

WALTER ARMSTRONG.

In another part of our paper to-day, will be found a communication from *Walter Armstrong*, the deceased candidate for Senator in this county, which we publish at his request. We suppose it is intended for the "explanations" which he promised the people of Dearborn, through the *Palladium* of the 9th inst. But instead of explaining the manner in which he was so shamefully beaten at the late election, he has dealt out to us a large portion of that vile calumny, bilgegate and slang, with which, it is well known, he has been surcharged from the day of his birth up to the present time.

We are well aware that we can add nothing to our reputation in a personal conflict with such a man as *Armstrong*—an individual who can lay no claim to either moral or political integrity, and who has made it his business to *bully* his way through life; but still we shall not shrink from our duty—we will meet him and expose him still further.

In the commencement of his article he says we have made a furious, unprovoked, pitiful, and cowardly attack upon him. No man but one writhing and groaning under the agonies of a most shameful defeat, would make such a charge as this. We made no attack upon him, and we indignantly throw back the charge in his teeth. We saw a paragraph in the *Palladium*, saying in substance that *Armstrong* would *explain* the manner in which he was defeated. We considered any attempt at explanations, (after the manner in which *Armstrong* had electioneered through the country,) as insulting to the People, and we exposed it. *Armstrong* saw our remarks, and his guilty conscience rebuked him for his meanness, and he gave vent to his feelings in an abusive and malignant attack upon us, without attempting to explain why and wherefore he was beaten.

He says the election was not conducted fairly, and charges us with basely stating what we knew to be false. We have asserted before, and we repeat it now, that the election was conducted fairly and honorably on our part, and we now most positively deny having made a single false statement. We can triumphantly appeal to the people of Dearborn to sustain our assertion. It was our duty as the Editor of a public journal, to expose the disgraceful falsehoods and tales which *Armstrong* circulated, in order to secure his election, and because we fearlessly and independently published the whole truth, he has charged us with stating what we knew to be false. Yes, we published the truth in relation to *Armstrong*, and if, in so doing, we aided in his defeat, all that we have to say is, that we still glory in it.

We, too, are pleased to believe that the people are made of sterling, unbending stuff, open to the convictions of truth and reason, and ever ready to render justice unto such mean and contemptible men as *Walter Armstrong*. He would now no doubt like to flatter the people, and draw forth their sympathy—but it is useless, for in this country he is down, down, "like Lucifer, never more to rise."

In relation to our assertion that *Mr. Plumer* was pledged to go for the removal of the County Seat, we have to say that we had and still have sufficient authority for making that statement. He wants us to satisfy the public on the subject. The public are already satisfied, doubly satisfied; and we ask *Armstrong* to point out to us a single man who voted for *Mr. Plumer*, that now regrets having done so; and for every one so pointed out, we will find ten who voted for *Walter Armstrong*, that now despise him, and will never vote for him again. His hypocritical actions on the day of the election have sealed his fate forever in this county. We know nothing of any statements *Mr. Plumer* may have made in the upper part of the county; it is the first we have heard on the subject, and if false, we have no doubt *Mr. P.* will deny it promptly. For our own part, we believe *Armstrong* has fabricated this story himself. He ought, however, to know that if he circulated falsehoods himself, it does not follow as a matter of course that every other candidate done the same.

He says the late senatorial election was conducted on different principles from any other that preceded it; but had he been elected then it would have been all right. His experience and his qualifications, he says, were thrown aside, and the question narrowed down to residence in a particular spot, and political belief. And does this, we ask, change the nature of the late election from all former ones? We think not. *Armstrong* knows very well, and every citizen of the county knows, that he never was elected to office on his own merits in his life. He, like many another men without talents, character, or claims, has rode into office in times of high political excitement, when the question was, "Does he belong to our party?" But that party which has heretofore sustained and promoted him, are now done with him—he has turned traitor, and they are pleased to find that they are at length rid of a very troublesome hanger on.

We are ready to confess that we made a mistake in relation to *Mr. Plumer*'s majority in Lawrenceburg township—instead of 146 votes, it is but 46. We made the error in subtracting, as may easily be seen; yet *Armstrong* seizes upon it as proof that we published falsehoods prior to the election. He thinks that he was not the favorite of the Lawrenceburgers; and in fact, if we judge by the votes given, he was not much of a favorite any place in the whole county.

*Armstrong* says that his "course during the whole canvass was open and honorable." We hardly believe he can find ten men in this county who will back him in that assertion. Honorable indeed! If he acted honorable, then we mistake the meaning of the English language. He says he made no bargains, mounted no hobby-horse. But he did try to rouse party spirit, and get up an excitement, for he well knew that *that* was his only hope. He also says that he had no supple tool to write and publish lies at his bidding; and 'tis no wonder. He kept us pretty busy telling the *truth* about him—we had no time to publish *lies*; and indeed it would have kept any man busy to have printed all his *lies*.

He points us to former elections, when he was favored with the confidence of the people of this county. This was when he was supported on party grounds. He says he has never been beaten when the question was asked—"is he honest, is he capable?" Now this is truly ridiculous, for he well knows that it was decided at the late election, in language which he cannot misunderstand, that he was neither *honest* nor *capable*.

He calls us creatures, managers, wire-workers, and strangers, and insinuates that we have not the control of our own paper. He may call us any thing he pleases; for he is too well known to do us the least injury; he is known to be destitute of all claims to the title of gentleman—and we view him as the very essence of all meanness. Yes, even such as *WALTER ARMSTRONG*, and as such he stands condemned at the bar of an intelligent and high minded People.

We are at a loss to know what he means by his allusion to the company we keep. We associate indiscriminately with the citizens of our village, "without distinction of party;" and we are proud to say that we can associate with men whom *Armstrong* dare not approach, even on terms of common sociability. We too, can point to the records of all courts of justice in the Universe, and say that our characters are unsullied and unpolluted by a violation of the laws of our country. Can *Walter Armstrong* do the same?

We are now done with his communication, but are not yet done with *Walter Armstrong*. He has charged us with "basely stating what we know to be false," and in order to let the people see that we did not publish all we knew, we now make the following specific charges against him, and we hope he will not *blink* the subject, but come out openly and vindicate himself. "Nothing short of this will satisfy the public."

1st. We ask him to deny having said that all the *devils in hell* could not prevent him from being elected.

2d. We ask him to deny having said that the *PEOPLE* could be bought and sold like cattle in the market, for thirty pieces of silver.

3d. We ask him to deny having endeavored to get up a party excitement, and of saying in a letter to a political friend, "Oh do sustain your Jackson elector."

4th. We ask him to deny having voted for *Noah Noble* for Governor.

5th. We ask him to deny having said on the evening of the election that he did not know what had got into the *Jacksonians*, and that they were a set of *d—d fools* for voting for *Noah Noble*.

Now we not only ask *Walter Armstrong* to deny these charges, but we even *DARE* him to do it. We hope in will give us an opportunity to wipe out the foul stigma which he has endeavored to cast upon us. He will, always find us willing to "stoop" low enough to expose falsehood when we detect it, and hold the author up as an object for "Scorn to point her slow, unerring finger at."

From the *Rising Sun Times*.

MESSRS. EDITORS—Permit me to say that I have no knowledge of making use of that uncouth statement, that "you had reported a *falsehood* in respect to my being a *pledged candidate*," as asserted by *Walter Armstrong*, in his communication published in your last paper. The phrase "*false*," I do not own; but you, gentlemen, will allow me, in justice to the *Wilmington Committee*, who called on me to know if I would accept their nomination for State Senator, to say to you and to the world, that no pledge was asked of me, and none was given; and for the truth of this I refer to *Capt. Stephen Wood* and *Mr. Thos. K. Cole*, of *Wilmington*. I presume, Sirs, you would think no better of me, if it were the case.

I think, however, that I am all that you could wish me to be in respect to the *County Seat* question; for let my private views be what they may, I now consider myself the servant of the People; and so far as I am competent, shall obey their will and prosecute the wishes of the People in all things, and with pleasure;—and I do intend to convince the people in the lower and upper ends of the country, that the confidence reposed in me shall not knowingly be betrayed. I shall have but one object in view, and that will be to do right; and if in this I shall fail, it will be for the want of ability, and not integrity.

Very respectfully yours,  
DANIEL PLUMER.

Manchester, Sept. 2, 1834.

OUR SENATOR.

We publish to-day a communication from *Mr. Daniel Plumer*, our Senator elect, in which he denies having made use of the language imputed to him by *Walter Armstrong*. We were decidedly of opinion that this would be the case, for although we did not know *Mr. Plumer* personally, yet we had heard enough about him to believe that he was not the man whom his vanquished opponent has represented him to be.

*Mr. Plumer* also very candidly states that the gentlemen who waited upon him to ascertain if he would accept a nomination, did not ask any *pledge*, and none was given. This fact speaks largely in *Mr. Plumer's* favor, for it would seem that these gentlemen reposed sufficient confidence in his integrity, without asking him to make a *direct pledge*. By a reference to our file, we discover that we have never yet said that *Mr. Plumer* alone was "pledged" to go for the removal of the County Seat. In our paper of July 25, we said, in reference to the County meeting *Ticket*, that it was "pledged to support the removal of the County Seat;" and now, we have. We considered the acceptance of the nomination a sufficient "pledge" that the County meeting *Ticket* would represent the majority of the people of this county, if elected. The candidates were not asked by the Committee who nominated them, to give a mortgage on their honor and integrity, nor were they purchased for a few pieces of silver—it was sufficient for the Committee to know that they were all upright and honorable men.

Rising Sun Times.

THE RISING SUN TIMES—AGAIN.

MESSRS. EDITORS of the *Palladium*:

As I anticipated, the managers of the *Rising Sun Times* are out on me again in their paper of the 30th ult., and 6th instant, in full yell of liar, dastard, and all the common place epithets of pot-house bullies. The worst language they are masters of, is brought in requisition and directed at me, with the skill and proficiency of regular graduates of the *Five Points*, New York, or the *Swamp*, Louisville. I am conscious that in noticing them and their productions, I am descending from the level every decent man ought to hold in society. But when it is considered that their paper may be circulated where they are not known, I hope to be pardoned for this seeming breach of propriety. Sometimes we are under the necessity of stepping aside to chastise a puppy, tho' by the act we may dirty our fingers and do little to cure his snarl, yelping propensities. With these preliminary remarks, I shall proceed to make a few comments on some late productions in the *Times*.

The late attack, as well as the former one, already noticed, is excused by the managers of the *Times*, on the ground that I had appeared in the papers to *explain* the manner of my defeat. Now there is no ground for this assertion; and I repeat, what I before, in substance, said, that my name, nor an allusion to me, is not to be found in the article, under which they wish to hide themselves from the charge of attacking me without cause.

With as much propriety might they have assailed every person who voted for me. But admitting that I had appeared in the papers, and stated that at a convenient time I would make some explanations and statements in reference to the late election, would that have warranted the *Times* in assailing me in the base, ungentlemanly manner they have done! I submit it to the candid and honest of all parties, whether it would not have been more liberal, more just, and more becoming the high character of conductors of a public press, to have waited until I had made the explanations or statements, and then, having some data to work upon, they might understandingly have filed their exceptions, and made such comments as they may have thought proper under the circumstances. I do not know what the public may think of it, but it seems to me that a man under our laws, must really commit some crime, before he

can justly be punished; and not on bare suspicion of intention, catch him up and deal with him as a guilty offender. The *Times* managers suspected, (they could no more from the evidence,) that *Walter Armstrong* was writing some *explanations*, in reference to the election, and in the eagerness of fiendish passion, they put him on trial before the bar of public opinion, on a charge of committing the deed! Shame! shame! where is thy blush, that thou dost not mantle in crimson the blanched visage of the craven who dares to deal so unjustly!

The managers of the *Times* repeat that the election was conducted as upon former occasions—speak in high terms of their course—reassert that *Mr. Plumer* was *pledged*, and that they have authority for it. I think it was pretty plainly shown, in my former communication, that the late election was not conducted as formerly. That sectional and political considerations had an influence, that controlled and determined the result. In the same communication I charged the managers of the *Times*, of falsely representing *Mr. Plumer* as *pledged* to go for a removal of the seat of justice, and in this way induced the people in the lower part of the county to vote for him; when, at the same time, *Mr. P.* was assuring the people in the upper townships that he had given no such *pledge*; and that the statements in the *Times* to that effect, were "false and unauthorized by him". This charge I need take no trouble to prove, because it is fully sustained by *Mr. Plumer* himself, in his published statement, though in very gentle terms, to be sure. Indeed, it was not to be expected, that after the managers had played into his hand so well, he would blunt tell them, in their own paper, they *lied*. He, however, does as much when he denies the *pledge*. *Mr. Plumer* salves the thing over a little by stating he thinks it did not use so harsh a term, as "false," as stated by me. In reference to this matter, I can only repeat my belief in the truth of my former statement, corroborated by two respectable gentlemen of *Manchester*, (as will be seen in the certificate appended,) who I believe fully sustain me.

It would therefore appear that the *Times* had no authority, for the statement of a *pledge*, on the part of *Mr. P.*, and herein I ask the public to determine, whether they are not guilty of publishing that which had no foundation in truth, with the view to influence the election. But to show more clearly, if need be, that the managers have so acted, I beg you to republish the three first paragraphs of their remarks on *Mr. Plumer's* letter. The way they endeavor to *crawl* out from a *lie* there, is "a sin to Cockeyt." After beating about at all points of the compass, and using arguments that would disgrace the most unprincipled pettifogger in the country, they come to the conclusion that if *Mr. Plumer* be not pledged, he will do right, and obey the will of the majority. This is the sum and substance of the *pledge*, as at last defined. "The mountain labored and brought forth a mouse," is certainly an apt similitude in this case. Before the election the managers of the *Times* bellowed and blared about *pledges*. No one, according to *their* standard, should be run as a candidate, on *their* ticket, unless he took a kind of oath to oppose *Lawrenceburg*. He must swear it was "surrounded by swamps"—half the season under water—and altogether a *little* the worst place between *Maine* and *Florida*. A simple *pledge* to do the will of the majority, was then evasive—would not answer, and so plainly stated in the *Times*, when speaking of *Mr. Dowden* and others. But mark the change. Now, the election is over, it is all sufficient in the view of the *Times*, that *Mr. Plumer* obeys the will of the majority—a *pledge*, if it can be called one, every one knows, was plainly given in my published address to the voters of the county before the election.

The managers of the *Times* allege that I was never elected to office, except in high party times. They know, or should know, is a falsehood of the first water, unclouded by any qualifying circumstance. I was a candidate for the legislature in 1829, and elected, in conjunction with *Messrs. Bassett, Pollock and Gunion*. *Messrs. Pepper and St. Clair*, prominent *Jackson* men, were candidates at the same time, and defeated. In the following year, 1830, I was again a candidate for the same station, and re-elected by a majority of all the votes given. This year, as well as in 1829, two from each party, composed the delegation; so that it is very plain that partisanship did not control, or influence either election. In 1831, when the parties were arrayed, and each had its ticket, I was not a candidate; nor have I been since before the people, until this year. The charge then, that I owe whatever political honors I have been favored with in *Dearborn* county, to high party excitement, falls to the ground. But to show further the unfitness of the charge, I would name that I was appointed county treasurer, in 1831, by the then board of supervisors, a majority of which was opposed to me in politics; and have held that office, by re-appointment, every year since. If I was, or am, the bad man, the partisan, the unprincipled creature, the *Times* would have the people believe, it is strange, passing strange, they would so often favor me with their votes; or that the board of county commissioners, composed of political opponents should have surrendered to my keeping the public funds of the county. No, ye supple tools of the *Times*—ye slanders of private character—ye traitors of insidious innocence—the poisonous malignancy of your nature, like the hated snake, has blinded your eyes, else you would see that *Walter Armstrong* stands on too firm a footing to be affected by your puny missiles. He has lived too long in the county—is too well acquainted with those around him—been too often honored with their suffrages, to be politically prostrated by a few adventurous strollers after fortune—fugitives from character, per chance from justice—whose chicaness gives evidence of a claim to the appellation of *freemen*. True it is *Walter Armstrong* has been a candidate, and defeated—by what means is well understood. But is this a crime? He hopes it does not attain a man, to lose an election, otherwise he must communicate the hapless lot of many of his respected fellow citizens. The hon. gentleman who now holds the seat of senator of this county, by election, was on sundry occasions a candidate and defeated; yet it was never alleged that he, in consequence, was a rogue, a liar, or a bad man. I do not allude to these things, out of any ill feeling, but simply to show what miserable expedients have been resorted to by the managers of the *Times*, to make up any thing like a tolerable argument against me.

The managers prate and make a flourish about their characters, as if it was a matter of consequence to the public to know they have exceedingly fine, transparent ones—unfilled "by a violation of the laws of our country." Now, I do not pretend to compare characters with the *gentlemen* of the *Times*—I vie not for such *distinction*. Mine has been long formed, and like many old things, may be a little out of fashion—a little too precise to suit modern notions; while theirs, being *newly* acquired, (having left their old *one behind as a patrimony* to their friends, perchance a *widow*—) are no doubt cut and modelled in the latest style, to suit the *turn* of the *Times*. The "records of the courts of justice" contain nothing of which I am ashamed. During my long residence here, it has sometimes (very seldom) been my misfortune to come in contact with bad men, and be compelled, in self defense, to resort to "studly argument." The court records in two or three instances, perhaps, in 23 or 30 years, show charges against me of this nature; and even now, the fear of adding another to the list, would not present any very serious barrier to my administering a little wholesome correction to certain *gentlemen* in "buckram," should they come in my way.

The managers of the *Times* put a number of interrogatories to me, and *have* a denial of them. Were I to put myself on my *dignity*, as they have done, I would shun them off, with scarce a notice. But I will not shrink nor *blink* a fair reply to all of them. To the 1st, 2d and 5th, I oppose an unqualified deni-

al. In the heat of the moment, vexed with the ungenerous conduct of those who should have been my friends, I may, and probably did, make use of some harsh expressions, in reference to certain individuals; but I am certain I never did, in terms, assume the confident tone alleged to me in the 1st, nor express the sentiment attributed to me in the 2d question. The 5th is too bare-faced a story, to require a single remark. The 3d, may be true in part; that is, I may have written a *private* letter to a political friend, exposing the underhand means resorted to by my political opponents to defeat me, as a friend of the administration.—I may have added too, that the circumstance of my having been an elector, was used to my prejudice, and asked my friends to stand by me; but am positive I never used the words, as quoted. And if the managers will do me the favor to re-examine the letter, filed or procured from its possessor, in defiance of every honorable principle, they will discover that they have again "made an error in subtracting." The 4th charge or question I admit as true. I never pretended to hide or disguise my vote for governor. I took no lot nor part in that election. I felt it my duty, for various reasons, to cast my vote for the present incumbent; for that I am not aware that I am chargeable with any offence, nor bound to make apologies. The manner in which the *Times* managers came possessed of my vote, might possibly, if examined into, be some.

As connected with the recent senatorial election, I would remark, in conclusion, that I had no long chain of connection in the county; nor did I call on the Methodist brethren to support me, either in the north or south parts of the county. But I had friends who knew me long and well, and when I shall ever shrink personally or officially from the strictest scrutiny, in either capacity, then let me cease to have them—I shall not deserve any. I have too much confidence in the good sense of my fellow citizens in Dearborn county, to suppose for a moment that they will give credence to the base slanders of the *Times*; and were the circulation of that paper limited to the county alone, I would not even have noticed them.

I am now done with the *Times*, and for ever. No bullying, slandering, or dark inuendoes shall ever induce me to raise my pen again to combat or