



## GAZETTE.

SATURDAY, JULY 13, 1833.

Another anniversary of American Independence has been numbered, and the acclamations of a still united people have hailed it with joy and gladness of heart. The awful and portentous storm which at one time during the year that has elapsed, threatened destruction to our happy union and to deluge the country in the blood of friends and brethren, has passed over; and although in the proceedings and toasts given in this village on the 4th inst. we can see the track of nullification, and hear the faint and distant mutterings of the once dreaded storm, we feel assured that the heresy is dead, the epidemic ceased, and can look forward to a long succession of years to come of peace and union.

We have ever subscribed to the doctrine that "error might be tolerated" when reason was left free to combat it; we have, therefore, unhesitatingly inserted in our paper of this day, the entire proceedings of the 4th inst. as furnished to us. Notwithstanding that, the tendency of some of the sentiments that day given by some of our most respectable citizens, are entirely at variance with our own feelings and judgment. Nineteen-twentieths of the people of the west, we honestly believe, abhor the doctrine advanced by S. Carolina. They look to the effect, and they see it in strife, in civil war, in slavery, in the prostration of our republic, to which the friends of liberty throughout the world point, as an illustration of the doctrine they advance, that the people can govern themselves. They care not for the fine spun theories and abstract principles of political mountebanks, who in the advancement of their doctrines, consult their own interests and ambition, self and not country. In short, they look upon nullification as a monster of such hideous mien, that to be hated, needs but to be seen.

MR. CARNAN:

The Oration delivered by you on the 4th inst. being highly approved of by the citizens generally, we would respectfully request you to furnish us a copy for publication. Yours, with respect,

A. BADOLLET,  
S. WISE,  
T. J. CARSON,  
GEO. HARPER.

July 5th, 1833.

Messrs. BADOLLET, WISE, & Co.

Gentlemen—In answer to your note of to-day, I would say, that although I do not feel myself at liberty to deny your request, yet, I am confident, I am indebted, for the flattering manner in which you mention my effort, to your kind partiality, rather than to any intrinsic merit of its own. Having but but a very short time to prepare it, I hope the public will look with an indulgent eye on its many imperfections. I herewith send you a copy of my Oration.

Yours, respectfully,

R. N. CARNAN

July 5th, 1833.

### ORATION.

FELLOW CITIZENS:

We have assembled again to commemorate the anniversary of our national independence—to celebrate that day on which our fathers shook from their arms the shackles of a foreign yoke, and proclaimed to the world that they were a free and independent people. It was a custom among the Romans of celebrating all great national events by offerings to the gods. It was a good custom, which has in a measure obtained in this country, inasmuch as it not only inspired a sense of dependence upon an overruling Providence, but served to keep alive that spirit of liberty, which gave birth to their free institutions. It is meet then that on this day, we should come up to the temple of liberty and offer our thanks for the past, and renew our vows for the future. It is surely a joyous spectacle to see twelve millions of freemen engaging in celebrating the birth day of their liberties. When God said let there be light, and there was light, it was a jubilee to the natural world. Old ocean felt back to her bed, mountains raised their heads, order and beauty sprang from chaotic confusion, and the whole face of nature was kindled with joy. When our fathers proclaimed to the world, that all men were born free and equal, it was a jubilee to oppressed man. Man put off the trappings of the slave, and came forth in all the dignity of his nature—tyrants trembled on their thrones—the fire was kindled on the altar of liberty, and our own republic, like the fabled isle of Delos, emerged from the troubled ocean of discord and civil strife, to take her place among the nations of the earth. But it may be asked, have we cause for rejoicing? What is the na-

ture of this change? Man is too prone to enjoy the good things placed before him without examining their nature or composition. Like the Athenians, he worships the unknown God without endeavoring to inform himself of his nature. He chants the watchwords of party, as some good Christians do their Te Deums, without knowing the import of the words they use. It is true, we are no longer an appendage to a foreign state—we no longer bow to the British lion, but are an independent nation, and have our Eagle. It is true, we have a widely extended country, "terra potens armis atque ubere glebae," beautifully diversified with hill and dale, and admirably adapted to the growth of every thing which can confer wealth and happiness. But the question is, what is the nature of our government? What are the rights secured to us? To throw some light on this subject, I will attempt to give a short history of the parties that have prevailed in our country and the principles for which they contended.

Government is the ship upon which we have embarked. The constitution and laws are the compass and chart by which we direct our course. Coming into existence as we have, when this vessel is under full sail, born as it were, on the high seas of the political world, we do not take time to examine the peculiar mechanism of her construction, but are busily intent in trimming her sails to catch every prosperous breeze to bear her forward, bounding o'er the waves of time, to that destination of all earthly things, that ultimate Thule of material existence, death, dissolution. If we will make this examination, we shall find that we have a government happily adapted to a free people, and admirably calculated to preserve us in the enjoyment of all the liberty consistent with our welfare and prosperity, wherein the full sway of the sovereign will of the people is only limited by the authorized operation of the immutable principles of justice, and wherein our natural liberty once diffused and spread out, is brought to a channel whose course is plainly defined, and whose banks are safely dyked and secured against future inundations. Man in a state of nature knew no law but his own will, no rule of action but his own caprice. He was like the untamed Eagle that looks abroad on the blue expanse before him, and feeling unfettered and unbound, stoops at every object of prey that crosses his vision. As a social being, he is the trained falcon that makes his quarry, but comes and goes at the sound of the shrill call—whose natural propensities are restrained by certain checks and laws. He has relinquished a part of his natural liberty for the benefits of society. How much, or what part depends upon the tenor of the compact, the bond of union—and this bond is the constitution. Our constitution is not the charter of our rights, it is the barrier against the encroachments of power. It is not like the magna charta of England, the grant of certain rights and privileges from an absolute monarch, to slavish but grumbling subjects, but the declaration of an absolute and sovereign people of what part of their natural liberty they will relinquish for the benefits of society, and what part of their sovereign power they will deposit in the hands of their ministerial agents for the purposes of government.

Our ship of state was launched in 1775. Scarcely had she reached her destined element, when the black cloud of war, which had been threatening so long, broke in all its fury upon her. Thanks to the skill and prudence of her commander, although loosely put together, badly provisioned and miserably equipped, she weathered the storm in safety. Yes!—When the storm was at the highest, when the enemy was pressing her the closest, and ruin stared her in the face, the well known voice of her commander was heard above the din of arms and roar of elements, exhorting his men to the contest, shouting the battle cry of freedom, liberty and independence, forever, down with our oppressors; and sirs, they did fall; for when all was hushed, and the battle's roar had ceased, and the cloud of smoke had passed away, our own gallant ship was seen proudly riding the waves unscathed, uninjured, with the star-spangled banner flying at her mast's head, and such will always be the result while it floats there, for with freedom's soil beneath our feet, and freedom's banner o'er our heads, our march must always be onwards, onwards, to victory and to glory. From the close of the revolution to 1787, nothing of moment occurred. Although there was disaffection in some parts of our country, there was not what may be properly called parties, fairly organized and contending for different principles. This disaffection, but more especially the vetoing of the impost bill by the state of New York, awakened the country to the crazy condition of our ship, and to the necessity of overhauling and re-modelling her. In May, '87, a convention met for that purpose, and on the September following, the present constitution was offered to the different states for their adoption. To this event we may date the origin of those two great parties, which for many years after, shook our government to the centre. The question then was, the adoption or rejection of this constitution? and there were strong parties in different states opposed to it. It is true, that there had always been under the old confederacy, a struggle between the congressional and state authorities, which resulted in the abasement of the former, but the pressure of danger from abroad prevented that asperity of feeling that was afterwards exhibited. The election of Gen. Washington in 1789, from his great popularity, it was thought, would put an end to all party bickering, and for the first year of his administration,

this hope seemed to be realized—things went on quietly and smoothly.—But partyism was not destroyed, the fire was smothered but not extinguished; it was the calm that preceded the storm, for in 1790, when it was proposed to lay an impost on domestic distilled spirits, for the purpose of relieving the country from the immense debt which hung like an incubus on its prosperity, it was immediately made the rallying point of party. It was denounced an excise—a tax particularly odious to the people; and its bitter denunciation and violent opposition, promoted and encouraged those insurrectionary movements, which were afterwards seen in western Pennsylvania, a section of country that had violently opposed the adoption of the present constitution. The project for the establishment of a national bank which was laid before congress the same year, widened the breach between the parties by drawing into the controversy the most distinguished men of the country. It was upon this question, that that difference in the construction of our constitution was first taken, which continues to divide the country to the present day.—Although the bill passed congress, the cabinet were divided upon it. The Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, was decidedly of the opinion, that congress had transcended its constitutional powers, while Alexander Hamilton, secretary of the Treasury, thought differently. The former contended for a strict construction of the constitution, the latter for a liberal one. The former urged that the foundation of that instrument was laid on this principle, "that all powers not delegated to the U. States by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states, or to the people;" that the constitution empowers congress to make all laws necessary for carrying into execution the powers delegated to the general government—that a bank was not necessary—that the opposite party only pretended that it was a convenience—that the doctrine of convenience may be tortured to apply to any thing, and that such a construction would break down all limitations in the constitution, and convert the federal into a consolidated government. The latter contended, "that every power vested in a government, is in its nature sovereign, and includes by force of the term, a right to employ all the means requisite and fairly applicable to the attainment of the ends of such power, which are not precluded by the constitution, not immoral, and are not contrary to the essential ends of society—that the bank was a mean fairly applicable to the attainment of the ends of some of the powers vested in the general government, such as collecting taxes, borrowing money and regulating trade.—These two great men equally attached to their country and to liberty, from differing in their views of government, became bitter enemies. Their difference of opinion, it has been said, may in a great measure be attributed to circumstances." Alexander Hamilton, a name that every American should be proud of—a name that will fill a bright place in the annals of our country, received from nature a mind of the highest order. He possessed in an eminent degree the talent, the most useful of all talents, the talent for business. No man contributed so much towards relieving our country from the creditless and almost bankrupt condition, which the close of the revolution found her in, and towards restoring our miserably debased currency to a sound state, as Alexander Hamilton did. What Themistocles vauntingly said of himself, Mr. Hamilton's biographer may with great truth say of him; that he possessed the talent of making a small town a populous city. This gentleman in early life entered the army, where seeing and feeling the impotency of the old confederacy, and where seeing and feeling the embarrassment in which the government was continually involved by the jealousy of the states, came to the conclusion, that if our liberties had to apprehend danger from any quarter, it was from the states, and therefore was in favor of a strong government—of giving the general government all the power requisite to carry into execution its own measures. Thomas Jefferson, who has been esteemed in this country, as the orthodox expounder of political science, after having taken a conspicuous part in our revolution, was sent in 1784 to France on a diplomatic mission. Being there just before that revolution broke out, which drenched France in blood and astonished the world, and seeing the corruption and abuses of the court and ruling powers, came to the conclusion that our liberties had more to dread from the abuse of power by the executive than any thing else, and therefore was in favor of a rigid construction of those powers delegated to the general government. These two gentlemen were the leaders of the two parties and although members of the cabinet, there was no measure of the administration, which was not assailed by the one or the other. Such were the violence of their hostility, and the bitterness of their animosity, that the efforts of the executive were paralyzed, and the wheels of government almost stopped. The President felt himself constrained to remonstrate, but he remonstrated to no purpose. What contributed to increase the excitement, was a contrariety of sentiment respecting our commercial regulations.—The Secretary of State was for making discriminations in favor of nations having commercial treaties with us. The Secretary of the Treasury advocated strict equality. The celebrated resolutions of Mr. Madison of the year following, by which it was proposed to raise the duties on the manufactures and tonnage of some

\*Marshall's life of Washington.

foreign nations, and to reduce them on those of others, had this object in view, viz: discrimination. Then came the French fever, as it is called. The peculiar situation of France at this time was calculated to create the deepest interest in this country, and to awaken all our sympathies in her behalf. She had been our friend in time of difficulty. She was now herself struggling for liberty—striving to throw off the yoke of despotism, which had been galling her for ages; and when in 1793 England declared war against her for asserting and maintaining her liberal principles, such was the ardor and enthusiasm with which we exposed her cause, that it required all the influence and authority of the executive to preserve neutrality on our parts. France had unfurled the banner of freedom, and having just shaken off the bonds of slavery ourselves, were willing to rally round her standard, wherever it might be erected. The first democratic society was formed at Philadelphia in May, '93, soon after the arrival of the French minister, Mr. Genet; and branches were soon established in every part of the Union. The avowed object of these societies was "the circulation of useful knowledge, and the liberal communication of free principles," but their real object was to aid the views of France by keeping up the French excitement. By uniting the elements of disaffection, and by warmly espousing the cause of France, they gave the opposition the ascendancy in congress. Party warfare began now to be carried on with unparadonable acrimony and unparalleled ferocity. The Indian war was reprobated. The President was charged with continuing it longer than necessary, for the purpose of raising a standing army to establish a monarchy; the navigation of Mississippi also produced great excitement in the west, and the opposition even went so far as to attempt to impeach the President for peculating from the Treasury.

The election of John Adams, in '97, placed him at the head of the federal party, which so far from throwing oil on the troubled waters—from appeasing the storm, seemed to impart to it fresh violence and fury. His principles were assailed, and his measures passing through the crucible of partyism, were held up to the country as glaring evidences of aristocratical opinions, and of his disposition to establish a monarchy modelled after that of England. The charge of aristocracy seemed to have some color; for, in several political tracts published by him, he advocated the necessity of a balance of power in our government for the preservation of our liberties. From which was inferred, that he was in favor of distinct orders in society. His alien and sedition laws increased the excitement. Virginia and Kentucky, took a bold stand against them, in their famous resolutions, of '98. In which the one, Virginia held, that where the general government transcends her powers and passes an oppressive and unconstitutional law, that a state rather than to submit to such oppressive and unconstitutional law, has a right to secede, and the other, Kentucky declared, that she had a right, under such circumstances to nullify such law. To such a height did party spirit run, that it seemed as if the whole country was reeling under the intoxication of party excitement. This gentleman in 1801, saw himself defeated, heard his "nunc dimittis" sung, but he had the satisfaction of living to see many of the important measures recommended by him, adopted by his political opponents, and no one at this day doubts that John Adams was an honest man and a patriot. The election of Thomas Jefferson brought the democratic party into power. The federal party then became the opposition, and shew as much rancor, intemperance, and unreasonableness, in their assaults upon the administration as ever were displayed by their opponents. When England had, under pretence of searching our vessels for contraband goods, impressed our seamen, insulted our flag, trampled upon the laws of nations, and in fact play the tyrant as she always does, when she has the power.—When by her ever-changing orders of council, our merchants were imposed on, our commerce rendered precarious, and our feelings as a nation trifled with; when after all this, the executive recommended the non intercourse and embargo acts as the mildest remedies; the opposition were for war. War, war, they cried! Shall we be insulted said they with impunity? Shall our rights be trampled upon without resistance? No! it must not be. The administration is imbecile, cowardly, and wants energy. War, came, and these gentlemen were its violent opposers. Mr. Jefferson retired from the Presidential chair the most popular man in the country. It is true, he lived to see the fallacy of many of his opinions. Ardently attached to free institutions, if he erred in any thing, it was in being too abstract—in mingling too much philosophy with his politics. He had drunk deeply of French philosophy. The illuminati of France had made a set against the christian religion. What they could not accomplish directly, they effected by intrigue and management. They aimed to control public opinion. To do this, they possessed themselves of all the avenues to literary fame, they paid court to the capitalists, they threw themselves into the ranks of the popular party, and of course became politicians as well as philosophers; not practical but theoretical politicians. It is no wonder then that Mr. Jefferson who had associated with these men and who read their writings a great deal should have shown in some degree this trait of mind. The western country is under peculiar obligations to him. The

purchase of the state of Louisiana, by which an outlet was opened to our surplus produce, should always obtain for his name a place in our memory—his name will be honored. Yes, although the stately column has been prostrated by the ever heating waves of time—although the voice of a sentinel is no longer heard upon the walls, his memory will ever be cherished by all who are capable of appreciating talents and patriotism, and he will always be looked upon as one of the brightest luminaries that ever gilded our political horizon.

Mr. Madison, stood at the helm of state, during one of the most tempestuous periods of our voyage since the revolution. The question then that divided the country, was the war. The democratic party supported it. The federal opposed it. Never did party spirit run so high before in this country. It seemed as if the element of discord had been let loose among us—as if men were willing to sacrifice every thing for party. England, it is probable, would not have treated us as she did, if we had not been divided at home. But in spite of all unfavorable circumstances, we taught her that she could not insult us with impunity—that she was not the sole mistress of the seas, and that freemen fighting for their soil, their firesides, their wives, their children, and their liberties are invincible—that they may be exterminated, but not subjected. After the termination of the war, the spirit of party began to subside and we turn with joy, with unfeigned joy, from the stormy, boisterous times, which have just past in review before us, to the sunny days that succeeded. Indeed the administration of Mr. Monroe, seems to have been the golden age of our republic. When the lion and the lamb lied down together—when party distinctions and party differences were buried—when democrat and federal associated and vote together—when these two great streams, which had been dashing forward in their furious courses, foaming, raging, and chafing their banks, met at this point to mingle their waters together in friendship and love, and to form one great national stream, the Republican. It is true, there was a division of sentiment on the Bills for chartering the present Bank of the United States, and for the adjustment of the tariff. A part of the old democratic party contending for a rigid construction of the constitution and the consequent unconstitutionality of these measures. But the show of opposition was trifling, men were tired of strife. In 1823, the tariff question began to excite great interest in south, and on its revision in '24, parties were fairly divided on it. The south were opposed to it on principle and as a matter of policy. They contended that it was unconstitutional, and they complained that the policy was impoverishing and ruinous to them; that there once fine fields and splendid estates were but the mementos of their former greatness, and that it was sacrificing one part of the Union to benefit another.—The friends of the tariff contended that it was a benefit to all, and that if it were not, a majority of the country were in favor of it, and the minority ought to submit. The complaints of the former became louder and louder until last year, the state of South Carolina, declared she would no longer submit to such oppression, but would nullify this act of Congress; predicating her proceedings on the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of '98. In which it was held that the General Government received its powers from the States, and that when it transcends its power and passes an oppressive and unconstitutional law, that a State, rather than to submit to such law, has a right to secede or to nullify. The opponents of this doctrine contended, that the General Government receives its authority from the people at large; that it moves in a sphere independent of the State Governments; that the Supreme Court is the sole arbiter of constitutional questions, and when the case cannot be brought before this Court, there is no remedy, the will of the majority must rule. There is no one, but must have felt the critical situation in which our country was placed by the position of South Carolina—but what must have felt, that the cause of mankind, the cause of liberty, and our bright prospects were jeopardized—but must have seen amidst the din of arms and hurly-burly of war attendant on a collision of the states and general government, some Cromwell, or some Bonaparte, rising up and taking the reins of government in his own hands and establishing a military despotism on the fragments of our broken Republic. But thanks to God, when the sky was lowering, the elements raging, the cloud of disasters hanging over us, and we were hourly expecting it to burst, the ruler of the storm appeared, the voice of the Savior went forth on the troubled waters, "Peace, be still," he said, and all was calm, the firmament brightened up and the sun of Peace broke forth in all his glory. We may judge of the intense interest that was felt upon this question throughout the country, by the acclamations of joy with which this news was received. It was a measure of compromise. I know that this doctrine has its opponents; that the doctrine of non concession emanates from a high source—no less than from the second Daniel, as he is called; but until I am convinced that like his great namesake the mantle of inspiration has fallen upon his shoulders, I humbly beg leave to differ with him on this question. I am glad the executive thought differently too, and although he deserves much of the present generation for his military services, he will deserve more of posterity or the firmness and forbearance evinced on this trying occasion. South Carolina