

# THE REVIEW.



CRAWFORDSVILLE,

SATURDAY MORNING, AUGUST 4, 1855.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING BY

CHARLES H. BOWEN.

5¢ The Crawfordsville Review, furnished to Subscribers at \$1.50 in advance, or 52¢ if not paid within the year.

CIRCULATION LARGER THAN ANY PAPER PUBLISHED IN CRAWFORDSVILLE!

Advertisers call up and examine our list of

5¢ SUBSCRIBERS.

All kinds of JOB WORK done to order.

To Advertisers.

Every advertisement handed in for publication, should have written upon it the number of times the advertiser wishes inserted. If not stated, it will be inserted until ordered out, and charged accordingly.

Agents for the Review.

E. W. CAREY, U. S. Newpaper Advertising Agent, Evans Building, N. W. corner of Third and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

S. H. PAINTER, South East corner Columbia and Main streets, Cincinnati, Ohio, is our Agent to procure advertisements.

We wish it distinctly understood, that we have now the **best** and the **largest** assortment of **new** and **fancy** **Iron** **Type** ever brought to this place. We insist on those wishing work done to call up, and we will show them our assortment of type, cuts, etc. We have got them and no mistake. Work done on short notice, and on reasonable terms.

Democracy and the Union! RIGHT SIDE UP AND COMING!

**Democratic Mass CONVENTION!**

GRAND RALLY AT INDIANAPOLIS!!

ON WEDNESDAY

**August 29th, 1855.**

**THE WHOLE PEOPLE ARE COMING!!**

DEMOCRATIC MEETING.

The National Democracy of Wayne township, will meet at the usual place of holding elections on Saturday the 18th of August. Let every National man be in attendance.

DEMOCRATIC MEETING.

There will be a meeting of the National Democracy of Montgomery county at Brown's Valley on **SATURDAY THE 1ST OF SEPTEMBER.**

Col. S. C. Wilson, Lew Wallace, J. E. McDonald, Daniel W. Voorhees and M. D. Mansfield will be in attendance and address the people. The ball is started, come out and keep it moving.

By the Union rats of BROWN TOWNSHIP.

The low scurilous attack upon the character of Mr. Joel Lee, in the last number of that obscene sheet, the Montgomery Journal, is universally condemned as a brutal and inhuman assault upon private character. The article we understand was written by that notorious bully and street fighter, T. W. Fry, with the double purpose of not only wounding the feelings of Mr. Lee, but that of his family and friends who should have at least been spared from the shafts of his envenomed hate and hellish revenge. It is a wonder to us how the community has so long tolerated this plague spot upon its peace and quiet. In some countries he would have long since graced the pillory or the whipping post. Like the hyena, gorged and surfeited with the carcasses of new made graves, let him sink into some dark cavern and pray to his god Moloch, that the black putrid recesses of his heart may be purged with the hottest flames of Hades. Neptune's ocean can never cleanse it of its foul impurities—fire, liquid and molten, with its seething blast alone can do it.

The American party of Evansville have passed resolutions fully endorsing the platform adopted by the National Convention at Philadelphia. The resolutions are published by order of the council.

BLACKWOOD FOR JULY.—We have received Scott & Co.'s re-publication of Blackwood's Magazine for July. It is the opening number of a new volume. Its contents are: 1st, The Imperial Policy of Russia—part I; 2d, Zaide, a Romance—part VII; 3d, Notes on Canada and the Northwestern States of America; 4th, Letter to Eusebius—Once Upon a Time—part II; 5th Modern Light Literature—Theology; 6th, Verrier; 7th, The Story of the Campaign—part VIII; 8th, Two Years of the Condemned Cabinet—(a terrible exorcism of Lord John Russell & Co.); 9th, Administrative Reform—The Civil Service.

Blackwood is published at \$3 a year; with any one of the four Reviews it is furnished at \$5, and with all four of the Reviews at \$10.

## THE FUSION CONVENTION.

On Saturday last, the opposition party held their county meeting, and made their appointments according to arrangements.—Doubtless they think they nominated a very telling ticket, and perhaps the assortment was about as good as could have been made from so bad a variety of long horns and short horns, fat, middling and lean, in the wild and untamable herd, of what graziers would denominate, graded stock.

The convention was largely attended, though really it was a very meager demonstration for Montgomery county, in an event so important, and so thoroughly heralded, as the announcement of the Hon. L. D. Campbell, of Ohio, as the speaker of the day. This gentleman has been distinguishing for many years as a prominent representative of his party, and particularly late as a member of Congress, in his earnest support of the angry and disorganizing anti-slavery tendencies of his furious and union dissolving constituents. In view of the active part he took last winter in the National Assembly, in the discussion upon the Missouri Compromise, he is now regarded as a champion and a front leader.

On last Saturday we suppose the Hon. gentlemen fired this big gun, and now that the sound thereof has died and the smoke has been drifted away, we will look over the field for a little while, and if possible ascertain the actual amount of havoc produced, by this little grape-shot battery, so suddenly dismounted and spiked last winter in the hot contest of sectional preferences against popular sovereignty.

We want to review Mr. Campbell's speech dispassionately and with reference to the truth involved in the issues between us.—It is very popular in these heated times to shoot blindly, but such is not our intention and such shall not be our mistake. We will indulge in no blind abuses or unwarrantable detractions. We accord him much merit as a high toned and finished orator; but we do not like his principles, and upon these we will take the liberty to advert, with that freedom and candor, which it is our right and duty to exercise, when great questions effecting us both in our individual and national capacity, are involved. In the first place, let us see what Mr. Campbell as the exponent of his party wants to prove, and secondly what he did prove, and then make our deductions. The first and great leading national issue between us is this: shall the people in the Territories, as in the States, be left free to vote and decide upon the question of slavery and freedom, as applying to those Territories, or shall Congress interpose its authority, and impose injunctions touching that question, contrary to the wishes and will of the inhabitants thereof.

The whole issue is couched, and there we are ready to fight the battle. The question is not whether slavery as an abstract principle be right or wrong. Throughout the north there is but one voice on that point. Everywhere this side the Ohio river and in many parts south of it, slavery is regarded to be an institution unfortunate in its establishment, and unfortunate in its results. But that is not the question in controversy, and it cannot be forced into the controversy. The whole question is as to the rights of American citizens, rights which have their origin in the Constitution, and which are co-existent with the Constitution, rights guaranteed to us everywhere throughout the limits of the government, to regulate our domestic institutions in our own way.

Now that is the question which Mr. Campbell came here to discuss. But how did he meet it. He set out in his speech with a recital of the golden rule. "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." Certainly that was a very beautiful extract from our Saviour's sermon on the mount, and we only wish it was more strictly adhered to, both in matters of a public and private nature. But all that we apprehend, has very little to do with the principle of non-intervention by Congress.

Mr. Campbell's whole speech was inflammatory with hate of Slavery. He proved that Slavery was an evil and that is the sum and substance of all that he did prove. We don't take issue on that point, not one of our resolutions in any of our platforms north or south in a single line or letter, is devoted to the justification of that which is now and always has been, almost universally deprecated as an evil.

After a long fire-works display of explosive coruscations, similar to those first alluded to, the speaker very virulently attacked the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, on the ground that it was a breach of plighted faith. The South he said had split upon its honor. Let us look at this for a moment, and we will have to go back a little in the history of the country. What was it that gave rise to the Missouri Compromise?

In 1802, we purchased a large tract of land from Napoleon, which was styled the Louisiana purchase. It commenced at the

Gulf of Mexico on the South, and extended as far as the Lake of the Woods at the North. It included the present State of Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Kansas and Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota and a large portion of Wisconsin. In the third clause of the treaty by which it was conveyed, it was stipulated, that "the inhabitants of the ceded Territory, shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the Federal Constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States; and in the meantime, they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess."

Such was the treaty and any half-witted man must see that by that instrument as slavery was then in existence there, it was a solemn guarantee to all who saw fit to place themselves among the inhabitants of that Territory, no matter in what part,—for there are no specifications,—to hold Slaves. Let us see if this was not the understanding entertained both by the people and by Congress.

Louisiana was admitted as a Slave State, April 30th, 1812, there seemed to be no question as to her right to come into the Union with a slavery clause. Arkansas came in June 15th, 1836. What was the question raised upon her application? Her admission was bitterly contested on the slavery question. It was thought for sometime that she would be rejected as Missouri had been and for the same reason. But what were the arguments employed then, even by the strongest and most punctilious members of the opposition? John Q. Adams we apprehend has always been regarded orthodox in Northern preferences, and what did he have to say? He made no allusions to the Missouri Compromise, as the basis of his reasoning that Arkansas had the right to come in as a slave State, his data extended further back, he went to the original guarantees. "As Congress" said he, "has not power in time of peace to abolish Slavery in the original States of the Union, they are equally destitute of the power in those parts of the territory ceded by France to the United States by the name of Louisiana, where slavery existed at the time of the acquisition. Arkansas, therefore, comes and has the right to come into the Union with her slaves and her slave laws. It is written in the bond, and however I may lament that it ever was so written, I must faithfully perform its obligations."

Such was the language of John Q. Adams, a man who used to dwell in Massachusetts—a man who was universally regarded there to be the very archetype of all that was noble in his private relations, and of the profoundest skill in the science of the law.

He was born amidst the storms of the Revolution—with his mother's milk he imbibed the principles of a sound Nationality—he understood the force and effects of treaties as well as any man, and he had the prescience to abide by them. Well now let us see how these views of this great statesman and lawyer would affect the Missouri Compromise. That State applied for admission in the year 1820 and was rejected on account of the slave element in her constitution. The whole country was thrown into a state of turbulence and disunion was threatened. The North contended just as they afterwards did upon the admission of Arkansas, that Congress had the right to reject the application, and assigned as their reasons, the very same principles, which John Q. Adams proved were insufficient to exclude Arkansas.

Then came Mr. Thomas of Illinois as the attorney of the North, with the Missouri Compromise as an adjustment of the contest, and what was it? That in consideration of the Northern assumption, that Missouri had not the right to come in as a slave State, contrary as we have shown to Mr. Adams' opinion, a geographical line was drawn on the parallel of 36 deg. and 30 min. north latitude, north of which, slavery should be excluded—there is the whole case historically stated, and now let us see how it worked. The stump orators of the opposition are very firmly assured, that in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise the South has violated its plighted faith. Shame on such ignorance—the South as a people never did acquiesce in that measure, the question as every intelligent man must know, was suddenly sprung upon their representatives in Congress and voted through without their consent. It was repudiated as an outrage everywhere throughout the South at the time of its passage, and it is repudiated still.

When Douglas introduced his bill for the organization of Kansas and Nebraska, the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was suggested, it was the first time they had ever had the opportunity to manifest their wishes, and almost to a man did they say to the North, that the Missouri Compromise was always wrong.

Let some one of these speakers go to the South and tell southern people that they have violated their plighted faith, and in

their very throats they will be rebuked for preferring a charge so laughable on account of its simplicity, and so disgusting from its ignorance.

Many persons deceived by misrepresentations believe, and believe honestly, that Mr. Clay of Kentucky was the author of the Missouri Compromise. Mr. Clay in his celebrated speech delivered on the 5th and 6th of February 1850, occupied grounds exactly analogous to those we now occupy. What was one of his resolutions for the organization of the Territories, then about to be thrust within the purview of the government? Here it is, and let every man read it and digest it.

"Resolved, That as Slavery does not exist by law, and is not likely to be introduced into any of the Territory acquired by the United States from the Republic of Mexico, it is inexpedient for Congress to provide by law, either for its introduction into or exclusion from any part of the said Territory; and that appropriate Territorial governments ought to be established by Congress in all of the said Territory, not assigned as, the boundary of the proposed State of California without the adoption of any restriction or condition on the subject of Slavery."

There is the resolution, very much like the principles we are contending for now. But farther in regard to this Missouri Compromise, in the same 6th of February speech, Mr. Clay says, speaking with reference to the resolution just cited: "Sir, while I was engaged in anxious consideration upon this subject, the idea of the Missouri Compromise, as it has been termed, came under my review, was considered by me, and finally rejected, as in my judgment less worthy of the common acceptance of both parties of this Union, than the project which I offer to your consideration." Well what was the project he had offered to their consideration? It was as we have just shown the doctrine of non-intervention by Congress on the Slavery question. Now it cannot be shown to the extent of a single line or word that ever fell from Mr. Clay's pen or lips, that he regarded the Missouri Compromise a good measure, and that it was irrepealable, but it can be proved that he thought his second resolution a good one, that he insisted upon its establishment to the fullest extent of his forensic power, establishing the very same settlement of this perplexing slavery question, which we are now seeking to establish.

The opposition party are unable to meet these arguments, they may pick at them, but they can do them but little harm, for it is difficult to crumble adamant.

We now take the position that the Missouri Compromise was always wrong, and that it ought to have been repealed long since, may more, that it ought never to have been established. Non-intervention by Congress in regard to this question of slavery applying to the territories we firmly believe is the only peaceable settlement that can be made, other expedients may be resorted to, and perhaps such may be adopted as will work temporary good results, but they are only temporary. Every time a new territory is organized, the whole ground must be traveled over again. Some of the opposition leaders take the ground that every foot of territory belonging to the United States is covered by some irrepealable law and they quote Mr. Webster as their authority. How is it with the territory acquired of Mexico, where Mr. Clay's non-intervention principle is this day the ruling principle?

Mr. Campbell made some very dyspeptic remarks on the subject of popular sovereignty. He declared there could be no sovereignty about it, for he said, Congress made their laws, and that Indiana paid her quota of taxes for their support. That is all true, but it don't touch the issue. The territories are hell to be the common property of the North and South, and as this angry question is forever arising upon the introduction of every new territory, we want some final and amicable settlement as to that question and we can see no better alternative than this. When we speak of popular sovereignty then, this is the application intended, and any other application is wrong, unjust and untruthful, and a clear evasion of the question. Every other means has been resorted to and what have been the results? We invite the attention of those who are so tenacious for lines and restrictions, to some matters of record, to show that their theory has not been sustained in a single instance where the experiment has been made. We believe that if slavery is to be established or excluded, it is to be done after all by those immediately concerned and by no others.

How did the ordinance of 1787 work? The provision was to exclude Slavery from all the North-western Territory, but what are the facts in the case? Slavery in Illinois under the operations of that ordinance, in ten years actually increased 445,83 per cent. In 1810, they had 168 slaves, in 1820 they had 917, and slavery did not expire there, or begin to expire, until it was introduced into the Union as a State, and in

not then but by a very gradual process, for in 1840 the census tables show, there were 231 slaves in Illinois.

The same is true with reference to Indiana. In 1800 there were 135 slaves here. In 1810 there were 257, an increase of a little more than 75,54 per cent., and even as late as 1820, there were 190 slaves in Indiana. The same facts are presented with regard to all the territories covered by the ordinance of 1787. Then this proves something; it proves that no general injunctions imposed by Congress can be made practical. So we hold, and we hold firmly to the views, that our plan is the best one and for two reasons; first, because it is general and meets every case, and secondly, because it is the most efficient. We feel assured that we are right and that we will eventually succeed. Survive or perish however, so long as our convictions remain as they now are, we will stand to them at all hazards and stand to them to the last.

For the Review.

CLARK TOWNSHIP NOT DEAD, BUT SLEEPETH—OLD LINERS WAKING UP!

LADOGA, July 23d, 1855.

The largest township meeting ever held in the township, was held on Saturday.

One hundred and ten voters, present, met without the aid of post-bills, public notice, secret wigwams or sworn conspiracies.

Joseph E. McDonald not being present

as he agreed, much to the disappointment

of his friends, who, perhaps, was induced

to believe that all the spirits willing to de

vote one day, in this busy season, to their

country's interests, had ride up to town on

Sanford's gravel train to see the "elephant,"

and hear "Bogus Corey" burn brimstone

from the hole in an anvil on the point just

beyond the depot in Crawfordsville. That

was a sad mistake. The old liners are alive

yet and were on hand, and will redeem the

time lost.

David D. Nicholson was called to the chair, and Jim Harnay being called on, made an excellent effort, showing very forcibly the great interests involved in the present contest, and the moral degradation of the tendencies of the present secret cabals in politics, and that the great battle was soon to be fought in this country whether the present form of government shall stand or the Union be dissolved; that Massachusetts had nullified the fugitive slave law, that Wilson, the distinguished champion, so much applauded at the Indianapolis fusion convention, was one of the principle actors in the Massachusetts nullification. Jim's speech did honor to himself and much satisfaction to his friends.

George Jeffries was then called on, and the way old "General Buncomb" made "fusion" squirm and twist was astonishing; he spoke about one hour, was hard to beat, and no man has a sounder heart and few have a clearer head than old George; we hope he will repeat the dose for the benefit of some of our prospective K. N.'s.

D. C. Stover followed, and directed his remarks mainly in support of the Democratic resolution, that charges the Know Nothings of being guilty of bringing about the Kansas outrage, in forcing upon the people of that Territory votes from other States; that Know Nothingism was a conspiracy without any avowed object, but whose results were to pull down; it was emphatically an elevating machine, to put demagogues into power.

Hon. Swan Brookshire refuted by a statement of facts, the charge that has frequently been made against the Senate, that the old liners were the authors of the Liquor law. He stated that the law as it now exists was the bill got up and reported to both houses of the Legislature, by the committee of Temperance, House and Senate committees meeting in conjunction, and that there was not an old liner in that committee, they were all fusionists, and that the bill was not amended after the committee reported it.

On motion of Jim Harnay the old liners of the township resolved themselves into an association, with the avowed object of giving the opposition no cause to complain of our lethargy, and no right to taunt us that they again "sniped voters" from our ranks.

Caleb H. R. Anderson was elected President, and D. C. Stover Secretary, and every democrat and old line whig appointed a committee of one to look out for intriguers from the K. N.'s.