

THE TARBORO' PRESS.

Whole No. 970.

Tarborough, Edgecombe County, N. C. Saturday, October 5, 1844.

Vol. II. No. 40.

The Tarborough Press, By GEORGE HOWARD, JR.

Is published weekly at Two Dollars per year, if paid in advance—or, Two Dollars and Fifty Cents at the expiration of the subscription year. Subscribers are at liberty to discontinue at any time on giving notice thereof and paying arrears. Advertisements not exceeding a square will be inserted at One Dollar the first insertion, and 25 cents for every continuance. Longer advertisements at that rate per square. Court Orders and Judicial Advertisements 25 per cent. higher. Advertisements must be marked the number of insertions required, or they will be continued until otherwise directed, and charged accordingly. Letters addressed to the Editor must be post paid, or they may not be attended to.



Important Notice.

To the Democracy of the Union.

The Democratic Associations, the Hickory and Young Hickory Clubs, and other Democratic Clubs and Associations now organized throughout the United States, are most respectfully and earnestly solicited, if they have not already done so, to report themselves, without delay, by letter, post paid, to the Executive Committee of the Democratic Association in Washington city, D. C. They are requested to give the names of their members, &c. &c. It is important that this step should be taken to secure a more thorough and efficient organization of the democratic party than now exists, for these reasons:

1st. That each association shall keep the other well informed of the condition of parties.

2d. That authentic and correct information may be disseminated far and wide.

3d. That the returns, whether of State or federal elections, may be circulated in a form authentic and official, and which can be relied upon by our friends for any purpose, especially to counteract the false impressions which may be created by the publication in the whig journals of the results of elections.

It is already ascertained that that party have a well organized system of falsehood, not only in the publication of erroneous returns of elections, but by the publication of tracts and documents. The whig and some of the neutral papers in every section of the Union attend to the first branch of the fraud, and the congressional whig central franking committee at Washington are attending to the latter, by publishing and disseminating one set of opinions by Mr. Clay for the South, and another set for the manufacturing and abolition districts of the North and West; also documents for the North making Mr. Polk a free-trade man, and documents for the South making him a tariff man. These frauds have been detected in this city; therefore we warn our friends to guard against them. Discredit everything coming from a whig source, until substantiated by information derived from those whose effort will be not to deceive, but to enlighten with the truth. We do not hesitate to say that the election returns which have been, and are being published in the Globe can be relied on by our friends for any purpose. They are as accurate as unofficial returns can possibly be, some of which, from necessity, being copied from whig papers. The official returns will be published in the Globe as soon as they are received. When the organization proposed by this notice is complete, the facility for getting the correct returns will be such as is desired. We appeal to the democracy in those sections of country where no associations exist to forthwith organize and report in accordance with the above. We make this appeal not from any doubt of the strength of our cause, or that we have not the numbers to carry it on to victory. We must not despise the enemy however corrupt or weak they may be; but knowing them to be weak and corrupt should make us more vigilant and active to guard against the unfair and unjust means to which they will from necessity resort to cover their weakness. We can assure our friends that that we have no doubt Polk and Dallas will be elected. We must, nevertheless, do our duty. We make the appeal with another view; that channels may be established through which we can develop to the American people one of the most corrupt and villainous schemes ever concocted by any party which has been set on foot by whiggery to subjugate republican liberty, and bring our institutions down to the footstool of the tyranny of the Old World. We do not fear the scheme. Its exposure will not only defeat its object, but will overwhelm the men and the party who conceived, and are attempting to mature it, in infamy so deep that the friends of civil and religious liberty throughout the world, to the remotest generations, will execrate there very names. When the organization is complete, the exposure will be made, and their plan rendered

abortive. Therefore organize—organize forthwith—North, South, East, and West.

P. S. This is to give notice to the democracy, that the whig central committee in this city are publishing documents purporting to show the votes of Mr. Polk, which, in fact, if they do not in all cases actually falsify his votes, suppress some of the facts connected therewith, and thus give a false aspect to them. It will be the duty of the democratic party in every section of the country to discredit these documents, denounce them as vile whig slanders, as they are, ask a suspension of public opinion, and write immediately to Washington to the executive committee of the democratic association to send the real facts in each case, to be derived from the Congressional archives, as authenticated by the clerk in charge of them.

The associations throughout the Union will be pleased to pay the postage on all communication sent to the executive committee of the democratic association at Washington, whose communications will, in all cases, be postage paid.

The democratic papers throughout the United States will subserve the cause of the democracy by giving the fullest publicity to the above, until it shall be seen in the remotest parts of the Union. They are earnestly requested to do so.

By order of the executive committee.

JAMES TOWLES, Ch'n.

C. P. Sengstack, Sec'y.

POLITICAL.

From the N. Y. Journal of Commerce.

GEN. JACKSON AND ANNEXATION.

The last Nashville Union contains the following letter from Gen. Jackson to Moses Dawson, Esq., in which the old hero gives his views more at length than he has before done, in regard to the annexation of Texas. There is great force and point in what he says,—on this subject, as on all others. He treats the question as a national one, and deprecates its being mingled with party politics.

Hermitage, August 28, 1844.

Dear Sir:—I am in possession of your note of the 27th inst., and although greatly enfeebled by the excessive warm weather of this month, shall endeavor to reply to it.

The more I have reflected on the policy of annexing Texas to the United States, the more decided is my conviction, that since the establishment of the Federal Constitution, no question has arisen of so great importance to the welfare and safety of the people of the United States. It seems to me that in this instance, as in the Revolution and our last war with Great Britain, kind Providence still interposes to help on our efforts in the cause of self-government, and to give us the necessary guaranty for our independence.

Under the treaty of 1803, by which Mr. Jefferson obtained Louisiana from France, the people of that country acquired the right to incorporation in our Union as ample and complete as that possessed by the original States and their territories, and all the corresponding rights of citizenship and protection. In the treaty, therefore, of 1819, by which the people of Louisiana, west of the Sabine, were deprived of the guarantees of the treaty of 1803, a serious question arises whether this government can dismember its territory and disfranchise its citizens without their consent, and, in the case of Texas, without the consent of France. But leaving out of view this solemn question, and looking only at the consequences which have followed the treaty of 1819, it is wonderful that the course of events is such as to enable us to repair the errors of that treaty, at the same time that we avoid doing wrong to other powers, either on this or the continent of Europe.

The people of Texas have maintained their separate existence, and, after years of battle and toil, have achieved their freedom and independence. And without a stain on their character, without violating obligations with Mexico or other foreign powers, with no restraint on their sovereignty other than that which has been imposed by their God, they again come back to us, and although the guarantees of the treaty of 1803 have been withdrawn from them, they are yet willing to embrace them. And the question is, what shall we say to them in reply.

But before answering this question, let us see if Mexico has any right to the territory of Texas, or any cause for resisting the extension to the citizens of Texas of the guarantees of citizenship as intended in the treaty of 1803. When did Mexico acquire any title to the territory of Texas? The title of France was conveyed to us, and that title was then recognized by all the civilized world as the only good one. Did we convey it to Mexico? We did not.

We conveyed it to Old Spain, and she did not convey it to Mexico. How, then, does Mexico derive her title? She pretends to none except what results from the confederation which was formed in 1824, and founded on revolution, in which compact Texas expressly stipulated that her separate sovereignty was retained. The overthrow of that confederation or compact by military force gives Mexico no title to the territory, unless she can show that she has conquered one. And if we examine the claim on the score of conquest, it is notoriously unjust. That claim was silenced by the battle of San Jacinto; after which event the principal powers of the world recognized Texas as an independent State. There is, then, no reason for the opposition now made by Mexico to the annexation of Texas to the United States—none founded on any just claim to the territory or the loyalty of the citizens of Texas.

We are then brought to the unembarrassed question: Is it right for us to possess Texas on the reasonable terms proposed by her? Is it a step necessary to our safety and prosperity? I say it is, & as you have requested my reasons, I will briefly state them.

That territory is represented by Mr. Thompson, and other gentlemen of character who have the means of judging correctly, as possessing some of the finest lands in the world. In soil, climate and productions, it is said to surpass the Floridas, and to equal Louisiana and Mississippi. As a portion of our confederacy, then, will it not benefit us in the same manner that the States just mentioned, and the other new States have done? Have not these States contributed to the wealth, safety and prosperity of the other portions of the confederacy? Have they not furnished homes for thousands and thousands of happy and free people engaged in the noble pursuit of agriculture, and have not the products of this agriculture, exchanged in our own and foreign markets, given healthful employment to our manufacturing and navigating interests, and to the various mechanical arts? Unless the measure of our prosperity is different from that which is applicable to all other nations, it is impossible to resist the conclusion, that it will be promoted by the annexation of Texas. This conclusion I deem self-evident.

But great as are the advantages of annexation in the encouragement which will result to our industrial pursuits—advantages in which all section of the Union will participate—they are not so important as the security which Texas in a military point of view offers us. It is in this aspect of the question that I shudder when I look at the course of the newspaper press opposed to annexation, and read the speeches of many public men—who, absorbed in the effort to make a President, seem to care nothing for the intrigues of Great Britain to defeat our true policy.

We have labored for many years to free the States composing our Union of the Indian population within their limits, and may be said to have just succeeded in the accomplishment of this humane policy. These Indians are now placed on our western frontier, and in a territory favorable to their gradual civilization and protection, against the intrusion of influences hostile to them and to us. At present they are not accessible to British influence, except on the northern boundary line. Is it not apparent, however, that the whole of our policy in respect to their civilization, will be thwarted if any foreign power acquires control over Texas. The line between Texas and these Indians extends some thousands of miles, and communicates with Oregon in the most direct and practicable route to the great river of that territory.

Texas, therefore, in hostile hands, could feed and sustain an army that could not only act against Oregon, but at the same time against Louisiana and Arkansas, and by conjunction with the Indians could make inroads on every western State to the lakes.—An army thus employed, seconded by a proper organization of force on the lake, would put the whole west in a blaze, and cause us more injury in blood and money in six months, than years of peace could atone for.

The sagacious statesmen of England understand much better than we do the military considerations I am here suggesting; and hence you will find that no pecuniary obligation will be deemed by them too great to prevent the annexation to this country. The success of our free system, its capacity to secure order, to promote the progress of the arts and sciences, and to stimulate the energies of our nature, to a point far higher than any yet attained under the forms of government in the old world, is alarming to the advocates of monarchy.—The further progress of our principles will be a demonstration which the popular mind throughout the world can not mistake, and opposition to these principles is therefore a necessary part of European policy; and it would be as short sighted for us to take for granted that a different feeling will control their policy, as it would be for one of our navigators to em-

bark on the ocean without chart or needle, to aid him in weathering storms and preventing shipwreck. No settled do I consider this antagonistic feature of monarchy and republicanism, in the present state of the world, that I would feel safe in inferring what our course ought to be in reference to this measure of such vital national interest, by finding out what was the course of Great Britain. Our position here, as it has been generally heretofore, will be found to be directly opposite to hers.

But why should I press on you further views of the paramount importance of Texas to the United States on the score of safety? Every mind conversant with the operations of war, and with the causes which give military ascendancy, must see from a glance at our map, that such a genius as Wellington's or Napoleon's, sustained by naval armaments on the gulf of Mexico, and on the lakes, and in possession of Texas, with a very small force on land, could, in one campaign, paralyze one-half of our Union, deprive us of Oregon, and produce scenes of servile insurrection and massacre, that humanity would shudder to describe. This is no fancy sketch—no chimera of the imagination, to frighten women and children. It is the natural operation of cause and effect—inevitable and irresistible.

Give Texas and Oregon to Great Britain, and she will have more territory on this continent than the United States. She will surround us from our north-east corner to the south-west corner. Leaving no outlet to us by land, we shall be literally embraced in her potent grasp, and open to her invasion by sea and land at every point of the Union.

And yet we are told by leading politicians of the day, that the project of annexation is a mere bubble blown for a political purpose, to put down one leader, and put up another; and this too on the face of assurances that reach us every day—which tell us that England holds in her hands a guarantee of peace to Texas, if she will only withdraw the proposition of union with us. I am proud to see that my friends throughout the Union are treating these foreign menaces as American patriots should who love their country, and are determined to stand by it in all emergencies without regard to party.

Let us next see, in answer to your third, fourth and fifth inquiries, what would be the probable effect of the determination of Texas to accept the guarantee of monarchical powers. A treaty of commerce would be the first result, and the basis of this treaty would be one of reciprocal benefit, in the exchange of the raw productions of Texas for the manufactured articles of those powers.

England would aim at once to destroy the manufacturing interest of this country in competition with her; to do this she would be the gainer by opening her ports to Texas; and Texas in her turn, first, anxious for the payment of her national debt, would so adjust her revenue as to give the greatest possible stimulus to the culture of cotton and tobacco, and the development of all her agricultural resources. Thus her debt would soon be paid, and her prosperity would be accelerated by the double force of European aid and domestic pride—unembarrassed on the one hand by high duties, upheld on the other by the deep seated determination of the European powers to cripple the United States and scatter among them the seeds of discord and jealousy.

Among other disadvantages resulting to us from such a treaty between England and Texas, would be the necessity to establish on that extensive frontier such police as would prevent smuggling and enforce our revenue laws. Could this be done? All experience answers, no—it cannot be done? Border citizens, having the same interest in trade, following the same pursuits, using the same inland streams for the transportation of their surplus labor, will not submit to the operation of unequal laws. The cotton planter on the south western boundary, within the United States, will not contribute to the enforcement of laws, the effect of which makes his labor less profitable than that of his neighbor in Texas; and what is true of cotton will be true of all other agricultural products. We know that at present, in the United States, the force of this principle is so strong as to compel us to put low duties on many articles which would be otherwise heavily taxed.

I know that many of our citizens suppose that the annexation of Texas will be injurious because it will add to the quantity of valuable lands in market, and may be the means of inducing the removal of many of our slaves to that favored region. I grant that this is true to some extent; but does it not increase the arguments in favor of annexation? If Texas has an advantage in cheapness of land, salubrity of climate and convenience of navigation, over our southern States, is it not better for the citizens of the United States to possess this advantage than surrender it to the citizens

of Europe? In the hands of Great Britain this advantage will be improved, as we have seen, to break up our manufactures and lessen our capacity to compete with her in the supply of other markets, and in the carrying trade. In other words, will not Texas out of our union, be a more formidable competitor than she would be in it? The iron and coal regions of Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky and Tennessee, if she is in the Union, will find a market there—so will the Lowell and other cotton manufactures of the North Atlantic side of our Union. The immense power of our inland trade, the nursery of our seamen, and the source of so much wealth, will find employment in Texas, if she is in the Union. If she is out of the Union, British policy may monopolize all these advantages.

We are also told by some who profess to speak on behalf of the sugar planters in Louisiana that Texas must not come into the Union, for, if she does, their lands are made less valuable, and the price of sugar will fall. If the fact were so, does it follow that an argument is thereby afforded for the rejection of Texas? This would only prove to the vast number of the consumers of sugar that Texas ought to be added to the Union. But is it probable that the price of sugar would fall? We know that the production of Louisiana is very limited, that the large protective duty extended to it has, thus far, not diminished the revenue from this article; and we also know, that the lands of Texas could not be brought into cultivation for many years. So that the probability is, that sugar, in Texas, would stand on the same footing with cotton and other agricultural productions, far more advantageous to the U. S. than in the Union than out of it. Even were it otherwise, I feel confident that the sugar planters of Louisiana will repel the insinuation that, on account of a possible competitor being raised up in Texas, they are willing to see that fair country pass into the hands of England. The sugar planter wants security for his negro property, stability for the Union, and independence for his whole country. To gain this, he will make the same sacrifice, if necessary, that the other great interests would make. But fortunately, no sacrifices are necessary, according to my view of the subject. All the interests and all the sections of our Union, instead of having sacrifices to make, will only have benefits to enjoy.

There are many other aspects in which it can be made manifest that England will injure the United States if it is rejected. But they are too obvious to bring to your notice. Take those already noted—take the question as it stands—the indisposition of the United States to profit by Texas is the most remarkable event that has occurred in history. No nation, under similar circumstances, has committed such an error. If there be patriotism in the effort to increase the wealth and happiness of all classes in our society—to diffuse the blessings of equal laws, and a just government—If there be love in the spirit which finds in this free land of ours the means to spread the light of the gospel, and to teach every man throughout the world how he may recover his right to civil and religious liberty—it seems to me that all this patriotism—all this philanthropy—all this religion—appeals to us in favor of the addition of Texas to our Union.

But it has been asked, not by you, but by others, if these cogent reasons exist, why did they not influence me when I was President? My answer is, that at that time the people of Texas had not a separate sovereignty but a few months before the close of my administration, and were then at war with Mexico, not claiming the benefits of the treaty of 1803, and not objecting to the cession of the Territory to Old Spain in 1819. The independence of Texas was recognized during my administration. I was not responsible for the policy which dismembered the Territory, and had no power to remedy the consequences of that dismemberment. It was my duty to be just to both Mexico and Texas, and keep the United States from becoming a party to their quarrel. This duty was faithfully performed. No interference on the part of this Government was encouraged or countenanced. The brave Texas troops, acting for themselves, terminated at St. Jacinto their contest for liberty, and then settled their title and claim to independence. From that period to this our relations to them have been changed, and the question of the proposed connection with them has now ceased to be embarrassed by the designs or expectations of Mexico.

The dismemberment of our territory in 1819, by the failure to execute the guarantee in the treaty of 1803, has but recently attracted public attention. But it has been silently operating, and is now exerting a great and momentous influence on our system of government. It has been thus with most of the causes that have produced changes in human affairs—unforeseen—perhaps hardly noticed in the beginning—but not the less potent in the result after