle and lurk beneath. The Latin poet has said, with great propriety, and force—

"Sic colit Sexta non amato."

—referring to a well-known quality of nature, in virtue of which that quality which demands our admiration tends to withhold our love. If this tendency of that moral coercion, we may expect from awe and terror. Do we really expect, by renewed conquest, by devastated fields, by captured places, by stormed fortresses, by occupying such positions that no Mexican look forth without beholding the evidence of the fall of his country and the presence of her conqueror, that a true peace will be restored? Sir, no man should so say. What is the situation of Mexico at this moment? She lies at your feet, dazed, exhausted, panting. Do you propose to trample upon this enemy already at your feet? Do you wish to crush the remains of her vitality? I hope not, but, even if you do, you do not need additional force.

We received yesterday the copy of the general order of the 15th December, issued by General Scott, the first article of which proceeded to inform the army that it would spread itself over the Republic of Mexico; and which goes on to establish a system of internal regulation of the government of the country, and the collection and disbursement of the revenue. If, then, it be right and mainly, in the present crippled condition of Mexico, to destroy her nationality, you have means to do so. But ere you proceed to the accomplishment of such a purpose, will you not pause for a moment and reflect upon the consequences which inevitably follow? If such a design is carried out, the destruction of our ties is certain. You send forth the President with his eighty thousand men, it is told that he can support these means meet the other expenses of the war, leaving contributions in Mexico. Thus, clothed with such authority, by a foreign country to form his plans, carry them into execution. Is he not invested with all the power and authority of a prince, free to obey the dictates of his own arbitrary will at the head of an

**Terms of the Watchman.**  
Subscription, per year, Two Dollars—payable in advance. But if not paid in advance, Two Dollars per copy, will be charged.  
Advertisements inserted at \$1 for the first, and 25 cts for each subsequent insertion. Court orders charged at 50 per cent. higher than these rates. A liberal deduction to those who advertise by the year.  
Copies to the Editors must be postpaid.

### JUDGE McLEAN AND THE WAR.

The following letter has been furnished to the Cincinnati Gazette, by the gentleman to whom it was addressed, for publication. The official position of Judge McLean, as well as his high character, and the uniform moderation of his political course imparts interest and will give weight to his opinions:

WASHINGTON, Jan. 7, 1848.

My Dear Sir: To all human appearance the termination of the miserable war with Mexico, is more remote than when the first blow was struck. In my judgment it was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced, and the marching out army into disputed territory for the possession of Mexico. And, I think, that Congress, unquestionably have the power, should put an end to the war on just and honorable principles.

After agreeing upon the terms on which a treaty should be made, they should call upon the Executive by resolution to offer a peace to Mexico upon that basis, and during the negotiation hostilities should be suspended. If the President shall refuse to do this, in the military appropriation bills, the army should be required to take such positions as shall carry out the views of Congress. These bills the President should not veto, and he would be bound by their requirements. This may be done by the House. I hope Congress will refuse to issue any more treasury notes. The notes demanded, in addition to those already in circulation, would flood the country with that description of paper. Such an emission would constitute a government bank, controlled and managed by a party administration. We have now fifteen millions of treasury notes in circulation, and authority to issue five millions more. I would not increase this circulation a dollar, but reduce it as rapidly as possible. Such a system would be incomparably more dangerous to the public morals and the public liberty, than any other system of banking that could be devised.

To meet any deficiency of the revenue to pay the current expenses of the war, I would authorize loans at par, paying not more than six per cent. interest, and if loans cannot be made at this rate, let the administration resort to a system of taxation, which shall cause the people to feel the expense of the war. All wars should be accompanied by a system of direct and internal taxation. Nothing short of this can show, in addition to the sacrifice of life, what we pay for military glory. This was the policy in the better days of the republic.

The late war with England was nobly sustained by the people, not only in the field but by the payment of taxes. And they will sustain every just war in which our country shall be involved. But I risk nothing in saying that an attempt to adopt such a system of taxation would wind up this Mexican war in 60 days. And this shows that the war should be put an end to. This may be done by Congress in 90 days, and I pray God they may do it.

Very truly Yours,

JOHN McLEAN.

### THE RUMORS OF PEACE—GOVERNORS OF CALIFORNIA AND NEW MEXICO, &c.

Correspondence of the Courier & Enquirer.  
WASHINGTON, Jan. 26th, 1848.

The news contained in my last letter is confirmed to-day; and you may rest assured that Mr. Trist has agreed upon a treaty, running up the Rio Grande to the Pacific. The question is, will this line secure the harbor of San Diego? I cannot speak of this with certainty, as having the precise language used by Mr. Trist in the treaty, but I think San Diego will be included. The question is on every tongue, will Mr. Polk submit the treaty to the consideration of the Senate? Yes, he certainly will know that the existence of the treaty is known he cannot get another dollar or another man from either House of Congress if he withholds the treaty. This is now an ascertained fact.

A large majority of both Houses of Congress would have preferred Gen. Taylor's line, running to the Sierra Madre; but they will take Mr. Trist's rather than continue the war. But now look out for a probable explosion in the Cabinet; for there are some of its members who could more easily digest tenpenny nails than Mr. Trist's boundary.

But after all, one half of Mexico is something in the way of annexation, and those who go with Senator Dickinson, of your State, for his more perfect union, embracing the whole North American Continent, having just obtained by Mr. Trist's Treaty a region larger than France bounding in fine harbors and rich in precious metals, may wait for another slice until a more convenient occasion.

By the bye, there are already several applicants for the post of Governor of California, and New York has a regiment there, it is thought a citizen of the Empire State ought to be selected. Gov. Marcy it is said, is for Col. Stevenson, Mr. Buchanan for Col. Forney, Mr. Walker for Gen. McFarren, of Mississippi, and Cave Johnson for Wm. J. Brown, of the Post Office. The choice of the Secretary of the Navy and Attorney General is not known; but the President is said to be hesitating between Gov. Brown, of Mississippi, and Gen. Pillow. There must be a Governorship of New Mexico, too, which some of the disappointed applicants may take, for no one wants to go to San Francisco if they can avoid the Breezes of the great Pacific. There are two parties that are in absolute despair—the advocates of the Calhoun and Wilcox Provisions; for all chances now of losing the game of shuttlecock with the slave question, between the abolition agitators on the one hand, and the ultra Calhoun slaveocracy on the other, is now ended, and California and New Mexico will become free States, because it is so willed by their inhabitants.

CRAILYOYANT.

A Washington correspondent of the New York Courier says:

"Great excitement exists among Naval men here this morning, in consequence of a prevailing report that the officers of the Gulf Squadron in reply to a circular from the Commodore requesting information on the subject, have returned for answer, that 'the conduct of a post captain at the batteries before Vera Cruz, was so unbecomingly an officer in the presence of an