

THE DARLINGTON FLAG.

DEVOTED TO SOUTHERN RIGHTS, MORALITY, AGRICULTURE, LITERATURE, AND MISCELLANEOUS NEWS.

JAMES H. NORWOOD, EDITOR.]

To thine ownself be true; And it must follow as the night the day; Thou canst not then be false to any man.—HAMLET.

[NORWOOD & DE LORNE, PUBLISHERS.]

VOL. 1.

DARLINGTON C. H., S. C., THURSDAY MORNING AUGUST 28, 1851.

NO. 26.

THE DARLINGTON FLAG,
IS PUBLISHED
EVERY THURSDAY MORNING,
AT DARLINGTON, C. H., S. C., BY
NORWOOD & DE LORNE.
TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:
In advance, (per annum.) - - \$2 00
At the expiration of six months - - 2 50
At the end of the year - - - - 3 00
ADVERTISING:
ADVERTISEMENTS, inserted at 75 cents a square (fourteen lines or less), for the first, and 37½ cts. for each subsequent insertion.
BUSINESS CARDS, not exceeding ten lines, inserted at \$5, a year.

POLITICAL.

[From the Unionville Journal.]
HON. D WALLACE'S POSITION.

According to the promise made in our last number, we publish below a brief sketch of the address delivered by Hon. D. Wallace, on the 7th inst. The speech was delivered in the Court House, and though no notice had been previously given, a large number of persons were in attendance, who listened to the speaker with profound attention, and frequently evinced their approbation by repeated bursts of applause. He commenced his address by stating that he would not attempt to discuss the wrongs inflicted upon the South by the Government of the North. Upon that branch of the subject the argument is exhausted. The question before us relates to the remedy which must be resorted to, to redress these wrongs. It is of the utmost consequence that the people of South Carolina should understand their true position. In reference to the wrongs which we suffer, and those which are threatened, it may be said there is but one opinion among the people of South Carolina. We have arrived at the point when we must determine the mode of resistance. There are three alternatives which present themselves to our consideration—secession, civil war, or submission. He regarded the latter as impossible. The people of South Carolina can never be so unjust to themselves and their posterity as to submit to dishonor and degradation. There remains then the two alternatives, secession and civil war, and we must choose between them; for by one of these modes we must resist, or submit. To resist by civil war in the Union, is to take up arms for the purpose of overthrowing the government by violence and bloodshed. Secession may be peaceable—if it be not peaceable it will be not our fault, but that of the government which seeks to degrade and ruin us. He believed it would be effectual, and the only mode by which we can secure our rank as an independent people—our liberty and honor.

It is due to ourselves and to the cause we have so much at heart, that the plain truth should be spoken. The contest in which we are engaged, is not of our seeking. We have preferred peace and tranquility—they have been denied us. The aggressions of which we complain, and which have created such deep discontent in the public mind, have been forced upon us, and in repelling them, we resort only to the law of self-preservation, which nature herself has stamped upon every heart. We are not responsible for the perils which surround us. We cannot allay the excitement—it is beyond our power. It is not a sudden ebullition of feeling, which will cease with the passing hour; it is in fact a revolution, moral, social and political, and we must prepare to breast the storm or it will sweep over us in an irresistible torrent, and cover our country with desolation. This is the alternative presented, and we cannot evade it. We have now no check upon the despotic power of the government of the North. Our delegation in Congress is powerless to protect us—as much so as if we were without any representation in the national legislature. If Congress, at its next session were to pass a law emancipating every African slave in the southern States, to what measure could we resort to save ourselves from such a violation of our rights, except to one of those suggested, secession or civil war? The veto power given to the President by the Constitution, is virtually abrogated. The war commenced upon that check upon the dominant will of the majority, by Clay, in the senate, in 1841, has in effect resulted in a repeal of that clause of the Constitution. The will of the majority is now the law, and the government is now converted into a despotism as despotic as that of Russia. Gen. Taylor was elected upon a virtual repudiation of the veto power. He declared in his letter of acceptance of the nomination for the Presidency, that he should regard the action of Congress as an expression of the public will, and any measure passed by that body should meet his approval.

The only barrier which the Constitution interposes between us and despotism, is thus broken down. It was the last foothold of southern rights. We have now no guards remaining to protect us from the aggressive acts of the government; and it may be asserted without fear of contradiction, that the veto power will never again be resorted to, to arrest tyrannical legislation; for no man will ever hereafter be elected President, except upon the ground that he is opposed to African slavery. We are thus placed in a condition far worse than the

people under the monarchy of England. The House of Commons of the British Parliament may compel a reform in the government, by refusing to levy the necessary supplies; but the government of the north holds both the sword and the purse within its grasp. It can tax the south to raise the necessary funds, for its own subjugation by the sword. No language can be used which can better define a despotism than this. The right of secession is the only mode by which we can exercise a veto power upon the federal government. The veto power should have been left with the States, by the express terms of the Constitution itself, where alone a safe depository of it can be found. It becomes, therefore, a question of the last importance, that the right of secession should be established and acknowledged; and were there no other question now before the people of the south than this alone, it would be incumbent upon them to obtain a clear and distinct recognition of this right. How are we to obtain this recognition? There is no way to obtain it but to resort to the act of secession. Until we shall have seceded from the Union, we can obtain no recognition of the right to secede.—Once out of the Union, by the act of secession—having once resumed that sovereignty which is now denied us, our voice will be respected, and until then it never will be. We will then be in condition to make terms if we desire it, and even if we desire to save the Union, this is the only mode by which it can be done. Let us suppose that South Carolina has seceded from the Union. If the general government resort to coercion, and South Carolina is subdued, there is an end forever of State sovereignty on this continent. By that act alone the character of the government will be disclosed, and it become at once, to all intents and purposes, a consolidated empire. If State sovereignty be thus crushed in the case of South Carolina, in our fair view Southern States may read their own—What State south of us would ever seek to defend themselves in any way against the tyranny of the general government, after South Carolina has been subjugated? When that time shall arrive, the phantom of a confederated republic of independent States will disappear forever, and we will be under the iron rule of a remorseless despotism. Do any suppose that the people of the South are sufficiently blinded not to see this? Whenever, therefore, South Carolina shall make the practical issue of secession, the States south of us, in order to save themselves from these dire calamities, will be compelled to co-operate with her; they can't escape it. If he were told, therefore, that he must wait for co-operation, he would answer, the only mode to guarantee that co-operation is to 'act'—to make a practical issue—and if we do not obtain co-operation then, all past history is a fiction. It is clear from these propositions that the secession of a single State, must, in the very nature of things, either effect a reform in the general government, by placing it in the power of a State to check the tyranny, by exercising the veto of secession, or dissolve the Union; and the Union once dissolved, a Southern Confederacy is inevitable. Let us not, then, hide from ourselves the important fact that South Carolina holds in her hands the power to destroy the Union. He had no fears of her being subjugated. The States having like interests with hers, cannot—will not—dare not permit her to fight the great battle of Southern rights alone. In his judgment, the prevailing ideas in reference to the co-operation which is sought, are not well founded. How did the colonies in 1776 obtain co-operation with one another, in resisting British aggression? Was the Union formed before the revolution began? Certainly not. The battle of Bunker Hill was fought by the militia of Massachusetts, under Col. Prescott, a militia Colonel. The Commission he held was from the Colony of Massachusetts, and not from the United States. The regiment he commanded was not called out by the authority of the United States, but by the authority of the Colony of Massachusetts. The conflict was thus begun by a single Colony—without co-operation.—How did she obtain it? The sound of the guns of Bunker Hill had scarcely passed away, before South Carolina rushed to arms to co-operate with Massachusetts in a common cause which involved the fate of both; and the first victory of the revolution was won upon Sullivan's Island, against a powerful British fleet, by a regiment of South Carolina Militia, under the command of a militia Colonel, and under the sole authority of a South Carolina Colonel. When these events occurred there was no Union—the blood that was shed at Bunker Hill and Fort Moultrie, brought about, and that speedily, a union of all the colonies.

And Washington was not commander-in-chief when the Union was formed.—The union of which we now hear so much, was the legitimate result of separate State action, and Washington placed at the head of an army raised after the war began. This is a lesson which history teaches us—let us not look the resolution to profit by it.

It is the part of wisdom, when a State is called upon to consider the great question of a change of her fundamental institutions to ask the question, what she is to gain on the one hand and to lose on the other by the step she is to take. It becomes us, then, to enquire now, what are the benefits we derive from the fed-

eral government? One great object for which the Union was formed, was to protect each State from foreign invasion and domestic violence. Admitting the fact that we are protected by the general government from foreign invasion, what price do we pay for it? Whilst we pay into the public treasury millions annually in the shape of tribute, to protect us from foreign invasion, are we not threatened by the protecting power itself with the sword of domestic violence? Are we not told now, that if we dare to take such steps as we deem essential to our preservation, that our country will be devastated by the domestic violence of the sword, placed in the hands of the general government to protect us from all such aggressions? And by the taxes of which we are plundered, we furnish the means of our own subjugation. These are the benefits of the Union—before the idol of which we are required to fall down and worship. A government like this could enkindle in his bosom no sentiment but the most inveterate hatred, and a people who still pay their fealty to it, and bow before it in obsequious obedience, deserve to be slaves. That part of the compact, therefore, which guarantees each State from domestic violence, is abrogated and the sword which was to protect us is the instrument by which our country is to be deluged in blood.

There is but a single item left—that of protection against a foreign power, for in the act of inflicting upon us the devastation threatened, every personal right and every right of property must be destroyed. Protection against a foreign enemy alone remains. If we be subjugated—if we must cringe under the rod of a master, what boots it to us whether the rod be held over us by the King of Britain or the abolition government of the North? Even if the protection against a foreign power be observed in good faith, it is a right without any value, and we should scorn it under such circumstances.

In the present state of the world, whatever fears we may entertain of foreign invasion, are little more than imaginary.—Commerce constitutes the bonds into which the world has entered to keep the international peace. The cotton crop of the South is a more potent element in preserving the peace of the world than all the navies and armies of Europe. The crown of England's sovereignty would not be safe if the great staples of the South were withdrawn from the commerce of the world for twelve months. What people on earth are more liable to oppression than we are, under these circumstances? Who so defenceless and powerless to protect themselves? And with these facts before us, shall we longer delude ourselves with the phantom of liberty, when all its attributes are denied us?

We are on our backs—the tyrant stands over us ready to inflict the last stab, and shall we pause? If we resist not, will it not be said, and with too much truth, that we fear the consequences?—By a timid, vacillating course of policy, will we not in effect say to the tyrant, "we know our wrongs—they have penetrated deep into the public heart—we know we are dishonored—degraded—and thence long our ruin will be consummated. We know that a power which seeks to dishonor a people will not stop short of conquering them, but we are aware that we are too weak to resist you?" A people who can thus reflect, cannot long retain a vestige of the spirit of liberty.

On the other hand, let us consider what we are to gain by the proposed action of the State. If we succeed, (as he believed we would) in practically demonstrating the right of a State to secede, we shall have established upon a sure basis the only veto power that can ever hold the tyranny of the government in check. We will have laid the foundation for security, equality and independence in the Union, or of a better government out of it—a government which must in the end result in a Southern confederacy, upon the establishment of which depends the last hope of liberty on this continent. But suppose we make the effort and fail, and we in fact be subjugated, an event which he did not believe ever will happen, even in that extremity, our condition will be no worse than that which awaits us in the Union. In every view of the case, therefore, secession seems to be the policy which alone can secure our honor and our liberty.

This is briefly our position. Our wrongs must be redressed, and we must have guarantees for the future. We cannot be so false to ourselves or our children as to submit. Is it a matter of surprise that we should have arrived at a period in our history, when we are called on by the highest obligations of patriotic duty, to take our rights into our own hands, and to reform the State? Whoever supposed that our liberties were placed upon such a sure basis that they would last forever without an effort from us to defend them? We have heretofore placed much confidence in the honesty of our government. Beware! lest it prove a fatal delusion.

We must apply the remedy of civil war or secession—for there can be no submission. Between the two he could not hesitate. He was in favor of secession with co-operation, if we can obtain it; if not, then by the single action of South Carolina. He preferred anything to submission. If we do not obtain co-operation before we act, he felt confident we would obtain it afterwards. Our hope lies in action. The delay he would count

sel, is only in deference to the judgment of those who think differently—for himself he was ready for the issue at any moment, and did not believe it could be postponed much longer with honor to the State, or safety to ourselves. And while he made this broad declaration, he would not counsel rashness or precipitation.—We have fallen upon a time which more than any other in modern times, requires coolness, resolution, and a profound political wisdom. One element, without which all is lost, is union among ourselves. Let us take care, lest in dividing among ourselves, we become the more efficient agent of our enemies. If there are any, then, who desire to wait yet a little longer, he would say to them let us not separate—but by our united strength, shape our course so as to command success when we do act. It is more important to accomplish the great design of redeeming our country from the ruin which awaits her, than that we should begin the contest unprepared and with a divided people. Let us at all events keep the State up to the color line, determined to triumph or perish, and when the proper moment arrives, to strike whatever blow the rights of our country shall command, and leave the consequences to God. He would commit violence upon the feelings of none. The difference which prevails amongst us he hoped and believed, is only at to the mode by which we are to free our country from bondage. The North are almost to a man against us. Shall we not profit by the example of the enemy, and unite too, to protect ourselves from their assaults?

It is the design of our enemies to divide and conquer us, and the darkest omen of the times is the fact that our enemies are united in solid phalanx, whilst the South is distracted with intestine divisions. This condition of things has ever preceded the fall of empires. Greece could not unite to repel the invasion of Philip because Philip's gold had preceded the march of his cohorts. It is much to be feared that federal gold is now performing similar work for us, and let us beware that it does not produce the same disastrous results.

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECH OF HON.

F. W. PICKENS,

DELIVERED AT EDGEFIELD COURT HOUSE, JULY 7th, 1851.

The separate sovereignty and Independence of these States is the fundamental law of American liberty.

In the declaration of Independence it is expressly laid down that these "colonies" (not these people) "are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States." In the old articles of confederation, the very 3d article, expressly declares that, "each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence."

In the present constitution it is laid down that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." This compact united States together for certain specified objects. The mode and manner in which it was adopted proves this. It was acceded to by the States separately in their State Conventions, and until each State adopted it for itself it had no binding effect upon such State. North Carolina and Rhode Island actually refused to adopt it for some time, and they could have remained out of it to this day if the had thought proper. The debate in this State took place in the Legislature upon the proposition to call a convention to ratify the constitution, and the call of the convention was carried by only one vote. Ninety six districts, of which this district was a portion, voted against it except one vote, and the great majority in the middle and upper districts were against its adoption. It was carried by Charleston and the low-country. The convention, sitting in the capacity of a sovereign State, imposed the obligations of the federal compact upon us as citizens, and the same sovereign power can be again called into action to release us from those obligations. As the State acceded to the compact so, it can secede in like manner. Without this right and power the reserved sovereignty and independence of the States is a rabid declamation and swelling assumption.

The right and the power of the separate States to check, in an extreme case and as the last resort, by secession, is essential to preserve their independence. If this were known and acknowledged as a dormant power belonging to our system, there would be no cause for dissolution, for the Government would abstain from usurping power over local and vital interests, and the States themselves would feel easy as they had the ultimate power to protect themselves, and would not become excited on any temporary usurpation or exercise of obnoxious power. But without this, there must ever be in the public mind a restless uneasiness and impatience, for fear that the ultimate liberty of the parts cannot be preserved. And the Government which was created as a mere agent to execute the compact between the States, will in the course of time, make its own interests the measure of its power, and substitute that power as the law for the States that created it, instead of the compact itself. This compact is not a compact with the Federal Government, but it is a compact between co-States, of the confederacy. And when a State, in its sovereign capacity, makes an issue upon the organic law by which it is connected with the other States, it is an issue not

with the Federal Government, but an issue with the co-States. And if the Government interferes to decide the issue then tendered, it is usurpation—and if it tenders force to put down the State, thus making the issue upon the original powers of the compact, it is despotism, and we are cowards and slaves if we do not meet it like brave men, although the land should be drenched in blood or wrapt in flames.

The sovereign States themselves are the judges in the last resort, and from the nature of things there can be no other judges compatible with sovereignty. The power to interfere and check in extreme and vital cases, involving the liberty of the State, is inherent in the nature of the compact itself. Without this we have made no advance in the System of regulated liberty. It is the great distinctive feature of American freedom. It is the great fundamental law of the American compact, without which we are under a consolidated despotism, one from which we will have to march sword in hand and through the perils of revolution. Under the recognition of this great fundamental right belonging to the States, there can be peace and no revolution. A fair adjustment and new understanding of the confederacy. But without it our doom is fixed—the hand writing is upon the wall, and we have no alternative, but an appeal to arms and the God of battles.

But the right of a State to secede or interpose was not questioned by the republican party of old. The Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798, drawn by Jefferson and Madison, expressly laid down the doctrine boldly and ably, and it was universally recognized by the republican party from that day until now. Virginia did actually interpose and declare the alien and sedition laws of no force, null and void within her territories—and empowered the Legislature to carry it out. The Government was checked and controlled, and a civil revolution was brought about. If those who enacted these laws had held power and persevered in enforcing them, the Union would then have been dissolved. But State interposition made the issue palpable and they were overthrown.

The right to withdraw or secede is not left to inference, although clear from the very nature of the compact and of sovereignty in the States. But New York, in the conditions upon which she ratified, expressly declared that the powers of Government may be reassumed by the people whensoever it shall become necessary for their happiness. Virginia did the same except using the words, "whensoever the same shall be perverted to their injury or oppression." Rhode Island did the same. Those were the conditions these States expressly annexed, and if it was a right they expressly reserved, if it avails any thing, it accrues equally to all; for it was ratified by equals and no one could retain a power which each and all did not have alike. But it does not require that the right should be secured in totidem verbis. It belongs to the existence and independence of a State, and cannot be limited or circumscribed by any parchment on earth.

I have said that the States acceded to the compact as separate States, and to deny this is to deny history. But I go farther, and say that it was not only made by the States as States, but that they only can unmake it—and I say that the federal government at this day is but the creature of the States. How is the instrument to be amended or altered? Is it by the people of the Union? No! Article 5th declares that amendments may be proposed and if ratified or adopted by "the Legislatures of three-fourths of the SEVERAL STATES, or by CONVENTIONS in three-fourths thereof," shall become part of the constitution. It is the States that made the constitution, and it is the States alone that can alter it. Three-fourths of the States can make a new constitution and a new government under it. Suppose three-fourths of the States, by amendment to the constitution, declare there shall be no navy and no army, or that there shall be no President, and nothing but a Congress of States.—Can they not do so? and where then is the power of this Government? where are the original and inherent powers that belong to it, independent of the States? To talk about the Government having substantive powers independent of the States, is nothing but naked assertion.—Suppose a simple majority of the States should refuse to elect or send Senators to Congress, where would your government of inherent powers be? I admit, as long as we are in the Union, it is a constitutional duty in the States to elect Senators; but suppose they should think it a duty not to elect—where is the power to compel them? If under force they are compelled to send Senators, it is not their free election, and itself changes the Government. There can be no law made without a Senate, and I only use this to show how completely the Government is in the power of the States. In fact it is a government of States, and of no simple majority of people. Wherever reposes the power in any community to make or amend the organic law by which the community is kept together, there resides sovereignty. If the written constitution be the supreme law of the land, the power that can make or alter it is the supreme and sovereign power of the land. I have shown that the States alone made the constitution and that

they alone can alter or amend it, even so as to alter the whole government itself, and if that be not sovereign power, then I am at a loss to conceive what can be. The truth is, the federal government has no sovereignty.

Fellow citizens! we now come to investigate our present position as a State, and to state fairly what may be our particular duty in the present emergency.

I was opposed to the call of the Convention under existing circumstances, and particularly opposed to the meeting of the convention being so long after the election. I thought it would give a pretext for divisions amongst our own people. I thought it dangerous to repose the sovereign power of the State, even extending to life and property in its results, in so small a body of men as constitute that Convention, for so long a time in advance. The great strength of a convention consists in coming fresh from the people, and the people themselves deciding all great questions in advance. I thought there was danger of confusion and feared final imbecility. I therefore would have preferred the election of the Convention to take place in October next, instead of February last. But now that we are in Convention—I am for going through. I am against standing still or taking any step backwards. True, the issues may somewhat change by next Spring, when the Convention meets.—New questions may arise that may vary the prospect of affairs. Allow me to say, with deference to others, that the great danger now is, not rashness, but division and imbecility. The danger is that we will sink under the pressure brought to bear upon us. I fear that if we pass this crisis without doing something, the country will sink. The spirit of our people will die away. If we permit this accumulation of all power in the federal hands under the dictation of Northern fanaticism, Northern prejudice and Northern interests, we will be worn out and prostrated, and finally quail before despotism.

Our young men will sink—they will begin to worship Northern power, and become indifferent to their own country.—They will bow down before a magnificent Government, where liberty will be absorbed in the extended rays of patronage.—They will crook the pre-announced hinges of the knee.

Where thrift may follow fawning." Our very women will condemn and despise us, as a degenerate race, and they will look to others for protection. The first evidence of the corruption and decay of a people, is that the women begin to idolize foreigners. If the men become cowardly and luxurious, the women begin to look to others for that manliness which they so much admire. Such was the case in Mexico, and such will be the case in every country where the men want spirit to defend their rights. I know that the great chartered rights of my State are in danger—I feel that we are a degraded people if we do not rise. I desire co-operation with our sister States of the South—I will yield to the very last while there is hope—I will yield every emotion of pride and every thing, but a sacrifice of principle, to procure co-operation. But it may become our sacred duty to act alone, and if so, we must walk the plank alone like men, although that plank may lead over a gulf of frightful dangers. If it be a right to secede—it is a perfect right, and belongs as much to one State as to all. It is a right incident to sovereignty. And the denial of that right by the constituted authorities would make it an imperious duty to exercise it. If this be the issue, the sooner we test the question of the unlimited powers of the Federal Government, the better.

After the British government and our Northern brethren were defeated in their schemes against us to be effected through Texas, they fell back to circumscribe us by the Wilmot proviso. After the acquisition of those vast territories from Mexico—it was suddenly laid down that there was no need for the Wilmot Proviso to exclude us, for we were already excluded by the Mexican law. And in addition to this it was gravely laid down as American law, that any band of adventurers that might seize upon those territories, under the natural and unalienable rights of man, could assume to themselves sovereign power; and then erect any government they might think proper, so they called it a State, and extend their jurisdiction to any boundaries they might declare, no matter how extensive or where the lines might run. Until this we had supposed that the States united through their common agent the Federal Government, had alone the power to take incipient steps in the organization of territories in the public domain. But under this new doctrine, together with the assumption as to the force of Mexican law, we were to be excluded from all privileges as citizens of slaveholding States in the rich territories acquired, and that was sufficient to make those, who now assume to be our masters, adopt it. They have asserted the power to circumscribe us—they have enclosed us in a great penitentiary wall, and our doom is inevitable.

In the progress of a few years, and by one quarter of a million of foreign emigrants a year, they will, under their system, have new States sufficient to make any law—or, if the letter of the constitution should happen to stand in the way, they will have ample power to make a direct amendment. Fifty years is but a very short time in national existence, and fifty years will fix us beyond the hope of