

# THE REVIEW.



## CRAWFORDSVILLE

Saturday Morning, Feb. 27, 1858.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING BY

CHARLES H. BOWEN.

12¢ The Crawfordsville Review, furnished to Subscribers at \$1.50 in advance, or \$2, if 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  
12¢ SUBSCRIBERS. 12¢

DEMOCRATIC STATE TICKET.

For Secretary of State.

DANIEL MCCLURE, 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.

## THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION,

That met in the Court House last Saturday, was neither as largely attended nor as enthusiastic as was anticipated. In another place we notice the "platform" it adopted and published. The event of the day was a speech from our distinguished townsmen, Col. Henry S. Lane.

We are induced to notice the gentleman's effort on the occasion with some particularity, partly because of his prominence, and partly on account of the indication it gave as to the tendency of his party.—

We had reason to think that he would "show his hand," according to the vulgar phrase; scores came there to catch "the cue" from him; how they were satisfied, we do not know; we were disappointed—such is our honest confession. Evidently, the Col. had no cue to give; his own mind was not positively made up. With the U. S. Senate in expectancy, he had reached a fork in the road, and was pondering the fingerboards—one inscribed, "Washington, via Cincinnati Platform," the other, "Washington, via Philadelphia Platform."—

Which should he travel? Which was the *surest*? His mind was not exactly made up, we say; by way of a compromise, he would try one road a little while, then return and take the other. Very naturally, he didn't make much headway on either.—Such, in truth, is the predicament of the Republican party.

"Popular Sovereignty" has suddenly dazzled their eyes. All at once it has become a holy principle; a fundamental doctrine of the government; the very question our father's shed their blood for in an ancient day. They oppose "Popular Sovereignty?" Oh, no! They are ready to fight for it now. To hear them talk, one would fancy himself safe in offering a reward for a Republican who had ever opposed it. So it is with the "low-cunning" fellows; those that aspire to nothing above an Assessorship; the happy irresponsibles. Alas, for such Lane! Alas, for Lane particularly! He sees the noble principle, and longs to embrace it; he waves his hat and kisses his hand to it; he shouts in its honor; shining and glorious with the national sanction, it overpowers him, and he spits on his hands and grits his teeth, and dashes out in swift pursuit of it. He gets but a few steps when something "fetches him up standing"—he looks back—there is a rope knotted round his leg and hitched to the centre post of the Philadelphia Platform—a nice little rope curiously made from Africa, and sometimes used to stuff in people's eyes, when it has the virtue of enabling them to look upon a negro as the equal of a white man—an elegant rope tied round Lane's leg by Josh Giddings that day they sat down together to make the Philadelphia Platform.

Seriously speaking, however, throughout his whole speech we felt assured he would give twice his fortune—aye, ten Banks—if he could undo the work of the 17th June, 1856—if he had not, by accepting the Presidency of the Philadelphia Convention, indissolubly linked his fame, honor, and fortune to the platform of abolition principles that day erected. His party may desert it; he cannot; they may even plant themselves upon the Cincinnati Platform; he never can; the President of the Philadelphia Convention is a doomed man—doomed to the life-long maintenance of the mulatto child born to him that 17th of June.

Col. Lane, in the course of his speech, declared himself in favor of popular sovereignty; in a moment after, with outstretched arms, he vowed himself unalterably fixed on the Philadelphia Platform. Now, we ask, how can he stand on that platform and at the same time advocate the great principle of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill? It is well enough to reflect his memory, and that of every Fremont, as to the effect of the Philadelphia resolutions. They shall derive no credit for at-

tacking Mr. Buchanan; where they prove against him the abandonment of one principle among the many laid down at Cincinnati, we will convict them of the baser abandonment of almost the entire series of principles laid down by them on the 17th June.

With what propriety, or claim to consistency, or pretense of honor, can Col. Lane and his sort of Republicans don the faith of Stephen A. Douglas, at this late hour? Let us institute a comparison.

The people of the Territory shall be perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way—so says the Nebraska Bill—so says the Cincinnati Platform. Under that provision the people were made sovereign in all matters affecting their domestic institutions; they could lawfully exercise that sovereignty to the establishment of Slavery in Kansas.

In contrast hear now the Philadelphia Platform:

"Resolved, That, as our Republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national Territory, ordained that no person should be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, it becomes our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it for the purpose of establishing slavery in the United States, by positive legislation prohibiting its existence or extension therein."

The literal meaning of all that is, that Col. Lane and the Republicans held, that our fathers had abolished Slavery by providing that no person (negroes included) should be deprived of life, liberty or property, &c.; that such being a sacred constitutional provision, it was their duty to maintain it from violation; that the *existence* of slavery in the United States, or its *extension* therein, was such a violation, and, lastly, that the way to keep it inviolate was by *positive legislation to prohibit its existence or extension*.

That, it will be observed, is rank abolitionism; its authors don't stop short with considering it their duty to prohibit by positive legislation the *extension* of slavery; by *positive legislation* they pledge themselves to *prohibit its existence in the United States*. No wonder Giddings, Hale, Seward, Lovejoy, &c., were willing, with Lane, John Beard, &c., to strike hands on such a platform!

The next question, in the same connection, is, where was the positive prohibitory legislation to be had? The platform answers—

"Resolved, That the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the Territories of the United States for their government, and that in the exercise of this power it is both the *right* and the *duty* of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery."

Now, contrast the principle of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill with the principle here asserted. The former says the *sovereignty shall be in the people of Territories*, and that in its exercise, they can establish slavery, if they please: the Lane-Giddings platform says the *sovereignty* over the Territories is in Congress, and that it is the *duty of Congress* to exercise the sovereignty for the *prohibition of slavery*, whether it pleases the people or not. We boldly assert that the distinction between Christianity and heathenism is not broader or better defined.

We are glad to see the masses of the Republicans shedding the intolerable wool they carried through the last campaign—Far from being jealous of their conversion to popular sovereignty, we welcome them on that white man's holy ground. We are free to say, however, there are some who can't come up to, with our consent; and Lane is one of them. We can never believe him honestly a popular sovereignty man. The rope is around his leg, linking him forever to the idea of Congressional Sovereignty as opposed to that of Popular Sovereignty. Moreover, the company he fell into in Philadelphia gave him a small too strong for healthy Democrats. We are sorry for Lane.

The dodge he attempts to excuse his betrayal of Giddings is too threadbare to delude us. He says he is now in favor of popular sovereignty in Kansas, because it has become a question pertaining to Kansas as a *State*. What a miserable humbug! There isn't a Peter Fung in Chicago who wouldn't blush at the imbecility of such a "soul." Isn't Kansas a *Territory* yet? When was she admitted? When the Leecompton Constitution was voted down or voted up, wasn't Kansas a *Territory*? When the gallant Col. advocates the right of the people to exercise sovereignty on the 21st of December or the 4th of January last, don't he advocate its exercise by the people as citizens of a *Territory*? The Col. has no right to come up to our platform, and drag after him his Philadelphia crew. When he flings the latter away, or repudiates it, and shows fruits meet for repentence, and will take an oath of allegiance to the people, and will suffer us to baptize him in their name, we will give him the hand of fellowship; until then, when we see him stalking about popular sovereignty, with a longing eye and watering mouth, we shall cry out, "Beware of Incendiaries!"

If he must come on our creed, let him come like a man, frankly repenting the Philadelphia abolitionism; not steal upon it in disguise. We will give him until the 4th March to make up his mind.

The Government land costs \$1 an acre on average, and champagne \$2 a bottle. How many a man dies landless, who, during his life, has swallowed a town—trees and all.

## REPUBLICANISM IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY.

The Republican Convention last Saturday adopted a series of resolutions, altogether out of jingle with the Philadelphia Platform, and their last State platform, and the resolutions lately passed by their friends in Lafayette and Indianapolis.

Here is the Preamble:

"Whereas, Evils when they become habitual impair the moral honesty of society as well as the principles of parties, and as the evil counsels of the *Retrospective Democracy* may produce a degree of oppression tantamount to a despotism, which despise the opinion that does not receive all its dogmas as orthodox, and as there is a faction in this government harmonizing with this Democracy, that claims for itself an aristocracy above the sovereign power of the whole people, and maintains the sophism that "slavery is the natural and moral condition of the laboring man, whether white or black," therefore,

We will liberally reward the ingenious reader who can make grammar or sense of such stuff. Who could have embodied such a paragraph?

"Resolved, That, as our Republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national Territory, ordained that no person should be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, it becomes our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it for the purpose of establishing slavery in the United States, by positive legislation prohibiting its existence or extension therein."

The literal meaning of all that is, that Col. Lane and the Republicans held, that our fathers had abolished Slavery by providing that no person (negroes included) should be deprived of life, liberty or property, &c.; that such being a sacred constitutional provision, it was their duty to maintain it from violation; that the *existence* of slavery in the United States, or its *extension* therein, was such a violation, and, lastly, that the way to keep it inviolate was by *positive legislation to prohibit its existence or extension*.

It will be observed, is rank abolitionism; its authors don't stop short with considering it their duty to prohibit by positive legislation the *extension* of slavery; by *positive legislation* they pledge themselves to *prohibit its existence in the United States*. No wonder Giddings, Hale, Seward, Lovejoy, &c., were willing, with Lane, John Beard, &c., to strike hands on such a platform!

The next question, in the same connection, is, where was the positive prohibitory legislation to be had? The platform answers—

"Resolved, That the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the Territories of the United States for their government, and that in the exercise of this power it is both the *right* and the *duty* of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery."

Now, contrast the principle of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill with the principle here asserted. The former says the *sovereignty shall be in the people of Territories*, and that in its exercise, they can establish slavery, if they please: the Lane-Giddings platform says the *sovereignty* over the Territories is in Congress, and that it is the *duty of Congress* to exercise the sovereignty for the *prohibition of slavery*, whether it pleases the people or not. We boldly assert that the distinction between Christianity and heathenism is not broader or better defined.

We are glad to see the masses of the Republicans shedding the intolerable wool they carried through the last campaign—Far from being jealous of their conversion to popular sovereignty, we welcome them on that white man's holy ground. We are free to say, however, there are some who can't come up to, with our consent; and Lane is one of them. We can never believe him honestly a popular sovereignty man. The rope is around his leg, linking him forever to the idea of Congressional Sovereignty as opposed to that of Popular Sovereignty. Moreover, the company he fell into in Philadelphia gave him a small too strong for healthy Democrats. We are sorry for Lane.

The dodge he attempts to excuse his betrayal of Giddings is too threadbare to delude us. He says he is now in favor of popular sovereignty in Kansas, because it has become a question pertaining to Kansas as a *State*. What a miserable humbug! There isn't a Peter Fung in Chicago who wouldn't blush at the imbecility of such a "soul." Isn't Kansas a *Territory* yet? When was she admitted? When the Leecompton Constitution was voted down or voted up, wasn't Kansas a *Territory*? When the gallant Col. advocates the right of the people to exercise sovereignty on the 21st of December or the 4th of January last, don't he advocate its exercise by the people as citizens of a *Territory*? The Col. has no right to come up to our platform, and drag after him his Philadelphia crew. When he flings the latter away, or repudiates it, and shows fruits meet for repentence, and will take an oath of allegiance to the people, and will suffer us to baptize him in their name, we will give him the hand of fellowship; until then, when we see him stalking about popular sovereignty, with a longing eye and watering mouth, we shall cry out, "Beware of Incendiaries!"

If he must come on our creed, let him come like a man, frankly repenting the Philadelphia abolitionism; not steal upon it in disguise. We will give him until the 4th March to make up his mind.

The Government land costs \$1 an acre on average, and champagne \$2 a bottle. How many a man dies landless, who, during his life, has swallowed a town—trees and all.

Terribly sarcastic, 'pon our word! We feel badly scorched. We are surprised at the audacity of the gentleman. Are they not in favor of giving negroes the rights of citizenship? If they are not, why don't

they quit abusing poor Chief Justice Tahey, for deciding that, by the general constitution, a negro could not be a citizen? May be they have quit it; we'll keep our ears open, and listen.

"Resolved, That we are opposed to the scheme originating with Wall Street Stock Gamblers, having in view the assumption by the State, of the indebtedness fully and honorably discharged by the transfer of the Wabash & Erie Canal, and the Canals to our bond holders, and that we will not support any candidate who does not oppose such assumption."

This is a correct principle, with which we can find no fault. The resolution contains some news, however. We did not know that the scheme of resumption originated with Wall Street Stock Gamblers; we innocently thought it originated with the English holders of our bonds. When William L. Dayton, the late Republican candidate for the Vice Presidency, reads the above blunt resolution, he will begin to doubt his popularity with his political brethren in Indiana.

Another resolution about increasing the army finishes the platform. We think, in some respects, our friends were a little too hasty in its manufacture; they should have waited until after the 4th of March—There will be a magnificent struggle that day between the out and out abolitionists and the milk and water negro-lovers. It will be nip and tuck between them—"

"Resolved, That in imitation of the system successfully adopted by the United States Government, the State of Indiana should establish an independent treasury for the safe keeping of the public revenue."

10. That gold and silver only should circulate as money; charters for banks of issue or monied monopolies should not be granted, and that the circulating medium of the States should be reduced to the constitutional standard as rapidly as possible.

11. That the Monroe Doctrine of non-intervention by European powers in the affairs of this Continent, should be insisted upon and enforced by the United States Government.

12. That we recommend to our friends throughout the State a thorough organization upon the foregoing platform of principles.

13. That we are in favor of a Homestead Law, granting to every actual settler a Homestead on the public lands free of all charge.

In addition to the above Platform of principles, we declared as follows:

"Resolved, That the organization in favor of the Leecompton movement, as its principles and policy are developed, reveals a tendency to the distinctive features of ancient federalism; that their theory, in our opinion, involves a complete centralization of the political power of the government; that we fear that there is great danger of a re-pudiation of the principle of the Nebraska Act as a rule for the organization of Territories.

"Resolved, That primary assemblies of the Democratic party, alone, can with propriety erect tests of party faith; that the functionaries of their creation have no such authority; that we have witnessed with indignation the presumptuous attempts to read out of the Democratic party many of its oldest, ablest and truest members.

"Resolved, That the Hon. Stephen A. Douglas is entitled to the gratitude and applause of the American Democracy, for his bold and triumphant vindication of the American principle of self-government; and the Democracy of Indiana, in mass convention assembled, hereby pledge to them their firm and undivided support; and furthermore, that we approve and endorse the course, up to this time of Messrs. English, Foley, Davis and Nillack upon the Kansas question in Congress.

"Resolved, That the Indiana State Senate, by its prevarications, misrepresentations, and inconsistencies, as well as by its betrayal of Democratic faith, and its injustice to members of the party, has placed itself outside of the Democratic organization of the State, and forfeited the patronage and respect of the party.

"Resolved, That the Chair appoint an Executive Committee of two from each Congressional District, and one from the city of Indianapolis, whose duty it shall be to watch over the interests and organization, to call such Democratic meetings and conventions as may from time to time be thought necessary and proper, looking to a thorough organization of the party for the coming canvass.

"Resolved, That we recommend to the National Democracy of the North-west the holding at an early day of a Mass Convention at Chicago or some other suitable place, and that a committee of Correspondence of five be appointed, to communicate with the Democracy of other States relative to the calling of such a Convention.

The chair appointed the following Executive Committee:

1st District—R. S. Hicks, C. Tracy,  
2d do do Job Hatfield, G. W. Randall,  
3d do do John G. Carr, J. H. Vawter,  
4th do do A. C. Pepper, A. S. Underwood,  
5th do do G. S. Buckley, Jeremiah Smith,  
6th do do A. H. Brown, A. Seidensticker,  
7th do do J. B. Ryan, Wm. D. Allen,  
8th do do J. B. Edmonds, Isaac C. Elston,  
9th do do R. P. Davidson, Gilbert Hathaway,  
10th do do Chauncey Carter, Robert Lowry,  
11th do do G. W. McConnell, James M. Dickson,  
B. F. Wallace.

The President also appointed the following Committee under the resolution in regard to the meeting at Chicago:

A. Seidensticker, Henry Secret, Allen May, Sam'l H. Buskirk, O. B. Torbet.

Various letters were received and read, and among them, the following from HENRY A. WISE, GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA:

RICHMOND, VA., Feb. 15, 1858.

To AUSTIN H. BROWN, Esq.—Dear Sir—Please present my acknowledgments to the Committee of Arrangements for the State Democratic Mass Convention, to be held in Indianapolis on the 23d inst., and say that it will be impossible for me to be present and address its meeting. Official duties will require my presence at the capital of Virginia, especially on the day preceding the 23d. It is the anniversary of the birth day of that son of the Mother State of this Confederacy, whose wisdom, valor, and virtue won the proudest title among men of the

"Father of his Country"—a day appointed to unveil the statue which Virginia has erected to the memory of Washington. We have invited the Nation of the United States to be present. We patriotically and devoutly pray that it may be a day of reinvigoration and refreshment to our whole country; that we may all have our strength renewed; that we may all have our hearts purified and our whole natures reanimated in the cause of Constitutional Freedom, of Truth, of Justice, and order and good government. I cannot, for any cause, leave an occasion at home like this. But my sympathies will go abroad to your meeting, with the objects you propose, with unspeakable fervor.

At the same