



T. MCDONALD, *Editor.*
PLYMOUTH, IND.

Thursday Morning, Sept. 25, 1856.

DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS.

FOR PRESIDENT,

JAMES BUCHANAN,
OF PENNSYLVANIA.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,

JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE,
OF KENTUCKY.

STATE TICKET.

For Governor,

ASHELL P. WILLARD, of White.

For Lieutenant Governor,

ABRAM A. HAMMOND, of Vigo.

For Secretary of State,

DANIEL McCLEURE, of Morgan.

For Auditor of State,

JOHN W. DODD, of Grant.

For Treasurer of State,

AQUILLA JONES, of Bartholomew.

For Attorney General,

JOS. E. McDONALD, of Montgomery.

For Superintendent of Public Instruction,

WILLIAM C. LARABEE, of Putnam.

For Clerk of Supreme Court,

WILLIAM B. BEACH, of Boone.

Reporter of Decisions of Supreme Court,

GORDON TANNER, of Jackson.

FOR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS,

GRAHAM N. FITCH, of Cass.

SAMUEL H. BUSKIRK, of Monroe.

W. F. PARSONS, of Warrick.

S. K. WOOD, of Harrison.

S. W. SHORT, of Lawrence.

D. JONES, of Franklin.

EDMOND JOHNSON, Henry Co.

MARTIN M. RAY, Shelby.

JAS. M. HANNA, Vigo.

J. S. McCLELLAND, Clinton Co.

ORPHEUS EVERTS, Laporte.

F. P. RANDALL, Allen.

S. S. MICKLE, Adams Co.

For Congress—Ninth District,
W. M. Z. STUART, of Cass.

For Procurator,
A. L. JONES, Porter County.

For Senator, HUGH MILLER, Fulton co.

Judge C. P. J. G. OSMOND, Marshall.

Prosecutor, J. HENDERSON, St. Joseph.

Representative, E. BROWN, Stark.

Treasurer—DAVID VINNEDGE.

Sheriff—J. F. VAN VALKENBURGH.

Com. Dist. No. 2—ROBERT PIPER.

“ “ “ 3—W.M. HUGHES.

Surveyor—J. B. N. KLINGER.

Coroner—JACOB KNOBLOCK.

W. J. Moon is authorized to act as agent, receive and collect for subscriptions to the *Democrat*, at Eldora, Iowa.

WILLOUGHBY M. McCLANAHAN, is authorized to receipt for subscriptions to the *Democrat*, at Knox, Stark County, Indiana.

REPUBLICAN SAVIOR—The Union is not worth supporting in connection with the South—*N. Y. Tribune*.

The Constitution is a reproach, and a league with topographical.

Shane's Riles are better than Bibles—*Henry Ward Beecher*.

Let the Union sit—*N. P. Banks*.

THE CRISIS!

Never, within our remembrance, have we seen the Democracy of the nation so thoroughly aroused, as at present. Men who had served their generation, and retired from the busy bustle of political life, and gave place for their sons, have become alarmed at the sectional and fanaticalisms of the day, lest this great confederacy of States should tumble to pieces. Many, whose locks have been bleached by the frosts of many winters, seem to be more interested in handling down our glorious Union to future generations, than those who have come on the political stage long since they did. A large proportion of those ancient worthies are thoroughly waked up to the great importance of lending their influence towards supporting National men and National measures. Whenever a man thinks he is honest and capable, all acknowledge that he is a ripe scholar, that his opportunities for acquitting himself with the various duties which devolve on the Chief Magistrate, far better than Mr. Fremont. We suppose him because he is a sound democrat, and stands square up on the Democratic Platform. We support him because the Union would be safe, were he elected—excellence would subside, confidence would be restored, and sectionalism would be put down. The United States has prospered and increased without a parallel—the Government has been administered by far the greater portion of the time by democrats, and we have gone along swimmingly, so far in our career, because we have always had national men at the head of affairs.

Is it safe? Is it the part of wisdom to risk the hazardous experiment of placing the administration of the best Government on earth, into the hands of a fanatical sectional party, the which number among its members, all the wretched political adventurers of our country? We think not.

We call the attention of the reader to an article in to-day's paper, over the signature of Anti-Know-Nothing. The writer has given a clear and truthful detail of the tendencies of Know-Nothing and sectionalism, and has shown clearly, that Mr. Colfax has placed himself in a very awkward and embarrassing position before the public. The writer who says to them, “taxation without representation” is good enough for you, until you are old enough to die. That man who would reduce every man, (who was not lucky enough to have his parents living in these United States when he was born,) to the level with the Russian serf, or the Spartan Helot. That man, who, though times a great stickler for the doings of '76 and '300, but who now denounces the policy which actuated Adams and others in '300, when the Government of England offered to make it a penal offence for any of her Naval officers to impress our seamen provided we discontinued our practice of *naturalizing her citizens*. That man who would have us a Whig, but when he discovered that he was a Federalist when a boy, and that he advocated the reduction of wages of laboring men to ten cents per day. These state changes have long since been answered, and were there anything else that they could find, in his political history that would injure his election, Mr. Greeley's advice would have been taken. We support Mr. Buchanan, conscientiously believing that we are using our feeble efforts to prolong our existence as a united government. The present is a fearful crisis in our history; never have the disunion party been bold enough to put in nomination a sectional man for the Presidency, until now.

Some of the small fry abolition papers, contrary to the orders and advice of Mr. Greeley, have industriously circulated the report that he was a Federalist when a boy, and that he advocated the reduction of wages of laboring men to ten cents per day. These state changes have long since been answered, and were there anything else that they could find, in his political history that would injure his election, Mr. Greeley's advice would have been taken. We support Mr. Buchanan, conscientiously believing that we are using our feeble efforts to prolong our existence as a united government. The present is a fearful crisis in our history; never have the disunion party been bold enough to put in nomination a sectional man for the Presidency, until now.

Many honest, misguided men are, no

doubt, of the opinion, that it will be for the best interests of the country that Fremont should be elected President, without thinking seriously under what circumstances he was nominated, and what must inevitably be the consequences which will ensue in case of the election of a sectional candidate for President.

When this Union was formed, twelve of the thirteen were slaveholding States—Suppose that the twelve had been as sectional in their views as the abolitionists are, what would have been the consequences? Disunion, as a matter of course.

The convention that nominated Mr. Fremont, was composed of delegates from sixteen States, which makes it appropriate to have but sixteen stars on their flags—We can see no propriety or fitness in the republicans having any more—why should they? They don't expect Fremont to get an electoral vote in any of the slave States, as there was not a delegate at the Philadelphia Convention from there. On the other hand, there was not a Congressional district in the United States but what was represented in the Convention that nominated Mr. Buchanan—hence the fitness of having thirty-one stars on our flags.

In the conventions that nominated Adams, Clay, Harrison, Taylor and Scott, the States were all represented, and the candidates received the vote of their party without any reference to a geographical line—How stands it now? We ask the candid portion of the community which is not excited, to ask themselves the question—are we following the counsel of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Jackson, Clay &c., when we attach ourselves to a sectional party, whose very life and existence depends upon excitement? Is it not a hazardous experiment to promote a man to the highest office in the world, with no further knowledge of the White House, than what he acquired in the brief space of twenty-one days? Were it not that the worst passions of men are excited by the fusion orators, portraying in vivid colors the blasting influence of slavery; and that if they wanted slavery, they should vote for Buchanan; but if they wanted freedom, they should vote for Fremont, there should be comparatively but a few of those sectional men that would be willing to run the risk of sailing in a vessel with an inexperienced pilot at the helm.

We have conversed with men who stoutly maintain the opinion that the democratic party were slavery extensionists, and that to vote for Buchanan was about equivalent to voting slavery into Kansas. Such falsehoods are proclaimed by every fusion speaker, and published in all of their presses. It is certainly a curiosity, how a fusion speaker can have the impudence to stand up unblushingly in an intelligent community, and promulgate what he knows to be false, and also knows that the intelligent portion of the community know better.

The above to be taken together. If our fusion friends are anxious to lose or make some money, they now have the opportunity; we think, however, that they will conclude that betting is a bad practice. For further information inquire at the *Democrat* office.

☞ Our Eldora Agent will please accept thanks for a club of new subscribers

the lame leg was to represent JUDGE STUART's misfortune in having a lame leg, caused by a white swelling or something similar. That is all right we think—JUDGE STUART had no business to have a lame leg; and the flag would not have been painted. Whoever designed the flag and painted it, we think deserves great credit (?) in getting up so similar a resemblance of JUDGE STUART's misfortune. He should have a pension from the fusion party to subsist on the balance of his days, and should wear a medal, so that such wonderful originality might stand out in all its beauty before the gazing world. A righteous retribution awaits you, gentlemen republicans for such heathenish conduct, and the ideas of next October will cover your political graves with the condemnations of an insulted community.

Congressional.

Our republican friends about town are (apparently) very confident that Mr. COLFAX will be elected by a larger majority than he received in 1854, and seem anxious to back up their opinions, could they get the opportunity.

We have always been opposed to guessing or betting on elections, believing that it has a bad influence; and many times lose money that they cannot very well spare; but as some of our republican friends are into that kind of business, we will merely mention that a friend at our elbow authorizes us to make the following proposition:

He will wager \$25 that Mr. COLFAX's majority will not be as large as it was in 1854:

\$25	“	“	“	“	“	“	100
\$25	“	“	“	“	“	200	
\$25	“	“	“	“	“	300	
\$25	“	“	“	“	“	400	
\$25	“	“	“	“	“	500	
\$25	“	“	“	“	“	600	
\$25	“	“	“	“	“	700	
\$25	“	“	“	“	“	800	
\$25	“	“	“	“	“	900	
\$25	“	“	“	“	“	1000	
\$25	“	“	“	“	“	1200	
\$25	“	“	“	“	“	1300	
\$25	“	“	“	“	“	1500	
\$25	“	“	“	“	“	1600	

\$25 that he will not get half as many counties as he did then:

\$25 that he will not get over five counties out of the thirteen in the district:

and

\$25 that he will not be elected.

The above to be taken together. If our fusion friends are anxious to lose or make some money, they now have the opportunity; we think, however, that they will conclude that betting is a bad practice. For further information inquire at the *Democrat* office.

☞ Our Eldora Agent will please accept thanks for a club of new subscribers

For the Democrat.

Mr. ENRICO:—In looking over the columns of the *Plymouth Banner*, of July 31st, I there see the question asked:

“What man, that voted for Schuyler Colfax in 1854, can refuse to vote for him now?”

In short, I will give a few reasons why they cannot.

The dark and damning deeds of Know-Nothingism, have become fully developed; the “modern Jacobins” have been obliged to show their hand, and it is now well known that Schuyler Colfax was a Know-Nothing, as can be seen by referring to the records of the “Supreme Order of the Sons of '76,” at South Bend, his assertions, both in public and private, to the contrary, notwithstanding. I am well aware this was not the cognomen by which they were known among themselves, but it is the name by which they were known abroad. And the man who will resort to such a *low, trickling subterfuge*, in order to be elected, is unfit to make laws for enlightened freemen.

Many, like myself, voted for Schuyler Colfax in 1854, who would then, and now, rather see their right wither than, see it put a bullet in the ballot-box, with the name of a Know-Nothing upon it.

Who I ask, that has been born in sunny France—in musical Italy—chivalrous Germany—brave old Scotia, or republican Hungary, that has an adored parent, respected brother, or beloved son left behind, will so far forget their memory as to vote for Schuyler Colfax?

That man who says to them, “taxation without representation” is good enough for you, until you are old enough to die. That man who would reduce every man, (who was not lucky enough to have his parents living in these United States when he was born,) to the level with the Russian serf, or the Spartan Helot. That man, who, though times a great stickler for the doings of '76 and '300, but who now denounces the policy which actuated Adams and others in '300, when the Government of England offered to make it a penal offence for any of her Naval officers to impress our seamen provided we discontinued our practice of *naturalizing her citizens*.

That man who would have us a Whig, but when he discovered that he was a Federalist when a boy, and that he advocated the reduction of wages of laboring men to ten cents per day. These state changes have long since been answered, and were there anything else that they could find, in his political history that would injure his election, Mr. Greeley's advice would have been taken. We support Mr. Buchanan, conscientiously believing that we are using our feeble efforts to prolong our existence as a united government. The present is a fearful crisis in our history; never have the disunion party been bold enough to put in nomination a sectional man for the Presidency, until now.

We thought and hoped we would not be under the necessity of noticing any more caricatures, flags, or anything in that line, referring to any of our candidates, but the one under consideration, which was carried about on the day JUDGE STUART and Mr. COLFAX spoke there, being so totally void of human feeling and common decency, that we deemed it but justice to give it a passing notice. The one we refer to was the likeness of a buck with three broken legs, and the other lame. The three broken legs were to represent Buchanan as being unable to run the race through and

although they were nearly the first in America to establish religious toleration by law, (which they did in Maryland in 1649,) while at this very period the puritans were persecuting their Protestant brethren in Massachusetts, and the Episcopalians were revoking the same severity on the Puritans of Virginia. There was forming in Maryland, a sanctuary where all might worship, and none might oppress; and where even Protestants sought refuge from Protestant intolerance.

But how was it three years later, when Cromwell came into power, thus giving the Protestants the ascendancy? They proceeded to disfranchise those who differed from them in matters of religion. Catholics were excluded from the assembly which was then called; and an act of the assembly will have the consolation of knowing that they have stood by the Constitution of that government on all occasions, preserving and defending it; and they can calmly wrap themselves in the flag of their country, and go down in the same grave with it, where together, in the same sacred vault will be entombed the history of the American Constitution and its glories, and the history of its defender, the Democratic party.

But we repeat, we have no such fears. The Democratic party has fought the battle of Samothus, and it has fought the battle of Marathon. It is now fighting the last great, decisive battle; it is now heroically and proudly standing in the gate of Thermopylae. We cannot doubt its success in November. Our eyes would close in despair, and our hearts would cease to beat with hope, if we could for a moment doubt it.

But how was it three years later, when Cromwell came into power, thus giving the Protestants the ascendancy? They proceeded to disfranchise those who differed from them in matters of religion. Catholics were excluded from the assembly which was then called; and an act of the assembly will have the consolation of knowing that they have stood by the Constitution of that government on all occasions, preserving and defending it; and they can calmly wrap themselves in the flag of their country, and go down in the same grave with it, where together, in the same sacred vault will be entombed the history of the American Constitution and its glories, and the history of its defender,