

# THE REVIEW.



CRAWFORDSVILLE

Saturday Morning, Feb. 6, 1858.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING BY  
CHARLES H. DOWEN.

The Crawfordville Review, furnished to subscribers at \$1.50 in advance, or \$2.00 not paid within the year.

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

**CIRCULATION**  
LARGER THAN ANY PAPER PUBLISHED IN CRAWFORDSVILLE!  
Advertisers call up and examine our list of 157 SUBSCRIBERS.

## DEMOCRATIC STATE TICKET.

For Secretary of State.  
DANIEL McCLELLAN, of Morgan.  
For Auditor of State.  
JOHN W. DODD, of Grant.  
For Treasurer of State.  
NATHANIEL E. CUNNINGHAM, of Vigo.  
For Superintendent of Public Instruction.  
SAMUEL L. RUGG, of Allen.  
For Attorney General.  
JOSEPH E. McDONALD, of Montgomery.  
For Judges of the Supreme Court.  
SAMUEL E. PERKINS, of Marion.  
ANDREW DAVISON, of Decatur.  
JAMES M. HANNA, of Vigo.  
JAMES L. WORDEN, of Whitley.

## PRESIDENT BUCHANAN.

It will be seen from our telegraphic despatches that the President takes the most extreme grounds in favor of admitting Kansas with the Lecompton Constitution, notwithstanding her Governor and both branches of her Legislative bodies, together with a majority of ten thousand of her sovereign citizens, have protested against such an act. If this course, which the President has seen proper to take, (not calling in question his honesty of purpose,) is Democratic, we confess that we have never been a Democrat, and know nothing of its principles. We are free to say that we are disappointed with Mr. Buchanan, and that with the rank and file of the Indiana Democracy, we shall oppose his administration on this line of policy. Next week we will state in full our reasons.

But, notwithstanding the policy of the President, and our antagonism to it, we can see no reason for the disorganization of the Democratic party. The case now stands thus: Mr. Buchanan is for Lecompton; our platform solemnly pledges us against it. Let his Excellency pursue his course; the Democracy of Indiana can follow theirs. He is not essential to our existence or success; his absolute repudiation would not hurt us more than a quill tickle in our side. The repudiation of John Tyler did not kill the Whig party. The gentlemen nominated on the 8th of January, stand on the Anti-Lecompton resolution. They seem to have had no trouble in constructing that resolution. It is now too late for any of them, even if they had the disposition, to go kicking after Mr. Buchanan. They are bound to maintain their integrity, quite as much as the whole Democracy. Stand by the party; let its flag be kept flying; it is the same good old ship it always was. Men change, principles never.

## MASS MEETING ON THE 23D OF FEBRUARY.

We predict now that the Democratic Convention on the 23d of February next will be the largest assemblage of the kind ever held in Indianapolis. Mr. Buchanan's last message to Congress, insisting on the admission of Kansas with the Lecompton Constitution unsubmitted, makes that Convention a necessity for the Democracy of Indiana. His Kansas policy must be repudiated, and it will be. There will be no mistaking the voice of Indiana on the 23d. It will go across the mountains with the lightning, and Bright and Fitch, hearing it, will think it the almighty thunder ever levelled at men in office. Will they obey it?

PROF. PALMER.—This gentleman still continues to draw large and admiring audiences. In him the science of Phrenology has a splendid champion. Notwithstanding this is the second week in the course of his lectures, there is not the slightest abatement in the general interest manifested by our citizens to listen to his logical reasoning, which, with his fine powers of elocution, give him a prominence and a fascination seldom attained by modern lecturers. As he is to commence a course of lectures in Lafayette next week, we take pleasure in recommending him to the favorable consideration of our brethren of the editorial fraternity in that city.

PERSONAL.—Mr. W. G. Corey arrived in Crawfordville, on last Thursday evening. He contemplates entering into the mercantile trade. We are of the opinion that he will find no better place in the west for business than our own beautiful town, and admire his judgment in selecting this point.

We publish in another place in this paper the answer of the Democratic candidates on the State Ticket to certain interrogatories propounded to them by the editor of the German paper at Indianapolis. It will be seen that the candidates consider the party in Indiana pledged against the Lecompton fraud. We are therefore, fully justified in opposing it.

## THE CINCINNATI ENQUIRER'S ARGUMENT.

The Cincinnati Enquirer has become a lick-spittle and toady for Mr. Buchanan; notwithstanding which, we must admit that it is the ablest advocate he has in the West. Strong, ingenious, and unscrupulous as it is, here is the strongest argument it can advance in support of its patron's recent message—we give the proposition in attack, and the Enquirer's proposition in reply:

"If it is urged that a majority of the people in Kansas have voted against the Lecompton Constitution, it can also be said a still larger majority voted for State Officers under it, thus indicating their willingness to be admitted under it."

Tremendous logic! A majority voted the Constitution down—the fact admitted; but, says the Enquirer, they didn't mean to vote it down, as is proved by their voting for State officers under it. They rejected it by over ten thousand majority, still they were willing to be admitted under it! What do the people of Indiana say to such contemptible make-shifts? However, judgment should not be passed too hastily on the Enquirer—it only borrowed the argument from its master, Mr. Buchanan.

**BUCHANAN VS INDIANA DEMOCRACY.**  
President Buchanan and his friends will make acquaintance in his recent Message, a test of Democratic orthodoxy. All in favor of admitting Kansas with the Lecompton swindle, are the immaculate apostles, and as such can take front seats in the old church; those opposed to that measure, believing that the people have a right to ratify or reject that Constitution by a fair vote at the ballot box, can't come in, but must stand outside and pray. Of this latter heretical class are the whole Democracy of Indiana—see 13th Res. 8th Jan. Convention. Very well. There is a nice little crowd of us outside! Pass around the pea-nuts, boys! While Jim Hughes, John L. Robinson &c., &c., are praying inside, we will amuse ourselves the best way we can.

Senator Trumbull of Illinois, in the Senate on the 3rd inst., moved, as a question of privilege, to take up the report of the Committee on the Bright and Fitch contested election case. Mr. Bayard objected, and said that as Messrs. Bright & Fitch represented the sentiments of the people of Indiana on the Kansas question, it was right that they should be permitted to vote on the Lecompton Constitution before the right to their seats was decided. Now, we desire to say that the idea of Messrs. Bright and Fitch representing the sentiments of the people of Indiana on the Lecompton Constitution (which swindle they are pledged to vote for) is preposterous. They do not represent the sentiments of one voter out of ten in this State; and if this is the best reason Mr. Bayard can advance in postponing action on the question, it is a lame one indeed. It is but proper to state that Mr. Bright interposed, and said that he was anxious to have the question settled as soon as possible.

## GOV. BANKS AND HIS 7000 LOAN.

A corruption Committee of the House of Representatives has dragged out of a fellow named Stone, a witness before them, that N. P. Banks, the late Republican speaker of the House, and the present Republican Governor of Massachusetts, borrowed the snug little sum of 7000, for services rendered the firm of Lawrence, Stone & Co., in a tariff project which that Company were urging through Congress. Either there never was in America as corrupt a gang as the so-called Republican party, or else it is peculiarly unfortunate in being possessed and led by a gang of the most God-forsaken swindlers that ever robbed a public treasury. The great Banks—Banks "the iron man"—has gone to swell the innumerable army of Republican defaulters, vote-sellers, and Kalleches now on their "winding way" to an infamous oblivion. "Let it slide," he said of the Union—"Let it slide!" the whole Union will now retort.

## SPIRITUALISM.

In no age in the world has there been a greater desire manifested than at the present, to solve if possible the dim future of humanity—the future beyond the grave. Shall we live again? That's the question! Where is the traveller who has ever returned from the undiscovered country to enlighten us on this point? Echo answer where? Not one has ever returned. Skepticism is the order of the day. Belief without knowledge, and that of the most positive and palpable character amounts to nothing. Simple belief will never eradicate from the reflective mind, the spectre of doubt and uncertainty. Modern spiritualism has made thousands of converts to its new, and we might say, novel theory of heaven and man's future destiny, and as they are but a branch of the christian world, we hold that their opinions are entitled to the same respect as any other christian denomination. In accordance with our ideas of toleration, we take pleasure in announcing to our citizens, that the Hon. WARREN CHASE, will deliver a series of six lectures on Spiritualism, commencing on Tuesday the 16th inst. Mr. Chase was formerly a member of Congress from Wisconsin. He is a fine classical scholar, and is said to be one of the ablest exponents of the new creed.

See the advertisement of LAYMON BROTHERS & Co., and then call and see them.

Wood wanted on subscription.

## SLAVERY IN KANSAS.

Mr. Buchanan says Kansas is now as much a slave State as Georgia. He also argues that it is there fairly and legitimately. If that is so, the majority of the people of the Territory must have established it, as, under the Kansas-Nebraska act, no other power could either establish it or prohibit it there. Unfortunately for the President's position, at an election held on the 4th day of January last, the slavery clause in the Lecompton Constitution, and the Constitution itself, were voted down by a majority of over ten thousand. Can Mr. Buchanan be right? If Kansas really is as much a slave State as Georgia, how did it come so? On this point, Democratic authorities differ. Mr. Buchanan says it became so, fairly and legitimately. On the other hand, Gov. Walker and Secretary Stanton, appointees of Mr. Buchanan, and, therefore, honorable men by presumption at least, emphatically assert that it became so by the fraud and usurpation of the Lecompton Constitution. Suppose each man who reads this a juror sitting to adjudicate the issue, how would he decide it? Certainly not for Mr. Buchanan; the witnesses against him are two to one.

When the President's message transmitting the Lecompton Constitution to Congress, was received in the House, two test votes were taken on motions to adjourn, which resulted in the defeat of the Lecomptonites—the first time by four, the last time by seven majority. Good!

## RIPLEY TOWNSHIP.

Read the report of the proceedings of the Democrats of the above township. Their resolutions smack of the old thunder—popular sovereignty—anti-Banks—anti-Canal. That is right.

Who supports the State Ticket.—The Terre Haute Journal, Crawfordville Review, and Jackson County Democrat, are the only professed Democratic journals in this State, which do not support the nominees of the Democratic State Convention, so far as we have yet learned.

We clip the above from the Clay County Democrat of the 29th Jan. Had the editor of that paper read the issues of the Review, since the January Convention, unless he intends wilfully to misrepresent us, he would not have published the statement. We are supporting the ticket, and intend doing so, until it is elected. Will the Democrat make the correction?

Nebraska is our largest territory. It will make about eighty States as large as New Hampshire. Nebraska is about one-sixth the size of Europe. If Great Britain were placed in Nebraska, it would occupy so small a corner that you could not see it "with the naked eye."

## A COWARDLY AFFAIR—A NOTED ACTRESS AGAIN IN A MEAS-GRACIOUS ALL AROUND.

The Buffalo Express gives a rich account of a cowardly scrape that came off in that city on Saturday last. It says:

One of our citizens raved in the street, and in presence of numerous spectators, by a Mr. Huntington, the reputed husband of Susan Denim. The name of the sufferer we suppress, on account of his family. The circumstances as they occurred, are briefly these:

The gentleman became enamored of the charms of Susan, and wrote her a note, proposing a meeting and an acquaintance, which might be mutually agreeable.

The note was written, but unmistakable in its meaning, and falling into the hands of her husband, he counselled her to accede to the terms proposed and grant the interview that had been solicited, and answered the note himself, in her behalf, and in favorable language, over the signature of "Sincere." This brought a rejoinder from the aforesaid C. W. W., who proposed in it how they should proceed after the meeting. The Express then adds:

Accordingly on Saturday afternoon, Miss Denim met her new acquaintance at the place appointed, and the two repaired to the corner of Main and Eagle streets, where they took a seat in a buggy and drove off. Huntington, it appeared, had a body of friends in waiting to observe the movements of Susan and her companion. Among those who were with Huntington, was Mr. Kent, of the theatre, the gentleman who, if we recollect rightly, was raved in the streets of Cleveland by Miss Denim a few years since. The buggy with Miss Susan and her friend passed down the street, and Mr. Huntington and his friends followed in a carriage. They proceeded to a house on Carroll-street, near Michigan, where Miss Denim's friend handed her down, and Huntington joined them. Susan introduced him to the gentleman as her husband, saying that they could settle the affair in their own way. Mr. Huntington then struck the individual repeated blows over the head and shoulders with a whip, when they closed and fell, and rose again, and then went down again, when the assailed broke away from Huntington and ran off, leaving his horse and buggy and a sword-cane, which Huntington has in his possession, and upon which is inscribed the name of a citizen of unsullied reputation heretofore. Thus ended the affair.

In our opinion it is alike disgraceful to all parties involved. Four memory serves us right, this Mr. Huntington is the individual who, while sojourning here a few years since, with a band of negro minstrels assaulted a waiter at the Western Hotel with a knife, and came near cutting his throat, and at a previous visit to this city, stabbed a negro. That, it would seem, should give him notoriety enough here without this last act.

The Hon. ROBERT J. WALKER, late Governor of Kansas, is to be at the Democratic Mass Meeting at Indianapolis on the 23rd February.

We have received the President's Message on Lecompton, but too late for this week's issue. We shall give it entire next week.

## THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO ALTER THEIR CONSTITUTION.

The Washington Union, like an old steam-wheel steamer going down stream, is puffing away at a terrible rate, and with evident astonishment at its own success, to prove that the people of each State have the right to alter or amend their State Constitution without the slightest regard to any provision in that instrument prescribing the time, manner or form in which such amendments shall be made.

The Albany Atlas and Argus also labors extensively to establish the same proposition. That paper states its position as follows:

We hold that the people of Kansas, after admission, may alter their Constitution as they please, in spite of any provision in it forbidding alteration. They may, if they choose, first of all abrogate such a prohibitory provision. They may, through the legislative power, call a Convention and make an entirely new Constitution. This was done in our own State in 1846, and the right to do it is now generally recognized by all politicians and statesmen who are not disposed to limit the sovereignty of the people.

Now, we do not propose to controvert, or to argue pro or con this proposition, though it is open to much argument on both sides. The right of revolution and its limitations and boundaries is one which has been discussed by the ablest statesmen of the Union. Nor do we intend now to inquire, supposing this proposition to be sound, how far the same right may be claimed as to the power to amend the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution of Kansas is an enactment made or assumed to be made in the name of the people of that State. "We, the people," etc., is the form in which the enacting clause of such instruments commence. The Constitution of the United States commences thus:

"We, the People of the United States, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

How far this proposition that the people of a State have the right to nullify their State Constitution by disregarding and putting aside the forms of amendment of the Constitution of the United States in any other manner than that provided in the Constitution itself, we do not propose now to argue. We merely suggest to these Democratic papers, particularly those who set themselves up as the special guardians of the constitutional rights of the South, that their mad zeal in behalf of the Lecompton fraud may carry them into the assertion of doctrines which are destructive of the stability of the Union. The Constitution of the United States recites that it is "ordained and established," by "the people of the United States," and provides particularly the two modes of amending it. The Constitution of Illinois recites that "we, the people of Illinois," do ordain and establish this Constitution." It also provides the modes of amending it. If the Constitution of Illinois be the work of the people, it is argued that the people of the State may amend it at their pleasure, without paying the slightest regard to the provisions of the Constitution itself upon that point. If this be correct, we would like some of these gentlemen to point out to us the distinction between the rights of the people of a State to do this, and the right of the people of the United States to do the same thing with respect to the Constitution of the United States. Both instruments are "ordained and established" by "the people," the one by the people of Illinois, the other by the people of the United States.

The Constitution of the United States, article V., provides that the Constitution may be amended whenever two-thirds of both houses of Congress, shall propose such amendments, and such amendments shall be ratified by the legislatures (or state conventions) of three-fourths of the several States; or whenever the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall apply for that object, Congress shall call a convention to propose such amendments, and such amendments thus proposed shall be ratified by the legislatures or conventions of three-fourths of the several States. These are not the only restrictions upon the power of amendment; the Constitution further provides that no amendment shall be made, which shall deprive any State (without its consent) of its equal suffrage in the Senate. Does this article in the Constitution of the United States mean anything? Has it any binding force or obligation upon the people of the United States? Are the people of the United States tied up by this provision so that they cannot amend their constitution except by one or other of the mode prescribed by the constitution? We confess that in our simplicity we thought that article V., of the Constitution was as binding upon the people of the United States as article IV., or article VI., or any other article. We do not believe that the precedent mentioned by the Atlas and Argus and which is eternally harped upon by the Washington Union, is one which ought to be carelessly endorsed or hastily followed.

Suppose the right now claimed were once admitted, and Congress instead of conforming to the terms of the Constitution should by a majority vote submit the question to the people of the United States whether they would have a convention to amend the Constitution; and suppose that question should receive an affirmative answer by a majority of the people voting on the question, how would the Washington Union, after having so emphatically endorsed and applauded the precedent set in New York, deny the power of Congress to provide for a convention, fix the ratio of representation in the same, and thus call in to being a power to overturn and destroy the existing Constitution. We will suppose that Virginia and Alabama, regarding such action by Congress as extra-constitutional, should refuse to send delegates to such a convention, or that Congress limiting the Kansas Legislature in denying to nineteen counties any representation, should fail to apportion any delegates to either of those States in the convention; and that, when it had closed its labors, the convention had abolished the equal suffrage of the States in the Senate; had declared that slavery should no longer exist in the Union; had conferred upon Congress all legislative powers which in the hands of a majority would be so destructive of State sovereignty; and, in conclusion, provided that the convention, "being the people" acting through their delegates, the Constitution needed no further ratification but was then completed. We ask of the Albany Atlas or the Washington Union, whether this strict following of the New York and Lecompton precedents would be submitted to by any Southern State.

And yet we are told by the Washington Union that the Southern States and people are a unit in support of the Lecompton constitution, and are also a unit in the support of the doctrine that "the people" are not and cannot be restrained in their time or manner of amending their constitution by any thing which that constitution may provide on that point. We can understand in cases where the constitution of a State or nation contains no provision for its own amendment, that the people may very safely and wisely exercise that power of self-government which has never been surrendered. But we started out with no intention to discuss this question; we simply desired to state that until we were shown the exact length and breadth to which the principle was applicable, we preferred to express no approval of it. But we intended to point out the remarkable absurdity of these two papers clamoring justly in behalf of the right of the people to overturn constitutions and governments just at their will and pleasure, and at the same time denying to the people, the poor privilege of saying yes or no to the form of government established for them by a handful of brawling fanatics. These men say to the people you have the right to alter the position of your claims, to transfer them from one limb to another but upon the issue whether you shall wear chains or not you have no right to say one word in the negative—that question has been decided for you by Lord President Calhoun and his forty companions.—Chicago Times.

From the Indiana Volksblatt.  
**INTERESTING CORRESPONDENCE.**  
The following correspondence passed between the Democratic candidates and the editors of the Volksblatt:  
INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 18, 1858.  
Dear Sir: In the last Democratic Convention, you, together with others, were nominated as standard-bearers of the Democratic party and the champions of Democratic principles.  
You are certainly aware, that in the Convention, and also in the minds of the people, the Kansas question, or rather the construction of the doctrine of popular sovereignty, as applied to Kansas, was the great subject of contention.  
The Convention passed the following resolution on this subject:  
"Resolved, That we are still in favor of the great doctrine of the Kansas-Nebraska bill; and that by a practical application of that doctrine the people of a State or of a Territory are vested with the right of ratifying or rejecting at the ballot-box any Constitution that may be formed for their government; and that hereafter the Union as a State without a fair expression of the will of the people being first had upon the Constitution accompanying the application for admission."

Now, as we understand that resolution, and as understood by the great majority of those who voted for it, the meaning thereof was: That neither Kansas nor any other Territory, ought to be admitted into the Union, unless its Constitution has first been submitted for ratification or rejection to the people and received their approval.  
We regret, however, to be informed, that the resolution in question receives a different construction, not only from our opponents, but also from Democrats. It is claimed, that because the word "hereafter" is used and the case of Kansas is pending now, that it has no reference to Kansas whatever, and that the same may, with our approval, be admitted into the Union with a constitution, opposed by a majority of its inhabitants.

Under these circumstances we feel that we owe it to the character, which our paper has always sustained for honesty and fairness, and to our thousands of readers, that have honored our paper with perhaps a greater reliance on its statements, than the readers of any other paper, to dispel any doubt or equivocation on this subject.  
We have maintained the doctrine of popular sovereignty during the last hard-fought contest in its broadest construction. We have in this last phase of the Kansas question contended, that neither the Lecompton Constitution, nor any other ought to be forced upon the people of Kansas against their will or without their ratification.  
We cannot conscientiously or consistently with honor and principle support even a Democratic candidate, that puts another construction upon the doctrine of popular sovereignty. And since there is a difference of opinion as to the construction of the resolution, adopted by our convention, we do not wish to assure our readers that in voting for our candidates, they vote for our and their construction and principle, without being assured, that we do so justly, honestly and correctly.

We, therefore, respectfully request you, to inform us at as early a period as possible whether your construction of the resolution, adopted at the last convention coincides with ours or not, that we place your views before our readers, and give you that cheerful, hearty and earnest support, which we cannot give, while any doubt on this subject cripples our energies.

J. M. BUTCHER.  
AD. SPIDENSTICKER.

INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 22, 1858.

Editors of Volksblatt:—  
GENTLEMEN:—Your inquiry addressed to the undersigned, separately, dated on the 18th inst., is now before us; as we do not differ among ourselves relative to the answer that should be given to the question propounded, we take the liberty of joining in that answer. Your request is to inform you what construction we give to a portion of the platform of principles, adopted by the Democratic Convention, which did us the honor to put us in nomination as candidates, to fill the several offices, for which we are now before the people. The resolution upon which you base your inquiry, as published, is as follows:

**DEMOCRATIC MEETING AT ALAMO.**  
According to previous announcement, a Democratic Meeting was held at Alamo, on Thursday, Jan. 30th 1858, at which M. H. DENMAN was called to the chair, and S. W. H. RAWLINS appointed Secretary.  
The object of the meeting was explained in a few appropriate remarks by A. J. Snyder.

On motion, the chair appointed the following gentlemen a committee to draft resolutions expressive of the sense of the meeting, to-wit: R. J. Fink, Mathias Clodfelter, and Mathias Elmore.  
The Committee reported the following resolutions which were unanimously adopted.

**Resolved,** That we heartily approve the nominations made, and resolutions adopted at Indianapolis on the 8th January, 1858, and that we pledge them our cordial support.

**Resolved,** That we regard all Banks to be subversive of the best interests of the people—calculated to place the business of the State within the control of a concentrated money power, and above the laws and will of the people.

**Resolved,** That the Constitution of the State of Indiana does not confer upon the General Assembly the power to commence or carry on any system of internal improvement.

**Resolved,** That we consider the sale of the Wabash and Erie Canal to its present owners a bona fide contract, and that we are opposed to the Legislature rescinding any part of the same.

**Resolved,** That the proceedings of this meeting be signed by the President and Secretary and published in the Crawfordville Review and Lafayette Argus.

Mr. Clodfelter offered the following resolution, which was adopted.  
**Resolved,** That the Old Liners of Ripley Township meet in Convention at Alamo, on the third Saturday in March next, to nominate candidates for Township officers.

M. H. DENMAN, Pres't.  
S. W. H. RAWLINS, Sec't.

"Mother, mayn't I have the big bible in your room?"  
"Yes, my son, and I am glad to see you desirous of perusing that book. What do you most want to see in it?"  
"Only want to see whether I can smash flies in it, like Bill Smith does at school!"

From the Indiana Volksblatt.  
**INTERESTING CORRESPONDENCE.**  
The following correspondence passed between the Democratic candidates and the editors of the Volksblatt:  
INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 18, 1858.

Dear Sir: In the last Democratic Convention, you, together with others, were nominated as standard-bearers of the Democratic party and the champions of Democratic principles.

You are certainly aware, that in the Convention, and also in the minds of the people, the Kansas question, or rather the construction of the doctrine of popular sovereignty, as applied to Kansas, was the great subject of contention.

The Convention passed the following resolution on this subject:

"Resolved, That we are still in favor of the great doctrine of the Kansas-Nebraska bill; and that by a practical application of that doctrine the people of a State or of a Territory are vested with the right of ratifying or rejecting at the ballot-box any Constitution that may be formed for their government; and that hereafter the Union as a State without a fair expression of the will of the people being first had upon the Constitution accompanying the application for admission."

Now, as we understand that resolution, and as understood by the great majority of those who voted for it, the meaning thereof was: That neither Kansas nor any other Territory, ought to be admitted into the Union, unless its Constitution has first been submitted for ratification or rejection to the people and received their approval.  
We regret, however, to be informed, that the resolution in question receives a different construction, not only from our opponents, but also from Democrats. It is claimed, that because the word "hereafter" is used and the case of Kansas is pending now, that it has no reference to Kansas whatever, and that the same may, with our approval, be admitted into the Union with a constitution, opposed by a majority of its inhabitants.

Under these circumstances we feel that we owe it to the character, which our paper has always sustained for honesty and fairness, and to our thousands of readers, that have honored our paper with perhaps a greater reliance on its statements, than the readers of any other paper, to dispel any doubt or equivocation on this subject.  
We have maintained the doctrine of popular sovereignty during the last hard-fought contest in its broadest construction. We have in this last phase of the Kansas question contended, that neither the Lecompton Constitution, nor any other ought to be forced upon the people of Kansas against their will or without their ratification.  
We cannot conscientiously or consistently with honor and principle support even a Democratic candidate, that puts another construction upon the doctrine of popular sovereignty. And since there is a difference of opinion as to the construction of the resolution, adopted by our convention, we do not wish to assure our readers that in voting for our candidates, they vote for our and their construction and principle, without being assured, that we do so justly, honestly and correctly.

We, therefore, respectfully request you, to inform us at as early a period as possible whether your construction of the resolution, adopted at the last convention coincides with ours or not, that we place your views before our readers, and give you that cheerful, hearty and earnest support, which we cannot give, while any doubt on this subject cripples our energies.

J. M. BUTCHER.  
AD. SPIDENSTICKER.

INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 22, 1858.

Editors of Volksblatt:—  
GENTLEMEN:—Your inquiry addressed to the undersigned, separately, dated on the 18th inst., is now before us; as we do not differ among ourselves relative to the answer that should be given to the question propounded, we take the liberty of joining in that answer. Your request is to inform you what construction we give to a portion of the platform of principles, adopted by the Democratic Convention, which did us the honor to put us in nomination as candidates, to fill the several offices, for which we are now before the people. The resolution upon which you base your inquiry, as published, is as follows:

**DEMOCRATIC MEETING AT ALAMO.**  
According to previous announcement, a Democratic Meeting was held at Alamo, on Thursday, Jan. 30th 1858, at which M. H. DENMAN was called to the chair, and S. W. H. RAWLINS appointed Secretary.  
The object of the meeting was explained in a few appropriate remarks by A. J. Snyder.

On motion, the chair appointed the following gentlemen a committee to draft resolutions expressive of the sense of the meeting, to-wit: R. J. Fink, Mathias Clodfelter, and Mathias Elmore.  
The Committee reported the following resolutions which were unanimously adopted.

**Resolved,** That we heartily approve the nominations made, and resolutions adopted at Indianapolis on the 8th January, 1858, and that we pledge them our cordial support.

**Resolved,** That we regard all Banks to be subversive of the best interests of the people—calculated to place the business of the State within the control of a concentrated money power, and above the laws and will of the people.

**Resolved,** That the Constitution of the State of Indiana does not confer upon the General Assembly the power to commence or carry on any system of internal improvement.

**Resolved,** That we consider the sale of the Wabash and Erie Canal to its present owners a bona fide contract, and that we are opposed to the Legislature rescinding any part of the same.

**Resolved,** That the proceedings of this meeting be signed by the President and Secretary and published in the Crawfordville Review and Lafayette Argus.

Mr. Clodfelter offered the following resolution, which was adopted.  
**Resolved,** That the Old Liners of Ripley Township meet in Convention at Alamo, on the third Saturday in March next, to nominate candidates for Township officers.

M. H. DENMAN, Pres't.  
S. W. H. RAWLINS, Sec't.

"Mother, mayn't I have the big bible in your room?"  
"Yes, my son, and I am glad to see you desirous of perusing that book. What do you most want to see in it?"  
"Only want to see whether I can smash flies in it, like Bill Smith does at school!"

From the Indiana Volksblatt.  
**INTERESTING CORRESPONDENCE.**  
The following correspondence passed between the Democratic candidates and the editors of the Volksblatt:  
INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 18, 1858.

Dear Sir: In the last Democratic Convention, you, together with others, were nominated as standard-bearers of the Democratic party and the champions of Democratic principles.

You are certainly aware, that in the Convention, and also in the minds of the people, the Kansas question, or rather the construction of the doctrine of popular sovereignty, as applied to Kansas, was the great subject of contention.

The Convention passed the following resolution on this subject:

"Resolved, That we are still in favor of the great doctrine of the Kansas-Nebraska bill; and that by a practical application of that doctrine the people of a State or of a Territory are vested with the right of ratifying or rejecting at the ballot-box any Constitution that may be formed for their government; and that hereafter the Union as a State without a fair expression of the will of the people being first had upon the Constitution accompanying the application for admission."

Now, as we understand that resolution, and as understood by the great majority of those who voted for it, the meaning thereof was: That neither Kansas nor any other Territory, ought to be admitted into the Union, unless its Constitution has first been submitted for ratification or rejection to the people and received their approval.  
We regret, however, to be informed, that the resolution in question receives a different construction, not only from our opponents, but also from Democrats. It is claimed, that because the word "hereafter" is used and the case of Kansas is pending now, that it has no reference to Kansas whatever, and that the same may, with our approval, be admitted into the Union with a constitution, opposed by a majority of its inhabitants.

Under these circumstances we feel that we owe it to the character, which our paper has always sustained for honesty and fairness, and to our thousands of readers, that have honored our paper with perhaps a greater reliance on its statements, than the readers of any other paper, to dispel any doubt or equivocation on this subject.  
We have maintained the doctrine of popular sovereignty during the last hard-fought contest in its broadest construction. We have in this last phase of the Kansas question contended, that neither the Lecompton Constitution, nor any other ought to be forced upon the people of Kansas against their will or without their ratification.  
We cannot conscientiously or consistently with honor and principle support even a Democratic candidate, that puts another construction upon the doctrine of popular sovereignty. And since there is a difference of opinion as to the construction of the resolution, adopted by our convention, we do not wish to assure our readers that in voting for our candidates, they vote for our and their construction and principle, without being assured, that we do so justly, honestly and correctly.

We, therefore, respectfully request you, to inform us at as early a period as possible whether your construction of the resolution, adopted at the last convention coincides with ours or not, that we place your views before our readers, and give you that cheerful, hearty and earnest support, which we cannot give, while any doubt on this subject cripples our energies.

J. M. BUTCHER.  
AD. SPIDENSTICKER.

INDIANAPOLIS, Jan. 22, 1858.

Editors of Volksblatt:—  
GENTLEMEN:—Your inquiry addressed to the undersigned, separately, dated on the 18th inst., is now before us; as we do not differ among ourselves relative to the answer that should be given to the question propounded, we take the liberty of joining in that answer. Your request is to inform you what construction we give to a portion of the platform of principles, adopted by the Democratic Convention, which did us the honor to put us in nomination as candidates, to fill the several offices, for which we are now before the people. The resolution upon which you base your inquiry, as published, is as follows:

**DEMOCRATIC MEETING AT ALAMO.**  
According to previous announcement, a Democratic Meeting was held at Alamo, on Thursday, Jan. 30th 1858, at which M. H. DENMAN was called to the chair, and S. W. H. RAWLINS appointed Secretary.  
The object of the meeting was explained in a few appropriate remarks by A. J. Snyder.

On motion, the chair appointed the following gentlemen a committee to draft resolutions expressive of the sense of the meeting, to-wit: R. J. Fink, Mathias Clodfelter, and Mathias Elmore.  
The Committee reported the following resolutions which were unanimously adopted.

**Resolved,** That we heartily approve the nominations made, and resolutions adopted at Indianapolis on the 8th January, 1858, and that we pledge them our cordial support.