# Carolina Watchman.

Devoted to Politics, News, Agriculture, Internal Improvements, Commerce, the Arts and Sciences, Morality, and the Family Circle.

VOL. XIII. SALISBURY, N. C., JUNE 3, 1856. NUMBER 1.


## LETTER TO MY CONSTITUENTS.

FELLOW-CITIZENS:—It has been said that a representative ought to keep near to his constituents, in order that they may have the benefit of his information, and he the benefit of their instructions. I shall not have an opportunity of seeing you soon, and, therefore, I adopt this method of communication. I am prompted to it at this time, because the country is in peril, and its patriotism needs to be aroused, and by the further consideration that my colleague, Mr. Clingman, has written a letter which is calculated, although not intended, to mislead, and which, from the position and reputation of the author, is likely to have a wide circulation.

I desire, in the first place, to give you such information as I have in regard to the condition of the country, its danger, and the cause. And in the next place, to suggest the remedy.

Our country is of vast extent; of every variety of climate, soil, productions, population, and interests, and, withal, is an experiment in government; several independent sovereignties united in one—*one of many*—and yet each retaining its sovereignty—*many in one*. That there should be perplexities and difficulties is to be expected, especially when the simplest forms of government are not exempt from them. That there should be excitement and disputes is too natural to surprise us; but that, beyond this, there should be actual violence and danger, ought to arouse every man, who is capable of appreciating the beauty and excellence of our government, and its example to the world, and of imagining the shame and distraction of its failure, or the evils of its overthrow. If any difference does or can exist, it must be because we have enjoyed the choicest blessings so long, as to suppose that there can be no end to them; and have failed to remember the lesson that eternal vigilance is the price of them. I do not desire to be an *alarmist*, but it is my duty to occupy the position of a *watchman*, and to cry danger while it is yet at a distance. I think there is danger now. The best informed think so. Mr. Clingman, in his late letter, says:

"**That the ultimate destiny of our present political system will be determined by events soon to occur, is most probable.**"

I am sorry to be obliged to agree with him; but I desire to encourage the hope, that the storm which threatens tempest, will only steady and make us the firmer.

The causes of this unsettled condition are several; but that which seems to be prominent now, is the controversy in regard to slavery. In the same letter, Mr. Clingman says,

"**The danger which now menaces the existence of the Federal Union, arises from feelings of hostility entertained in the North towards the Southern section and especially the institution of negro slavery as it exists among us.**"

I have now stated the danger, and I have stated one, at least, if not in the main cause.

And now, my fellow citizens, who should the controversy between you and the North, upon that subject, threaten the destruction of the Union? That the North should be opposed to slavery, almost to a man, and that you should be in favor of it, almost to a man, is just what both sides expect; and is, in fact, just what exists. But because you cannot think alike, is that any reason why you should destroy the government? You always have differed about it, and you have differed about other matters; but you have always settled them.

In 1820, Missouri asked to be admitted, as a State, into the Union. Her constitution allowed of slavery. The North objected to her coming in, and there was a very dangerous excitement about it. At length it was compromised, in this way: it was agreed that Missouri should come in as a slave State, and that all the balance of the territory we had, should be divided by a line right through it, and that all north of that line should be free. After the compromise the public mind rested quietly. And for this I have the high authority of Mr. Clingman, who in his letter, says:

"**The anti-slavery feeling gradually subsided there [at the North,] and the country remained quiet until a new influence was brought to bear on it.**"

Here, then, you see, we had our quarrel, and we compromised it, and divided out the whole of our territory, and the country was quiet. How much it is to be regretted that it could not remain quiet! How much it is to be regretted that any influence should be brought to bear, and disturb the nation's quiet! Bacon has long ago said that,

"**The king, less lizard will mar the lion's rest.**"

And so it is that some thing has been brought to bear to break up the "rest" of the people. Be that influence what it may, it is an unhallowed one, and deserves the people's censure. Mr. Clingman states that influence as follows:

"**Great Britain had acquired by the force of her arms and skill in diplomacy, immense possessions in Asia. Her East Indian provinces alone contained more than one hundred millions of people, held in a state of most abject slavery.**" &c.

After going on to show how cruelly these people are treated by England, Mr. Clingman proceeds:

"**These miserable laborers are mainly engaged in the cultivation of tropical productions to supply the demand of the markets of Great Britain, and those of her customers. It was seen, however, that owing to the superior skill and energy of the planters of the South, they were able by means of slave labor to produce cotton, sugar, rice, &c. at lower rates, and thus undersell similar articles grown in India. The British government likewise held certain islands in the West Indies, cultivated by negro slaves, but as the amount of her interest there was comparatively small, she determined to sacrifice it for what she regarded a more important object. She accordingly emancipated her negro slaves in the West Indies, and then by reduced the islands to a state of unproductive Barbarism. Now then set to work on a system of operation to force the United States to emancipate her slaves in like manner, expecting, if this was accomplished, to be able to supply the world, at her own prices, with tropical productions from her great Eastern possessions.**"

Mr. Clingman states further, that England regarded us as a rival, and sought means to alienate the North an South, and break up the Union, and then he proceeds as follows:

"**With a view, therefore, to accomplish these objects, more than twenty years ago, the British press and book-makers generally, were stimulated to commence a systematic war against negro slavery in the United States. Abolition lecturers were sent over and money furnished to establish papers and circulate pamphlets to influence the minds of the citizens of the Northern States. Looking far ahead, they sought to incorporate their doctrines into the school books and publications best calculated to influence the minds of the young and ignorant. Their to was were most readily received in Massachusetts, where there were the remains of old anti-slavery feelings, and where the British influence has, for the last half century, been greatest. From this State these doctrines were gradually diffused, to a great extent, throughout the North.**"

Now, are these things so? If they are not, why would Mr. Clingman say they are? You will concede that he would state nothing which he did not believe, and you will concede that he is well informed. And as confirmatory that what he says is true, (if any confirmation were wanted,) he copies from a late London paper as follows:

"**The aggressive spirit of the people of the United States requires an humbling, and it is for us to perform the task. England's mission is to complete the great work commenced by her in 1834, when she liberated her slaves. There are now over 3,000,000 human beings held in cruel bondage in the United States. If therefore, the United States Government deny, and resolved to question, the right of Great Britain to her Central American possessions, we, the people of the British Empire, are resolved to strike off the shackles from the feet of her 3,000,000 slaves. And there are those among us who will sanctify such a glorious cause.**"

And then Mr. Clingman says, as follows:

"**There is, too, a complete understanding between our enemies in Great Britain, and their allies in this country.**".

I have quoted thus freely from Mr. Clingman's letter, because, from his long experience in public affairs, and his admitted ability, I thought it would be the most satisfactory proof to the administration party, with which he is acting; and, also, because I design to use it for another purpose.

It appears, then, that we had our quarrel about slavery. We settled it, and were at rest. We are disturbed again upon the same subject, and threatened with destruction. And that disturbing cause is, foreign influence!

Well might the Father of his Country warn us "against the insidious wiles of foreign influence!"

I have stated the danger, and the cause.—Now, what is the remedy? And here I most regret that I can get no further aid from my distinguished colleague, Mr. Clingman. I must not only stand unsupported by, but must stand against him. Indeed, so strange is his remedy, that I fear some one will doubt whether he understands the cause. It can only be explained upon the old adage, that, "the hoof of the animal that bites will cure the wound." But there is a philosophy which teaches that long experience in political life, which furnishes much information, clouds the judgment with a thousand phantasies of the interest of self and party; and which teaches further, that what we have been accustomed to consider very bad, and, upon inspection, find off not to be so bad as we supposed, may really not be equal to what it appears to be now light. It is probable to our nature that, when our hopes have led us to believe, some of our injurious bodies so long for some time. And when we have lived an unnatural object, we hate it the more as the time we served.

I cannot, I know, I must stand alone in all these views for the time. I believe that the re-election of Mr. Clingman, and a few other if disguised friends, to the next Legislature, as to the proper time for the great general election, foreign influence! If he has lived the Whig party more than it deserved, may it not be a little one severe in his denunciation, more than he has felt it? And if he has lived Democratic principles, and voted against the measures of his party, may it not be a little too much in the other way, in his admiration of them, now that he has joined it, and has shed it has come home?

May not we hope that the party, in the last election, may, in a very large degree, be true to its principles? I cannot believe that the party, in a large degree, will not be true to its principles. Are not the principles of the Democratic party such as to commend themselves to the country? Is not its policy such as to maintain the country? In a speech which he made in the 28th Congress, to be found in Congressional Journal, vol. 14, page 116, in speaking of and defending the course of that party in regard to the Gag rule of the House, he says as follows:

"**Was it done as a concession to their slave interest? Let the North, the West, and the Eastern States of New York and Pennsylvania, and thereby elected Mr. Polk.**"

Again he says:

"**Sir, it is a common remark, that the members of this so-called Democratic party, however they may take opposite sides on questions of policy, never stick to their colors, but always stick in a common struggle on the election day. This is owing to the fact, which I had occasion to state at the first session, that the party is held together by the cohesive power of public plunder; and, therefore, whenever they are making a struggle to get into power, it is a period of unusual strength of cement, and such a moment of the party should adopt that side of any question that would secure at home, and thereby increase their chance of carrying the election.**"

"**The only connecting tie being cast off, the party will go to pieces. This, sir, is the rock on which our are destined to split. Though a political seer, I warn you of the danger.**"

How kind! Was ever such mercy shown to such a culprit? And how unquestionably true, and dangerously so, this, have been! And how the cement, from time to time, has been applied to keep the party together! And how it has proved in the hands of the South, and to the South, the enduring fidelity of a Cincinnatus to Rome! And!

On page 116 of the same, he says, in substance, that they arrayed on their behalf "the unprincipled Abolitionists." And that "even in order to rallied for and by the party in all its hazards," (just what he says now of the Abolitionists) "though in doing so he should act in opposition to the best interests of the country. In truth, the party will stand by him, and protect him from the consequences of any crime he may do it to be done for the benefit of the party.—And now, if the administration party shall not adopt this picture to be true, I beg them to be so model, that if they discredit Mr. Clingman, as one will believe a word that he says against the Americans. On page 117 he continues as follows:

"**The Abolition party had nominated as its candidate for the Presidency, J. G. Birney, but the Democratic party, after a time, likewise nominated him for the Legislature of Michigan. He accepted the second nation; and by that means, or perhaps by more odd appointment, he was induced to give his influence with his party for Mr. Polk.**"

"**So strong, however, sir, was the Whig party in the country, that even this manœuvre would not have defeated us, had it not been for other similar devices. Nearly 100,000 foreigners are estimated to arrive annually in the United States. Of this number a very large proportion are Roman Catholics. By this means, which time does not permit me to recount, but the most in idiom and unjustifiable, the Democratic party succeeded in influencing them to band themselves together, and rally to the support of Mr. Polk. Some of them avowed their preference for him, because his free trade policy was more favorable to the interests of the mother countries from which they came, than was Mr Clay. Others proclaimed on their banners, that they would not be ruled by Americans. Sir, had the foreign Catholics been divided in the late election, as other sects and classes generally are, Mr. Clay might have carried by large majorities the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Louisiana, and probably others in the Northwest.**

"**Not only did he have to contend with the influence of foreigners, here, but British gold was openly and profusely used.**" &c.

"**All the world may interfere in our domestic matters. * * * And we as a nation sit stupidly quiet while she foments, for her own advantage, our domestic troubles.**

"**Men who had not been one month in the country from the penitentiaries of Europe unacquainted with the language in which they were sworn, for that they knew not.**

"**And of the foreign Catholics, or foreigners generally, we estimate binded together with a view of controlling the elections of the country, there will be aroused antagonistic feelings in the hearts of all true Americans, which will sweep away the party to which they have attached themselves.**"

Thus spoke, and such were the sentiments of my distinguished colleague, in the 28th Congress. But then, as now, he seems to have had an clear idea of the cause, yet he was unable at least to remedy. Then he said the Whig party could put down the evils. But, instead of that, the evil put down the Whig party. And now he thinks the Democratic party can cure the evils. Are the truth is, that the cure of the evil must be something alone could cure the evil. Abolitionists alone could cure the evil. Abolitionists alone could cure the evil. The Democratic party, composed of both the old parties.

I do not like to go to Democrats, as such, with Abolitionists. Let I do charge the administration party, or party organization, of doing this thing. I do not believe, and that it has paved road to the Abolitionists; and I proceed to offer in the reasons which have satisfied me. I have already quoted the language of Mr. Clingman. Let us see what he says. Its policy seems very strange. But let us see the extracts. There is no doubt but that he speaks the truth. They state that they had conquered North and South; that they had conquered North Abolitionists, and by subjugating South foreign and Catholic votes.

Look off to the testimony of the Union, the organ of the party, in January:

"**The Democratic leaders at the North are a great portion of the Democratic party, and from Congress of electors, may make an distinction between them and the rest of the Democrats in the distribution of office patronage, and in the selection of agents for administering the government.**" See Gen. Lewis's speech in Congress April 7, 1856.

I look after the testimony of Mr. Douglas, the leader of the party in Congress. He is in a hurry to say, North that the Kansas bill was forced by slavery, he wrote to the Concord New Hampshire Patriot, on the 16th February, 1854, as follows:

"**Why do they not state the matter truly, and state that opposition in the country to it was done by leaving the Democratic party in the place?**"

Again, in a speech in the Senate, 12th March, 1856, he said that, if the measure had prevail.

"**The whole of the Territory acquired from Mexico would at the moment have been dedicated to freedom by a solemn political promise.**"

I am going back to the days of Mr. Clingman in Congress, and the peace of the Union was in danger. Mr. Pierce were elected. I find Mr. Clingman gave the reason of the

[illegible]

"**Yes, sir, I say, that I have shown the proposed to the Democratic party, and the Democratic party, Mr. Pierce went into office, Mr. Brown, Collector of the Customs at New York, in office of great responsibility and emolument, was notified to resign a full share of patronage in the office (just as the Union proposed should be done) but Mr. Brown refused. And Mr. Pierce removed him, although he was a Democrat, and put Mr. Bockee in his place, who was an opposition Democrat. Upon the Democratic party spirit, and has remained dedicated ever since. Opposed is called the Hards or National, the other State or Free-soil. The Hards are led by Dickinson, Bronson, and others; the Softs by Van Buren, Rockfield, and others. Now, which of the other [illegible] do you suppose the administration favors? It states with the Softs. The Administration party in New York. I quote from the National Democrat, the organ of the Hards. In its issue of April 1st, 1856, speaking of the Softs, it says:**

"**Politicians in the passage of the [illegible] and stimulated by the courage feeling in [illegible] which class them as Democrats, they organized for new crusades against the Democratic party. That organization is the Softs—the supporters of Mr. Pierce, as Governor of the State and President of the United States, and the Softs—the supporters of the administration, entertaining now the same views upon the identity question, which they held in 1848, and 1852.**" &c.

The same paper has an article headed "A word to Southern Democrats," from which I quote as follows:

"**The National Democrats of New York, formed from opposing the administration of Mr Pierce, would longer support it, it would have divided them; and it would be upon pursuing a line of policy, which had been so unfavorable to them in forming up a new Free-soil party in 1848.**"

The same paper proceeds from the Washington Sentinel, [illegible] Northern Democratic papers, as follows:

"**You asked the course in the New York contest, [illegible] the position of the true social Constitution of the North, and the election of the Van Buren Democrats, merit your approbation. Your answer is negative, and yet here is the national friend to help you.**"

From that same paper, of its issue of April 19, 1856, I quote as follows:

"**The time has therefore come when the question is to be put before the National Democrats of the States on general principles, which shall be recognized as the Democracy of New York. On the one hand the friends of Mr Van Buren and Marcy present the unchangeable, saying that their recognition by their present adversaries should be taken in bar of all investigation of antecedents; on the other hand the Hard or National Democrats have taken a solemn and serious appeal to the principles of the administration and its recognition of a democratic [illegible] as better Democrats than themselves; which appeal must come up at Cincinnati.**"

"**When the separation of Hards and Softs occurred in 1853, under the preliminary session of the Syracuse Convention, had been broken up by principle and balance, supported by the Soft leaders from New York city, the administration at Washington, in the year of May, took steps to declare the Free-soilers and the Nationals to be the regular Democracy.**

Now have I not shown you, not by what I say, but by the best Democratic authority, that in the great State of New York, as large as half a dozen small States, the administration party sides with the Free-soilers, and has prostrated the Nationals?

But you ask if the course of the administration in regard to Kansas ought not, with the South at least, to atone for any and all supposed errors? I answer no. On the contrary, its course in regard to Kansas ought to meet with censure everywhere, and especially at the South. And the witness I offer here is the President himself—These are facts: Kansas and Nebraska are Territories of the United States. Kansas is just west of Missouri, and Nebraska is just north of Kansas. Missouri is a slave State. Kansas has the same latitude, soil, and climate, and then foreign inviting to slave owners. Nebraska is not suited to slave labor. In May, 1854, Congress organized a government for these Territories. It then became the duty of the President to appoint a Governor for each of them. He appointed a Governor for Kansas 29th June, 1854. The Governor of a Territory has almost entire power at first. Now, under these circumstances, what sort of a Governor ought the President to have appointed? It seems clear that if he wished to preserve peace he ought to have given a Northern man to Nebraska, because that was North, and a Southern man to Kansas; or, at least, as that was middle ground, he ought to have selected a sound, conservative, able man, distinguished for his moderation, and whose character would have been a guarantee of impartiality and justice, to all sections, and all interests. But instead of that, he sent a southern man to Nebraska, and a Northern man and thorough Free-soiler to Kansas; and further, a man of no weight of character, and, if the President is to be credited, of dishonest purposes. But I will let the President speak for himself. In his Kansas message he says:

"**The Governor of the Territory of Kansas, commissioned on June 29th, 1854, did not reach the designated seat of the government until 7th evening October, and even then failed to make it, and open its legal organization, that of holding the census, until so late a day that the election of the members of the Legislative Assembly did not take place until March 30, 1855, nearly a year after the Territory was constituted by the act of Congress and the office to be appointed by the Federal Executive had been commissioned. It was without a complete Government, without any and proper authority, without legal laws, and, of course without the ordinary guarantees of peace and public order.**

"**In other respects, the first month of his official duties, instead of vigilance and putting to shed his energies to prevent or [illegible] the lawless violence of [illegible] which are prone to occur in a country [illegible] and newly appointed communities, which should have attention to be directed from office, [illegible] other objects, and himself set an example of the violation of law, in the performance of acts which rendered it my duty in the sequel to remove him from office.**

Now, are these things true? If they are not, would the President say they are? Is it true that the Governor of Kansas would not go to his post until the next March, or a meeting of the members until July? Is it true that for twelve months the Territory was without laws, and in a state of anarchy? Is it true that during this time the Governor was neglecting his duties and engaged in disreputable practices? The President says so, and the President ought to know. Then, I ask you, may I ask, *Why did he not remove him?* Was ever such a state of things heard of before? Suppose, my fellow citizens, that for twelve months the State of North Carolina were without laws and without a government? What would you expect but the wildest disorder? And if such would be the case with the steady people of North Carolina, what would you expect in the unsettled and adventurous people of Kansas? You would expect just what occurred, distraction and bloodshed. And this is for a administration that we are all advised to surrender to as the only hope of saving the country! *God help the poor land from such salvation.* The ship at sea, helpless and strained by the storm, without sail, compass, or helm, might drift into port; but such an administration would drive it to pieces of its own weight, and sink in a calm.

But me. Did I not did remove him at last.—Well, what did he remove him for? He did not remove him for his failure to discharge his duty; but he says he removed him for *certain acts that he perpetrated!* These acts now will understood to be his [illegible] in [illegible] Gov. Wakefield, the Delegate in Congress from Kansas, whose seat is contested by the old Governor Reader, says, in his answer to the Governor's memorial, as follows:

"**Some of your specifications were so grossly immoral and illegal that it became my duty to denounce them in the proper quarter; and for them you were eventually removed from office.**"

And, speaking of the conduct of the Governor in office, he says:

"**When you came into this Territory, instead of devoting your energies in good faith to the discharge of your official duties, and to preparing the way for the introduction of laws adapted to the condition of society, your whole time was occupied in fraudulent devices for enriching yourself, and for usurping the legislation of the country, as to secure a preponderance to your own *Abolition and Free-soil party.*"**

Observe, then, that the whole of the Governor's time was taken up in two things—one was working for himself; the other working for the Abolitionists. He was complained against and rewarded for working for himself, and was not complained against or rewarded for working for the Abolitionists. Indeed, the President takes care not even to hint at anything of the kind.

Well, having removed Reader, whom did he appoint in his place? Surely, now that the country is so much disgusted, and as the Abolitionists have had one Governor working for them a whole year, this *par excellence* Southern statesman will appoint a man known to the whole country. No; he appoints Mr. Stanton, of Ohio—a Northern man again, if he has any habitation at all. I will do him no injustice yet I must say that he is not known to, and has not the confidence of the country. I know but little of his history. I see it stated in the papers, and although I do not vouch its truth, yet I have no reason to doubt it, and have not heard it contradicted, that some years ago he went to California, and was in the convention that formed its constitution, and was the man who introduced the clause prohibiting slavery in California. It does be true, it may be that the President thought that as he had made one free State he could make another; and if he succeeded, why the sleepy trusting South would suppose that it just happened so; and if he failed, why he could say to the North that he had given them two of their own men, and one of them a *martyr in Kansas* in that line.

Well, but has not the President threatened that, if they do not keep quiet in Kansas, he will send the United States army there and subdue them? Yes, he has; and Stanton will read his Kansas message, you will find that it is so penned that the South will swear that he is going to shoot the South, and the North that he is going to shoot the South.

Well, but in his annual message did he not maintain the rights of the South? Yes, he did. But at the same time that he is sending out his billet-doux to the South, where our chivalric feelings make us regard a man's word as his bond, he is satisfying the North with the distribution of office and emoluments, where such things are prized at least at their full value, and cover a multitude of faults. One of his late appointments is that of Solicitor of the U. States Court of Claims—not in the North, but here in Washington—an important office, with a salary of $3,500 a year, a son of the President of the late Free-soil Convention! And no instance can be given of his removing from office because of Abolitionism, while thousands of such have been appointed. Everybody knows that the way he shows his dislike is by removing from office. You cannot show an instance where he has appointed an American to an important office, and he has removed thousands for no other reason than because they were Americans. Now, why did he do it? He did it because he hated them. Well, does he not hate the Abolitionists, too? If you will show me an instance where he has ever refused to appoint one, or where he has removed one, then I will believe it, and not till then.

Again, how many advertisements have you seen, all over the country, of anti-Know-Nothing meetings, but when did you see one of an anti-Abolition meeting?

Again, turn back and read the extract from the New York National Democrat, in which it is said that *heretofore* the administration party has sided with the Free-soil Democrats, and preferred "*unmitigated Abolitionists*" to the National Democrats, and says that the time has come when the question is to be submitted to the Democrats in other States, as to which they will recognize as the true men. And then read the fourth resolution of the Free Democratic Convention in North Carolina, in which they post their Northern Democratic friends, and say that they "will cheerfully unite with them as *brethren!*" Mark! *as brethren.* What a damper upon the true Democrats North, who have been fulminating against the Abolitionists, and what a damper upon the true Democrats South, to be committed to such an association.

Again, in all the address of the State convention, I do not see that they denounce the Know-Nothings as *corrupt*, and see how they do not. Examine the black Republicans as corrupt, like men, in their imperfections and speak in no measure equal to their conduct with the time. Are not the two great parties in fact counterfeits, and as if they meant to the world—come and see for ourselves conflict that even the most corrupt, each having in the other a "formidable worthy of his steel." But I am much mistaken if the great body of the people do not look upon it as a fight of factions, and regard the country as the safer the sooner each destroys the other. They are but factions.—They cannot strut themselves into importance. They occupy the position of tops in a crowd, who mistake *amusement* at their *gyrations* for *admiration* for their *importance*. They congratulate themselves upon the "rapid decay" of our party, but let me warn these boasters on both sides, that *there is a time in David's song that never stood its man.* And I am much mistaken if, after this coarse and unprovoked attack, they do not find a spirit before them that will not down at their bidding, and men in the land who will not cringe at the lash of a master.

Here, my fellow citizens, a great mistake to suppose that the present administration is anti-abolition. It is anti American and nothing else. As it would by its ruthless hand long before this, have crushed out the last remains of it, if it had not been for the indomitable spirit of the American people, that never yet stooped to stick to the hand of a tyrant, and never will.—Just think of it; the whole power of the administration, instead of being devoted to the stirring events in Kansas, and the great interests of the country, to the highest and humblest in to find at the anvil, or the work bench, some industrious, honest, and respected American spirit thinking for himself, and its greatest achievement has been to drive such spirit from his place, and in his, put such a foreign mental that supplants him:

"Cannot did the high a weeping wife
And to press children in vain."

In the next place, I say, that the administration party cannot cure the evil if it would. It has not strength. Such has been its course of policy that it has lost its power. For this I have the high authority of Mr. Clingman's letter. Speaking of the party, he says:

"While this acting, however, during the late struggle, so many of its leaders [illegible] that it was concealed that it would have [illegible] in almost every State in the Union, but for the assistance of the patriotic Whigs who have imprudent to its support."

Observe, then, that if it lost its own strength, it would have lost nearly every State in the Union, North and South. And even with all the strength it could get from the Whigs, it has been reduced from a majority of two thirds, which it had in the last Congress, to a majority of one third in this Congress. Observe further, that Mr. Clingman says it lost its strength by standing up to the rights of the South. Now, if that be so, I concede that it is a powerful reason why the South should stand by it to a man. But if it was on account of its standing up to the rights of the South, how happened it that its friends in the South forsook it? Remember, Mr. Clingman says, but for the Whigs it would have been [illegible] in nearly every State in the Union—in the South as well as the North. Surely he would not attempt to charge upon the Southern Democrats as that they forsook the administration for standing up to the rights of the South? But Mr. Clingman [illegible] back again. Now, if it lost its strength by standing up to the rights of the South, I can conceive how it can regain its strength in the South. But if its Northern friends left it for standing up to the rights of the South, can it win back these friends without deserting the rights of the South?

But the mistake lies in supposing that it lost its influence by standing up to the rights of the South. It lost its influence everywhere, and at the same time, by driving the conservative men to great, by forcing the factious North and South; and especially by its ruthless and low down proscription of the native citizens of the country from places of trust and profit, and its encouragement of the foreign element to the extent of going down into the workhouses and holding the Americans stand aside, and the Englishman take his place. It has lost its influence, because the time has arrived, so plainly predicted by Mr. Clingman, in the speech from which I have quoted, when the native Americans, so generous when fairly dealt with, and so terrible under a sense of injury, should arise and sweep it from the country.

But will it not regain its strength by accessions from other parties? The Whigs, for instance? Answer, never!—There always has been, and always will be, a change now and then from one party to another; some from the best, and others from the worst motives. But, that the Whigs, who have been battling the Democratic party upon principle for twenty years, will ever surrender to its party organization; or, that the Democrats will ever surrender to the Whig organization, is absurd to suppose. The great mass of both of these parties were honest. Each believed that he was right, and the other wrong. Each believes so still; and neither can surrender to the other, without a forfeiture of his independence and self-respect. This is the illustration: you have been at law twenty years with your neighbor. Both of you are honest. Each thinks that he is right. It is desirable to end it. You talk, intercede, and get you together. The first proposition that your neighbor makes is, that you should make to him an *unconditional surrender!* Does not that put an end to the conference? Will you not turn away indignantly and say, I have no such mean spirit as that? I will *compromise*, but I will never *surrender*.

Now, has the Democratic party ever proposed a compromise with the Whigs, and a union upon a common platform, outside the Democratic organization, to cure the evils in the country? Never! Never!! Its only terms are, *submission*. Now, if there is a Whig in this free land, who, when a *compromise is refused* is willing to *surrender at discretion*, will have to say is, that his is not the spirit of his fathers, and I do not envy him his degeneracy. A very different course is pursued by the American party.

I propose to state my remedy for the evils in the hope of its to incorporate with the American party.

I do not claim for it perfection either in its origin, its principles, or its principles, for it is human; but I do claim that it is thoroughly patriotic. Its sources and its motives, which have been so much abused, I am under no necessity to justify, because, out of respect to those who thought their motives praiseworthy, they have been abundantly justified. Washington, who was a member of the Cincinnati Society, recommended the abandonment of some of its aims, which he himself originated, not because he thought them wrong, but because he was willing to yield something to the prejudice of those who did. But I must say, in passing, that the secrecy which characterized the organization of the party, by no means shows that it was wrong. Secrecy is not a crime. The purposes and the circumstances must determine its propriety. The earliest organized resistance to England was a secret one. A band of men, paint and disguised themselves as Indians, and went on ship board and threw over the tea. They were denounced at the time as lawless rebels. And yet which one of you now would not feel proud to trace back his ancestry to these same secret, disguised, lawless rebels? Noble men! They knew that they would be denounced, but the interest of their country required it, and their patriotism enabled them to rise above every consideration, and subject themselves to censure and suspicion. The brave man does his duty in that way that seems to him to be best; the coward hesitates, to see what will be thought of it, fearing the worst. They thought the circumstances justified that secrecy and disguise, which, under other circumstances, they would have condemned. And so those who originated this organization thought that the circumstances required secrecy, and they determined to incur the censure for the public good. Noble men! He deserves but little praise who stands by his country and her interests only when he can do it in sunshine, and sailing smoothly down the popular tide without a ripple or a wave to impede his course; but he who stems the current and braves the storm, when it is danger or peril, defeat, and will to cover, sooner or later, his country's highest commendation. And when this country shall, through the means which these men originated, be freed from injurious foreign influence, they will have the same praise which those they call men have who originated resistance to foreign oppression. But be that as it may, it now stands before the country as a party.

Now, why should you not cooperate with it? I will notice the objections urged by Mr. Clingman, because you will be satisfied that he urges the best that can be urged, and that, if they are not sufficient, there is there are none that are. He first addresses himself to the "old Whig party," and says:

"**You, as such, are of course not under the slightest obligations to go for the nomination of the Know Nothing Convention, because that Convention denounced both the Whig and Democratic parties as corrupt, and proclaimed that it had arisen on the ruins of both, and in spite of their opposition.**"

Now, I answer, first, that the Nominating Convention did use language of that kind, and I confess I always thought that that was one of its faults; a failing one, to be sure, and just such as any party, and many persons, are apt to commit. They will not be content with setting forth their principles, but must abuse somebody else. But I am happy to say that, like the other alleged faults, it has been abandoned. Even Mr. Clingman, with all his experience and [illegible] dence, is not free from the same fault. "Let [illegible]."

"**The old Whig party, as you remember I predicted some years ago, would be the case no longer existed.**"

Observe, the old cause. The Americans only proclaimed the Whig party dead [illegible] dead! But Mr. Clingman proclaimed the [illegible] years ago which [illegible] its death. And who was [illegible] the [illegible] of its death? [illegible] the prophet [illegible] And who [illegible] how much stronger is an [illegible] dead than [illegible] one hand, than [illegible] with the other. [illegible] when he thought he was [illegible] know, that I would [illegible] stay the death [illegible] the party [illegible] Mr. Clingman [illegible] Americans, who [illegible] how who can [illegible] who caused it? But Mr. Clingman [illegible] [illegible] against the Democratic party [illegible] a common union?

Answer me. We do not [illegible] We are not [illegible] with Democrats. On the contrary, we desire it. We have [illegible] to do so and still offer to do so. Yes, we urge it with earnestness. Mark what I say—*unite with them.* But they tell us to come with us, and require a *surrender* to their *party organization*. Our objection is not to uniting with them on a common platform, been, and always will be, a change now and then from one party to another; some from the best, and others from the worst motives. But, that the Whigs, who have been battling the Democratic party upon principle for twenty years, will ever surrender to its party organization; or, that the Democrats will ever surrender to the Whig organization, is absurd to suppose. The great mass of both of these parties were honest. Each believed that he was right, and the other wrong. Each believes so still; and neither can surrender to the other, without a forfeiture of his independence and self-respect. This is the illustration: you have been at law twenty years with your neighbor. Both of you are honest. Each thinks that he is right. It is desirable to end it. You talk, intercede, and get you together. The first proposition that your neighbor makes is, that you should make to him an *unconditional surrender!* Does not that put an end to the conference? Will you not turn away indignantly and say, I have no such mean spirit as that? I will *compromise*, but I will never *surrender*.

Now, has the Democratic party ever proposed a compromise with the Whigs, and a union upon a common platform, outside the Democratic organization, to cure the evils in the country? Never! Never!! Its only terms are, *submission*. Now, if there is a Whig in this free land who, when a *compromise is refused* is willing to *surrender at discretion*, will have to say is, that his is not the spirit of his fathers, and I do not envy him his degeneracy. A very different course is pursued by the American party.

I propose to state my remedy for the evils in the hope of its to incorporate with the American party.

I do not claim for it perfection either in its origin, its principles, or its principles, for it is human; but I do claim that it is thoroughly patriotic. Its sources and its motives, which have been so much abused, I am under no necessity to justify, because, out of respect to those who thought their motives praiseworthy, they have been abundantly justified. Washington, who was a member of the Cincinnati Society, recommended the abandonment of some of its aims, which he himself originated, not because he thought them wrong, but because he was willing to yield something to the prejudice of those who did. But I must say, in passing, that the secrecy which characterized the organization of the party, by no means shows that it was wrong. Secrecy is not a crime. The purposes and the circumstances must determine its propriety. The earliest organized resistance to England was a secret one. A band of men, paint and disguised themselves as Indians, and went on ship board and threw over the tea. They were denounced at the time as lawless rebels. And yet which one of you now would not feel proud to trace back his ancestry to these same secret, disguised, lawless rebels? Noble men! They knew that they would be denounced, but the interest of their country required it, and their patriotism enabled them to rise above every consideration, and subject themselves to censure and suspicion. The brave man does his duty in that way that seems to him to be best; the coward hesitates, to see what will be thought of it, fearing the worst. They thought the circumstances justified that secrecy and disguise, which, under other circumstances, they would have condemned. And so those who originated this organization thought that the circumstances required secrecy, and they determined to incur the censure for the public good. Noble men! He deserves but little praise who stands by his country and her interests only when he can do it in sunshine, and sailing smoothly down the popular tide without a ripple or a wave to impede his course; but he who stems the current and braves the storm, when it is danger or peril, defeat, and will to cover, sooner or later, his country's highest commendation. And when this country shall, through the means which these men originated, be freed from injurious foreign influence, they will have the same praise which those they call men have who originated resistance to foreign oppression. But be that as it may, it now stands before the country as a party.

Now, why should you not cooperate with it? I will notice the objections urged by Mr. Clingman, because you will be satisfied that he urges the best that can be urged, and that, if they are not sufficient, there is there are none that are. He first addresses himself to the "old Whig party," and says:

"**You, as such, are of course not under the slightest obligations to go for the nomination of the Know Nothing Convention, because that Convention denounced both the Whig and Democratic parties as corrupt, and proclaimed that it had arisen on the ruins of both, and in spite of their opposition.**"

Now, I answer, first, that the Nominating Convention did use language of that kind, and I confess I always thought that that was one of its faults; a failing one, to be sure, and just such as any party, and many persons, are apt to commit. They will not be content with setting forth their principles, but must abuse somebody else. But I am happy to say that, like the other alleged faults, it has been abandoned. Even Mr. Clingman, with all his experience and [illegible] dence, is not free from the same fault. "Let [illegible]."

"**The old Whig party, as you remember I predicted some years ago, would be the case no longer existed.**"

Observe, the old cause. The Americans only proclaimed the Whig party dead [illegible] dead! But Mr. Clingman proclaimed the [illegible] years ago which [illegible] its death. And who was [illegible] the [illegible] of its death? [illegible] the prophet [illegible] And who [illegible] how much stronger is an [illegible] dead than [illegible] one hand, than [illegible] with the other. [illegible] when he thought he was [illegible] know, that I would [illegible] stay the death [illegible] the party [illegible] Mr. Clingman [illegible] Americans, who [illegible] how who can [illegible] who caused it? But Mr. Clingman [illegible] [illegible] against the Democratic party [illegible] a common union?

Answer me. We do not [illegible] We are not [illegible] with Democrats. On the contrary, we desire it. We have [illegible] to do so and still offer to do so. Yes, we urge it with earnestness. Mark what I say—*unite with them.* But they tell us to come with us, and require a *surrender* to their *party organization*. Our objection is not to uniting with them on a common platform, [illegible] dence, is not free from the same fault. "Let [illegible]."

"To show that this can be done with propriety, and without loss of self-respect, let us recur to the past action of our party in the State," &c.

He then proceeds to show that the Whig party had frequently elected men to high places who had not *always* been Whigs, and admit that this is true.

I am glad to say that the Whig party has been liberal, and is liberal still, and does not require a humiliating surrender of anybody. But if Mr. Clingman means to say the Whig party of North Carolina ever held its independence lightly, the old love I bear it makes me say he is mistaken. It never yet forgot its dignity.—And he is himself a living evidence of it. Great as was his merit, much as it desired to honor him, yet as soon as he bore upon its infirmities and prophesied its downfall, it turned its back upon him, preferring rather to die in his hate than to live in his servitude.

For the long service he rendered, it still wishes him prosperity, and hopes that a few years of hard service and short rations will still leave him vitality enough to come back, as comes the tired stag to his starting-place, and rest in the old range. By which time, retaining in all his desire to do good, he will have lost his power to do harm, and will be kindly received.—And now, in very love for his new associates, I will gently remind them, that Mr. Clingman, who so truthfully prophesied the downfall of the Whigs, said that your love of public plunder was "the rock on which you would split." And that the Native American spirit against foreign influence was that which would sweep you from the country. And, although you may remove Atlas and the Pyrenees, yet you shall not escape that prophecy!

Mr. Clingman next addresses himself to the Americans, and says he told them that the Americans would be disbanded, and advised them to stand aloof from them, and then asks affectionately:

"**Do you not wish that you had taken my advice?**"

I answer, No. We have more confidence in his prophecy than we have love for his advice. We must follow the fate which he predicted for us years ago, to wit: that if the foreign influence continued to be injuriously exercised, we would sweep the party from the country that so exercised it. That is our mission. Prophecy has predicted it, and we mean to maintain its infallibility. No advice, no threats, no allurements, shall swerve us a hair's breadth. Our course is right on and onward, up to victory.—And then, when our mission is ended, when we have clothed the American name with more lustre than ever Romans had, then we will listen to the advice of friends, though they may be slightly interested therein themselves Mr. Clingman next addresses the Democrats, and says:

"**With respect to those persons who have formerly acted with the Democratic party,**" (of course he