THE SUMTER BANNER

IS PUBLISHED

EVERY TUESDAY MORNING

BY W. J. FRANCIS.

Terms.

Two Dollars in advance, Two Dollars and Fifty-cents at the expiration of six months, or Three Dollars at the end of the year.

No paper discontinued until all arrearages are *paid*, unless at the option of the Proprietor.

☞Advertisements inserted at 75 cts. per square, (12 lines or less,) for the first and half that sum for each subsequent insertion.

☞The number of insertions to be marked on all Advertisements, or they will be published until ordered to be discontinued, and charged accordingly.

☞One Dollar per square for a single insertion. Quarterly and Monthly Advertisements will be charged the same as a single insertion, and semi-monthly the same as new ones.

All Obituary Notices exceeding six lines, and Communications recommending Candidates for public offices or trust—or puffing Exhibitions, will be charged as Advertisements.

☞Rev. FREDERICK RUSH, is a travelling Agent for this paper, and is authorized to receive subscriptions and receipt for the same.

From the Black River Watchman.

Response of Maj. Haynsworth.

OCTOBER 2, 1851.

In the Banner of the 23rd ult., I find certain questions propounded to me as the President of the Southern Rights Association for Claremont, which I think it proper for me to respond to. The writer, whose piece, not purporting to be a communication, and appearing under the editorial head, I presume to be the editor, expresses for myself sentiments of respect and esteem, for which I make to him my acknowledgments, and assure him that to me one of the most painful incidents of an excited political contest, is its tendency to alienate feelings of good will and friendship, and to distrust and suspicion as to the honesty and purity of purpose of the opposing parties. I assure my friend of the Banner, that I am quite ready to account to the public for my conduct as President of the Southern Rights Association, and to answer all proper questions relating thereto, simply and honestly, and that a series of cross questions such as are resorted to, to extort the truth from a reluctant or suspecting witness, was not necessary to draw it from me, and certainly shall not betray me to say anything which my own sense of propriety may not approve. Before I do so, however, will he permit me to say a few words on the character of the *inquisition* which I am called upon to undergo, and the extraordinary conditions as they appear to me, on which alone, it is annouced the co-operationists will agree to meet their opponents in free discussion. For myself, I have believed, and yet verily believe, that the good of the people of this and the other slaveholding States, and the best measure to secure that good, are the object and wish of the true hearted of both parties. Unfortunately, we differ as to the expediency of a certain important measure *openly* proposed, the one party believing that it would result in the salvation of the country, the other that it would not only fail of accomplishing the object intended, but on the contrary would not only result in the ruin of the State. It is a question in which the people are vitally intested. The evil of our condition cannot be avoided by shutting our eyes upon them, or by doing as the ostrich is said to do when pursued, (hoping thereby to escape,) covering his head in the sand, while his body remains exposed. We must do something or submit to bear the ills we have. It is a question for the people to decide, and which it is of incalculable importance that they decide aright. Now simply, and according to the maxims of every day common sense, it may be [illegible] I think that they will be more competent to make a right decision if they have a full understanding by having the arguments on both sides submitted for their judgment. The maxim of Mr. Jefferson in substance (I am not sure that I use his words) was that error may be safely tolerated, if truth be left free to combat it. But it is insinuated that the party tendering free discussion have put themselves out of the pale of civility and fellow-citizenship by their conduct as a party; in that, "while in a (supposed) majority, they did every thing they could to discourage and prevent free discussion." "That willing and desiring that it should be taken for granted they were in the majority, they were afraid of free discussion." "That circulars, documents, and letters, marked *private* and *confidential*, coming from persons styling themselues as the Central Committee, &c., have been addressed to, and received by, persons in this District, the object and design of which was to stifle the voice of the people and prevent free discussion. These I think are the substance of the charges made by insinuation. To these is added a direct charge of insincerity. And we are told when the questions put "shall have been answered *fully and without evasion*—when all the *secret* letters, circulars and other documents shall have been made public, and the conduct of the seperate secessionists explained, &c., *then*, but not till then," will the tender of free discussion be accepted.

Of course some of these are impossible conditions, and must put the extinguisher upon the proposition of such discussion. I suppose it was so intended; for besides the violation of confidence which it demands in relation to what may be called public documents, that is to say, circulars, and other communications relating to party matters interchanged between officials appointed for that purpose, (which I suppose are common to all parties, and which when intended to be private and confidential, I have never before had it suggested to me, it would be otherwise but dishonorable to give other publicity to, than that intended or sanctioned by the author) the requirement goes further and demands that all *secret* letters, by which I understand all private correspondence about public matters—for I do not suppose that the *private* affairs of individuals could have been meant to be brought in—should also be published. This is of course out of the question, and could not have been expected. At least so it appears to me, and I desire it to be understood that I speak for myself, and not by authority of any one else.

I have referred to the unfortunate tendency of excited political contests to generate distrust and suspicion as to the honesty and purity of motive of the opposing parties, I make allowances for it, and in this way account for the vision of spectres which seems to have presented itself to the lively imaginations of the editor and his po[illegible]. I hope, though I cannot [illegible] to all that I am required to do, for the purpose of exercising those spectres, yet that I shall be able before I close, to shed so much light on the subject, that they will of themselves fade away; and that you Mr. Editor will regret the general tone and spirit of the article I am responding to, and especially the charge of insincerity and fraudulent disguise, which you make, I hope inconsiderately, but certainly very intrepidly.

In relation to this charge, and as proof of its justice, you ask, "why is it that Messrs. Cheves, Barnwell and Withers are the only persons named as invited and expected to address the meeting. Was it not well known that these gentlemen would not attend, and were not their names inserted *as a mere blind?*" I have not the card announcing the meeting before me, and from my own memory would not undertake to say whether these are the only gentlemen named. I take it for granted it is as you say; but it not named, there were others, as clearly designated as if named, to wit. our Senators and Representatives in Congress, (a majority of whom are known to be co-operation men,) all the gentlemen who have been nominated as candidates for the Southern Congress (both sides,) the gentlemen named, and in all forty distinguished men from different parts of the State—equal numbers from both parties—all of whom were invited, and if they had attended, it was impossible that the co-operation party could have been more strongly represented. That all who were invited would attend, certainly, was expected; but as certainly, it was not expected that not one of that party from abroad would come. Why, it was so, *we* cannot account. Those who have acknowledged their invitations, do justice to the courtesy, etc., extended to them. But where do you find that the gentlemen named by you were the only ones of your party expected to address the meeting! Certainly not in the published card. It is unfortunate that you had not more carefully ascertained the facts, before you made them the ground of so serious a charge.

I will now endeavor to give an account of my stewardship as President of the Southern Rights Association for Claremont. The first question put to me is, why the Association has not been called together since May last! I will endeavor to answer this question as fully as is necessary, "and without evasion.', The Southern Rights Association is an organization intended for the defence of Southern Rights, framed on general principles in which the State rights men of both our present parties profess to, and I believe do concur, and of which almost every man in the country is a member. It is therefore a bond of union which, although not strong enough to prevent its members from breaking into parties, may hereafter help to bring them together again. It is impossible to foresee with certainty what is in the future, and upon what ground we may not be driven by events which are pressing upon us, in defence of our rights. I therefore think that though at this time, powerless of good, because if it were to attempt to act, it would immediately be taken possession of by the strongest party as a party engine, and all the dissentients would immediately withdraw from it, yet it is worth preserving as a ground on which the true hearted of both parties may hereafter be glad to rally. Those members who attended the last meeting will remember the deep excitement, and almost hostile collision which sprung up in the discussion of the principal matter then under debate. It was manifest that the two present parties were then forming, and that on the next occasion on which matter involving the grounds of difference between them should be brought into discussion, there would be a rupture; the stronger, whichever it might be, taking the name, and the others withdrawing. This, so far as it depends on me, for the reasons already given, I would avoid; and *it* is the reason and not any supposed orders from the Central Committee, why I have not called the Association together. If there is any good end to be attained by calling the Association together under present circumstances, it may be done with or without my concurrence—I hope however, it may be permitted to stand. It may some day do good service.

In relation to the other questions put to me, so far as they are not answered above, I further answer—

That in fact, I have received no circular that I have any recollection of, from the Central Committee. It is true that I saw a circular, dated May 26th, which was shown to me by a gentleman now acting with the co-operation party—and which since your call, has been put into my hands by another gentleman with authority to use it—As that circular contains all that I have seen from the Central Committee, or any organ of the secession party, which could possibly give colour, to the charge against them, that they desired to stifle discussion, I have transcribe all that it contains on that subject, and ask you as an act of justice to publish it.

"In the meeting lately held in Charleston, while entire unanimity prevailed as to the great object of vindicating our rights by adopting the most effectual measnres of resistance, there was some diversity of opinion as to the question, what mode of resistance will be most effectual.

'The vast majority of the delegates who composed the meeting concurred in the propriety and necessity of those resolutions with regard to the policy of the State which were adopted.

A minority, highly respectable for intelligence and devotion to the common cause, regarded the action of the meeting as imprudent and impolitic. But happily this difference of opinion was not permitted to lead to estrangement of feeling; and there is now every reason to hope, that the sons of South Carolina will move forward in defence of their rights with an unbroken front and unexampled unanimity.

To effect this great object the utmost respect should be shown, and the most conciliatory conduct adopted on the part of the majority towards the minority of the great resistance party of the State. If such conduct should be observed, it has been understood since the adjournment of the meeting in Charleston, that the minority will exhibit the same spirit, and that in all probability, there will be no organized opposition to the proceedings of that meeting, but that when the Legislature and the Convention of the people have acted, that action however decided its character will be cordially and firmly sustained even by those who may deem it premature or hazardous.

"The Central Committee, therefore beg leave, respectfully to suggest to you the propriety and policy of an entire abstinence on the part of those who approve of the proceedings of the late meeting from any act which by the most jealous construction might be regarded as provoking the minority to a contest on the subject. And with this view unless opposition meetings should first be called in any Districts, the Central Committee would respectfully suggest that it is unnecessary to agitate the subject, or call together the several Southern Rights Associations for the purpose of expressing their approval of the late proceedings in Charleston.

"Great as the majority in favor of those proceedings would beyond doubt in that manner be ascertained really to be throughout the State, it is of still higher importance to avoid if possible, every cause of dissention among friends."

I have thus in answer to your call, made an unvarnished statement, and I leave it to the people to judge between us. Were it not that what I have already written will perhaps occupy as much of your paper as you may be willing to spare, I would say something now, in defining my own position; but I would not trespass, and therefore refer those who may feel interested on the subject, to the piece which I published in the *Banner* and *Watchman* in February last. That piece was drawn up with consideration, no language used which was not intended to be significant, and no opinion expressed which I do not now adhere to—circumstances have somewhat altered since then, should they greatly alter, my opinion as to the question of *policy* will of course be accordingly modified.

WM. HAYNSWORTH.

From the Southern Standard.

A Card.

The undersigned are happy to inform their Secession friends, and the Public generally, that they have at length been able to carry out the suggestion made by a distinguished Co-operationist, in a speech to the citizens of the Upper Wards, and that they have entered into an engagement with MR. BROWN, the celebrated Pyrotechrist, for a constant supply of IMPROVED SKY-ROCKETS.

Any Secessionists who are anxious (as some have recently expressed the desire) "*to perish in a blaze of glory*," can upon application to the undersigned, be sent up (free of charge) in a Sky Rocket, thus making their exit with brilliant eclat, and accomplishing in their death, what they have failed to effect in their lives, the illumination of their benighted countrymen.

GUY FAWKES & CO.

N. B.—GUY FAWKES & Co, have also on hand a full supply of material for the construction of the squibs, torches, firebrands, &c., required by the "MUSCOVITE FILLIBUSTERS," in their promised scene of "CHARLESTON A MOSCOW."

Wednesday evening [illegible] (weather permitting) is suggested as an appropriate time for the exhibition.

Gen. Scott.

The New York Expres says—Gen. Scott, being written to some months since by a gentleman of Pennsylvania, at the request of eight members of the State Senate, addressing him as the undoubted Whig candidate for the Presidency, and requesting his opinions on the various political questions which have agitated the country, wrote the following characteristic letter in reply:

WASHINGTON, March 26, 1851.

Sir: I have received your letter, (marked "confidential,") in which, after committing the error of supposing me to be "fully before the country as the Whig candidate for the Presidency," you proceed to interrogate me on many points of grave public interest.

Permit me to say, that, considering we shall propably only have a Whig candidate for the Presidency through a National Convention, and that I cannot be its nominee except [illegible] of the unsolicited partiality [illegible] of my countrymen—

Considering, also, that if my principles be not already known, it would now be idle to attempt to supply the deficient information by mere paper professions of wisdom and virtue, made for the occasion—

And considering that, if I answer your queries, I must go on and answer others already before me, as well as the long series that would inevitably follow to the disgust of the public—

I will beg permission to close this acknowledgement of your letter by subscribing myself,

With great respect, your obedient servant,

WINFIELD SCOTT.

——, Esq., Harrisburg, Penn.

P. S. I must add that I write and say nothing on public subjects, which I am unwilling to see published. W. S.

LETTER FROM LORD BYRON TO D'ORSAY.—A letter from Paris says:

"By the liberality of Count D'Orsay, the national liberary has just come into the possession, for the first time, of an autograph of Lord Byron. The Director of the library often regretted this want. The document in question is a letter (never published) from Byron to Count D'Orsay addressed to the latter at Genoa. As the library is shut for the autum vacation, I cannot see the original. I, therefore, translate back again from the French version, the concluding portion of the epistle:

"I am sorry for this for your sake, for if you are so well initated into life at your age, what will become of you, when the illusion shall be still more dissippated! But no matter: *Envant!* Live as long as you can, and that you may enjoy the numerous advantages of youth, talent, and face that you possess, is the hope of—an Englishman, I suppose; but there is no treachery here, as my mother was a Scotchwoman, and my name and family are Norman. As for me, I am of no country, and as to my 'works,' which you are pleased to mention, let them go to the devil, from whom, in the opinion of a great many people, they come.

I have the honor of being your most obliged and devoted servant.

'NOEL BYRON.'"

TRIP AROUND THE WORLD.—R. S. Wade, Esq. has just returned from Europe to Boston. In December last he left, Boston for California, thence proceeded to China in the barque George E. Webster, and thence to England, via the overland route from India, thus having taken a turn around the globe in less than nine months, stopping two months of the time in San Francisco, a month in China, and at least a fortnight in England.

A Matrimonial Agency has just gone into operation in a certain street in the vicinity of St. John's Park, N. Y. The fellow advertises in the public prints, that he is in possession of a secret he will sell for one dollar, that will enable ladies or gentlemen to win the object of his or her heart, without fail. The "no cure, no pay" principle is adopted. This Cupid's quack should not be tolerated.

The Grand Jury in the United States District Court at Philadelphia, have found ture bills against Elijah Lewis, Caspar Hanway, Jos. Scarlet, and Jas. Jackson, white men, and twenty-seven negroes, for treason in participating in the Christiana outrage. The bill against *George Wise*, negro, was ignored.

THE SUMTER BANNER.

Sumterville, So. Ca.

JOHN T. GREEN, EDITOR.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1851.

☞ Messrs. A. WHITE & Co., are Agents for the Banner in Sumterville.

Our Principles.

"There is one point on which there can be no diversity of opinion in the South among those who are true to her, or who have made up their minds not to be slaves; that is if we should be forced to choose between resistance and submission we should take resistance at all hazards."—CALHOUN.

"To do that, concert of action must be necessary, not to save the Union, for it would then be too late, but to save ourselves. Thus in my view, concert is the one thing needful."—CALHOUN.

"What is the remedy? I answer secession, united secession of the slaveholding States, or a large number of them. Nothing else will be wise—nothing else will be practicable."—CHEVES.

Statement of the Election for Delegates to the Southern Congress, so far as heard from.

CANDIDATES	CHESNUT	PRESTON	BARNES	OWENS
Sumterville,	181	180	135	135
Swimming Pens,	16	16	49	49
Bishopvills	88	88	35	35
Carters' Crossing,	25	25	16	16
Spring Hill,	89	89	21	21
Statesburg,	20	19	43	42
Providence,	61	61	19	19
Manchester,	23	23	17	17
Privateer	44	41	36	36
English ✕ Roads,	65	65	56	56
Mechanicsville,	18	18	11	11
Lowrys,	28	82	7	7
Bradhams,				
McFaddens,				
Shorters,				
Fulton,				
Packs,				
Mack's Store,				
Witherspoon's,				
Motts,				
Calhoun,				

☞We have received a communication over the signature of "A citizen of the District," but have not been able to give it a place in our columns.

Dedication of the Temperance Hall

On Friday evening last, the 10th inst., the interesting and impressive ceremony of dedicating the Hall of the "Sons of Temperance" took place.

The members of the "Sumter Division, No. 12" met in pursuance of previous arrangements at the Town Hall, the accustomed place of meeting at 7 1-2 P. M., and being formed into line by the Marshal, Lt. WILLIAM S. HUDSON, marched in procession to the New Hall, being the old Presbyterian Church, entirely and tastefully remodelled by the intrepid Father of Temperance here, Judge WILLIAM LEWIS. A crowded audience of beauty and intelligence were in waiting to witness the ceremony.

The W. P. having taken the Chair and called the "Division" to order, indicated to the D. G. W. P. that the Division, with their friends, were ready for the dedication. The officers of the occasion, consisting of D. G. W. P. MONTGOMERY MOSES, P. W. P. WILLIAM LEWIS, W. P. T. B. FRASER, W. A. H. J. HAYNESWORTH, C. O. P. McRoy, A. C. R. M. DYSON then proceeded to the dedicating services. After the novel and highly interesting ceremony was over, the Division was favored with an appropriate and beautiful address, upon very short notice, from JOHN S. RICHARDSON, Jr. Esq. From this period we believe, and fervently hope that the Temperance cause in our District will date a new and growing impetus, until the stronghold of the enemy shall have been completely demolished, and its influence shall have been extended and felt far and near.

The thanks of the Division is due and hereby tendered to the "Sumter Band," for the interest added to the occasion by their music. The success of the cause will be the best return that could be made to them and we doubt not, the only one desired by them.

Major Wm. Haynsworth's Response.

In our last number, we gave our reasons for not re-publishing the response of Major HAYNSWORTH to questions put to him, as the President of the Southern Rights Association. It should properly have appeared in our columns, before being published in any other paper; but as it was handed in too late for insertion in the issue for which it was designed—and as Major HAYNSWORTH was anxious "that it should be laid before the public previously to the large meetings" held on the 6th inst., it was withdrawn and published in the columns of the *Watchman*. That purpose being fully answered, we stated as an additional reason, for not re-publishing in our las', that we were very much crowded.—Without doubt this response should, under other circumstances, have preceded any comments upon it. But it should be remembered, that the response had already reached the public eye, although through a different medium from the one first intended, and this imposed upon us the necessity, in a case where either the response or the "commentary" had to be excluded, of excluding the response. We were not unapprised at the time that we took this course that we were subjecting ourselves to the charge of "doing ourselves greater injustice than we were doing Major HAYNSWORTH;" but when it had already been made known to the public *through the response*, that a very estimable citizen had been charged through the *Banner* with practising dishonesty and fraud upon that public, we felt constrained to take the earliest opportunity of disabusing the public mind, as well as that of Major HAYNSWORTH of any such impression, and to assure both that nothing of the kind was intended. To those who have read both the response and our comments, we need say nothing more. To those who may have read neither, after they shall have read the response, we would refer them to our last issue where they will find our comments, with our reasons at large for the course we adopted in the outset. What we have done, has been in good faith. We have nothing more to say.

Letters Addressed to the Committee of Invitation.

ANDERSON, 29th Sept. 1851.

Gentlemen: A prior engagement will, I regret to say, deny me the pleasure of participating with you in your Co-operation demonstration on the first Monday in October.

I should have been much gratified to mingle my counsels, humble though I know them to be, with the noble spirits who will meet you on that occasion, as also to have made the personal acquaintance of my fellow citizens of the wealthy and populous District of Sumter.

I concur fully in the objects and purposes of your meeting and hope it will accomplish much good in illustrating the true character of the contest now waxing so hot in South Carolina. The painful solicitude which I have felt for the position of our common mother has been greatly mitigated by the accumulating evidence that the *people* have taken at last the question of Separate State Action into consideration and I verily believe they will prevail in spite of the efforts of a partisan press and save the State from the miscarriages incident to a separate nationality. The extraordinary action of the Charleston Convention in May last precipitated a division in South Carolina which perchance might have been avoided. The Co-operationists were not allowed to stand upon the plat[form] [illegible] which the address and resolutions of [illegible] without sacrificing their principles [illegible] the strongest dictates of duty and [illegible].

Anxious [illegible] were to preserve harmony this requires [illegible] much for that great end.—We [illegible] Secessionists upon that [illegible] which every resistance man in the State could occupy without involving any sacrifice of principle, and were willing to trust the whole matter to the judgment, wisdom and discretion of the State Convention elect when it assembled, if no efforts should be made there or elsewhere to influence its decision unduly.—The Secessionists judging from their actions thought it to be indispensable that the State should be irrevocably pledged to seperate action as far as they could, and thereby manufacture a fictitious public opinion in the State in favor of their policy, which so far from having been decided upon by the people in the election of the Delegates, was never discussed before them. They were unwilling to trust the great issue in the hands of the Convention without putting the fetters and trammels of a supposed popular opinion in favor of isolated nationality on every member of that body. The State must be committed then and there: Such a bold movement, in their speculations, might have the effect of driving into the ranks the feeble minority that opposed them upon that occasion. It failed however and subsequent events have clearly demonstrated that they misjudged the sentiments of the people and now no doubt many vain regrets fill the minds of the actors in that body that a little more moderation did not mark their deliberations. Most of them now claim to be Co-operationists and say that they will wait a "reasonable time" for it, but that reasonable time which can only be regulated by events, yet to happen, must end with the [illegible] of year that the present Convention is to live, and *that Convention* within that year must pass the ordinance of Secession. Now at the Charleston meeting I think such a moderate opinion as that, would have put the author under suspicion; for the longest "waiter" of that party whom I had there the pleasure to meet, thought that dishonor would sully the fair escutcheon of South Carolina if she remained in a Union, where Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi was, longer than the first of next May. The 22d February was the favorite day fixed in the hotels and at the street corners for passing the ordinance. The change which has come "over the spirit of their dreams" proves one thing at least, that Co-operation was not such an unmitigated humbug at that time as was supposed when we were told that "Secession was the last arrow in our quiver," and that it must be shot off before our thickskined brethren of the South "would face the *music*" in defence of their own rights.

The Charleston meeting pledged the State as far as it could to Secession after rejecting our platform, and no alternative was left the Co-operationists but to return home and concentrate public sentiment to counteract that pledge.

If the Secession press was correct in claiming that a majority of the delegates elect to the Convention, were pledged to Separate State Action, and that majority were gravely determined to carry out these committals when the body should be assembled by the Legislature, it was perhaps fortunate for the best interests of the State that they rejected our own proposition [of] conciliation, and imposed the unpleasa[nt] task on resistance men, who had no con[fi]dence in the nostrum of Secession withou[t] Co-operation, of exposing its mis-shapen proportions to the public gaze. The attention of the people has been attracted to the subject, which is in my opinion tantamount to a rejection of the whole scheme. Such "*feeble cattle*" as Cheves, Barnwell, Butler, Hammond, the venerable Gov. Johnston, Huger, Memminger, Burt, Woodward, Chesnut and Preston, Chancellors Johnston, Dunkin and Wardlaw, and Judges O'Neall, Frost, Wardlaw, Withers, Evans and Whitner, your own able and gifted Senators from Claremont and Clarendon, and a host of others, may yet be able to save the State from [illegible] tion which rash coun[sels] [illegible] bring down [illegible] made Co-operation [illegible] eyes of the Separate Actio[n] [illegible] in May last, and now they a[re anx]ious to obtain it but they [illegible] late Mississippi election have [illegible] last plank upon which to foun[d] [illegible] that all is lost if South Carol[ina] [illegible] isolate herself from her allies a[nd] [illegible] and take the cause of the *South*, th[e] [illegible] of the *South*, the danger to the ins[titutions] of the *South*, the honor of the *Sou[th]*, the courage of the *South*, into her [illegible] keeping and protection, and this too [illegible] done solitary and alone. Wonderful ca[pacity] ty in South Carolina! amazing disinte[rest]edness in whipping the recreants Da[vis], McDonald, McWillie and others, into the path of duty! Now I have not the remotest idea that a majority of the people of the State desire or intend to take any such position—the people have courage surpassed by none, but they still have wisdom and prudence which would forbid their assuming any such high prerogative. And when the elections in Alabama and Mississippi are scrutinized, it will be found that they do not banish the prospects of Co-operation, and furnish but little ground for the despondency which seems to have seized our Secession friends. I regret that the Southern Rights party in Mississippi were defeated, but it is an unanswerable fact establishing the wisdom of the Co-operationists in requiring some other State to lead or to give some authoritative assurance that they would follow our lead, before [illegible] ourselves into [a] predicament [illegible] there can be no retreat, except in [illegible] It is now manifest that the majo[rity in] Mississippi are not only opposed to [illegible] ving off, but believe that no serious [illegible] has been done by the Compromise. [The] vain delusion that our moving would [force] her to act has been dispelled. It may be said if Mississippi has decided in fav[or of] the Compromise, we never can expect [Co-]operation. Not so. We will get it, a[nd] the only means that can be devised for [ob]taining it is to *revolutionize public opinion there*. Our friends have been defeated, not vanquished, they will never endorse the Compromise—the gallant Quitman has retired from the contest, but his place has been taken by the valiant and indomitable Davis. Who doubts his making a gallant fight—he has never yet been whipped—he saw one-half his brave soldiers melt away on the bloody field of Buena Vista, and still victory perched upon his banner. Our friends will go into the battle with renewed vigor and energy and success will eventually crown their efforts. The recent outrage in Pennsylvania where Southern men were cruelly butchered in reclaiming their property will be a weapon with which the Union Compromise will be hewn down by thousands. The Union leaders can find no excuse, or palliation for this outrage, and that circumstance will make for the South, thousands of Southern rights resistance men. Other such scenes will occur and quicken the blood of the most slothful man. The next session of Congress will disclose the feelings and purposes of the abolitionists, and present new aggressions which will turn other of our sons to the true faith. The failure of the North to carry out the Fugitive Slave Law, which will become m[ore] apparent at every attempt, and the [illegible] of the Compromise itself, al[l] [illegible] laid before the people [illegible] effect that resolution [illegible] which must take [illegible] should [illegible] wait the action [illegible] mark, and a concerted movement by [illegible] will restore us our lost rights, and give us guarantees for future security in the Union, or if it should be considered preferable (and I believe it would) we can retire from the Union without molestation or restriction establish a Southern Confederacy, which will command the respect of the nations of the earth and give us the ability to defend ourselves against the strongest assailant.

It is said that the Southern Rights party are growing weaker. I do not believe it.—By taking a brief glance at the history of the Compromise we may find something worthy of our observation, and we may be led to the conclusion that that party is for numbers and intelligence greater than the most sanguine anticipation could have justified.

Who passed the Compromise measures?

On the passage of the California Bill, one-third of the Southern Members voted for it, but 57 of 91 voting against it. On the Bill abolishing the slave trade in the District of Columbia, only 59 voted against it, and on the Texas Spoliation Bill and the Bill to establish a territorial Government in New Mexico, but 30 of the 91 vo[ted] against it.

As to all the territory wh[illegible] been included in Cali[fornia] [illegible] the Southern M[embers] [illegible] constituent[s] [illegible] rep[illegible]

[illegible] sent [illegible] South—two-thirds of [the] [Sou]thern Representatives sustaining the Compromise, and but one-third opposing it. The two-thirds had the ear and confidence of their constituents as much as the one-third, and is it surprising that they have succeeded in getting their constituents to endorse (temporarily only as I believe) this odious measure?—Would it not have been a most extraordinary result if the one-third had carried a majority of the South in opposition to the ot[hers]

[illegible] home to the [illegible] one of great[est] [illegible] them a fair an[illegible] never been ca[illegible] cide on such a [illegible]

I am sure th[illegible]

had y[illegible] zens of Edg[efield] [illegible] same day tha[illegible] ing, so that i[illegible] be with you.

I assure y[ou] [illegible]

[illegible] *Gen*[illegible] prese[illegible] Sum[ter] [illegible] posed to sion is before me. [illegible] rule laid down for [illegible] early in this conte[st] [illegible] the meeting.

My opinions I hav[e] [illegible] ceal.

I regard Sepa[rate] [illegible] perfectly suicidal. [illegible] have devised anything more [de]structive to us, and our insti[tutions] without *at least*, an [illegible] slaveholding States, our [illegible] separate people will either [illegible] by [illegible] or as dependent upon Great Britain [illegible] can meet the expectations, or [illegible] South Carolina.

The course of the Con[illegible] worthy of commendati[on] [illegible] of our politicians [illegible] "with a pe[illegible] they w[illegible]