

### For the American.

Mr. Editor.—In the "Franklin Democrat" of the 25th inst., I have read a letter to the editor, written by my old personal and political friend, Judge McCarty, with a view "to define his position" in relation to the political questions of the day. This letter, to use the Judge's language, was "intruded upon the public," because he had "no anxiety or wish to conceal his opinions" in relation to matters of public policy.

As this letter, and the things which it contains were undoubtedly published for the benefit of the public, the author cannot certainly complain if I, as one of that public, shall point out, in a respectful manner, my objections to his opinions:

In the first place, then, I think he had no reason to suppose that any "denunciations" would be "hurled" at him in consequence of his change of opinion in relation to the two great political parties which divide this country,—for he has been long enough a Whig, (to my own knowledge upwards of 17 years) to be aware that they respect the opinions of all men, as regards their political rights, and concede at all times the right to every man in this republic to think and act in accordance with the dictates of his own judgment and conscience, when compatible with the laws of the land. But, upon the supposition that the Whigs are vindictive enough to "hurl denunciations" against men for opinions sake, it is scarcely reasonable to suppose that so small a matter as the loss of a single vote, should so far make them forget themselves as to denounce an old neighbor, and that too, at a time when they are so confident of success.

The Judge tells us that "changes of opinion may prove that we are wiser to-day than we were yesterday." This, I will admit may be true—but at the same time I think it may prove also, that we are not quite so wise.—Take for instance, his opinions in relation to Banks since his "change," and I think it will puzzle any man to come to the conclusion that my friend's wisdom and consistency have been increased by his summer set.

But that we may the better judge of this matter, we will place a few sentences of the different parts of this letter side by side.

"The failure of banks for a few years passed; with the train of distresses following them; fluctuations in prices of commodities, & derangement of the business of the country have satisfied me that there are infirmities in the system of Banking, against which it is almost impossible to guard." \* \* \*

"I think the country wants stability and permanency in the prices of her commodities, and whilst they are measured in bank paper, that may be increased to-day, and contracted to-morrow, permanency of value can not be had."

These three paragraphs will enable the country to judge of the wisdom that a man accumulates by renouncing his party. He believes that "permanency in the prices of commodities" cannot be had when measured in bank paper—yet, if the affairs of banks were "well managed" "the good may, and I think will, outweigh the evils."

Now, if the Judge can understand and reconcile these statements, I should almost be willing to admit that his vision had been sharpened by what he calls his "change of opinion," but to myself, who have not changed, they appear very much like inconsistencies, and seem to have been written for future reference in case he should be charged with being either bank or anti-Bank. This course, at least, has prudence to recommend it, for he is not sure as to whose hands he may fall into, and probably thinks it safest to be prepared for any emergency which may arise.

Upon the subject of the tariff he says, "I cannot go protection for protection." This is a very elegant sentence, but it means nothing, for protection is simply what the word imports, and nothing more, and he is either for it or against it, and to say that we are opposed to protection for protection is downright nonsense, Gov. Polk and others, to the contrary notwithstanding.

Again he tells us that he "can not see how government can furnish pecuniary aid to one branch of industry, except at the expense of the others, and even if it were true, that the general welfare is promoted by such a policy, I could not sacrifice the rights of a minority by despotic legislation."

The Judge used to see and understand very clearly that protection to the mechanics of our own country could be extended without injury to the other interests of the nation,—and if this were the proper place, it does seem to me that I could bring to his memory even enough of his own arguments to convince him that by extending encouragement to our mechanics and manufacturers, that good would result to the whole people. But the strangest part of his Tariff doctrines, if I understand him rightly, is, that it would be better, where the same legislation can not bear equally upon the various interests of the North and South, to adopt that course of policy which would op-

press the majority and protect the minority.—Now every man, of course would condemn "despotic Legislation," or any other Legislation which would maliciously oppress any part of our people, but I have always understood it to be the duty, not only of men in a private capacity, but of Legislators also, to do all the good they can, and if a case should arise where either the majority or minority had necessarily to be subjected to injury from legislative enactments, I should think that no one would hesitate a moment to decide in favor of the majority. My friend having turned Polk man, I suppose thinks it necessary to fall in love with the dear South, and adopt the Locofoco rule that a majority ought not to govern either in conventions or elsewhere, for fear of oppressing the defenceless minority!

I am glad he did not promulgate these doctrines whilst he was in our ranks, for we profess to be republicans, and believe that a majority, and not a minority, should rule. The expression of such sentiments as these by the Whigs would justly subject them to the appellation of aristocrats and favorers of the "One man power."

We now come to the consideration of decidedly the richest paragraph in this previous letter, namely, that upon the veto power.—Here it is:

"I am also in favor of the veto, or one man power, as it is called by some politicians. I consider it an eminently conservative power and a necessary element in the political machinery. All legislation being restrictive of our natural rights, and the veto cutting off the legislation and restriction, is a check the surest and safest in our system. It concentrates a responsibility upon one man, which in either branch of Congress is distributed & weakened.

It is broader, and therefore better than that of the Supreme Court.

And, in fine, the Democratic principles do not suffer as much by legislation as those of opposite opinions, and I am for as few exercises of power as will comfort with the public good. And the grant of privileges to any particular class of men, whose interest is not identified with the great body of the people, is an unjust and an unequal exercise of power."

In the expression of these opinions there is displayed a good deal of heroism—and none but a man of courage would openly express, in a republic, opinions entirely adverse to every principle of democracy and in favor of an absolute despotism. The inference is inevitable from his remarks, that he wishes the Legislative branch of the Government abolished, together with the Supreme Court; for, "all legislation being restrictive of our natural rights, and the veto cutting off legislation and restriction, is a check the surest and safest in our system."

Now, as legislation is an evil, and it is necessary to keep a power to cut it off, where is the necessity of the existence of the Legislature. There can be no necessity for keeping up such an expensive establishment, if the judge's "One man power" be better.

What he means by our "natural rights" we are not told, but I presume he considers them such as are enjoyed by a herd of wild buffaloes upon the wide spread prairies of the west, who riot and luxuriate in the unrestrained enjoyment of animal existence. I had always thought that one of man's most exalted "natural" rights was the privilege of governing himself, both by laws of his own framing and by an observance of those given by the Creator.

Man seems to have been placed upon the earth with a different view and for a more exalted end than the common beast of the field; it therefore became necessary that he should be furnished with a strict code of laws for his government;—this the Almighty has given us—and it does seem to me, that, if laws had been unnecessary for the control of men, He would not have given them to us, or set before us an example which He did not wish us to follow.

This is, however, a mere matter of opinion, and as it comes in conflict with those of Fanny Wright, Robert Owen, and my friend the Judge, they may be wrong.

The length of this article admonishes me that I must bring it to a close, though there are many other matters connected with this letter of which I would like to speak—but I think enough has been said to bring us to the following conclusions:

1st. That the Judge is opposed to all Banks.

2d. That he is in favor of State Banks (i. e. according to his own showing.)

3. That he is opposed to protection "for protection" (i. e. opposes it altogether.)

4. That he believes the minority should rule.

5. That where legislation becomes oppressive, it would be better to burthen the majority than minority.

6. That all the powers of the government should be concentrated in one man.

7. That legislative bodies are useless.

8. That the Supreme Court is a cypher.

9. That men would be better off without laws than with them.

10. And finally, that if men must be governed at all, that an Autocracy would be better than a democracy.]

In closing I must be permitted to say, that my friend will take no offence at any thing which I have said, for it is not intended, but as I consider his dangerous deranged to republican institutions, I have felt it a duty not to let them pass without expressing my own sentiments in relation to them—and this I consider the more necessary, as the writer is one of our most worthy and respectable citizen.

R. H.

Brookville, July 30, 1844.

11. H. HAZZARD, & CO.

Commission and Forwarding Merchants,

White Water Canal Basin,

CINCINNATI, O.

Attention paid to the Purchase and Sale of Produce.

May 16, 1844.

21 3m.

20,000 LBS. of Iron assorted,

3,000 lbs. Cotton Yarns'

50 Sacks Rio Coffee,

Just receive and for sale by

R. & S. TYNER.

May 9th, 1844. 20 1y

April 2, 1844. 12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44

12-44