

The last "Journal," contains the ablest political paper to which the present contest about State Rights' has given birth—coming from the pen of George M. Troup, it must and will be read with attention; and cannot fail to carry conviction to the minds of every reader of the truth of the great principles which he teaches.—Its publication at this time, is well calculated to sustain the cause of the Republican party, whose principles are well nigh strangled, amidst the furious contests, which the latitudinarians, on each side are waging—would to Heaven, it had been sooner published, we would have secured a different Executive, from the present, and a Legislature, of different complexion from that of the last. But these evils have all come upon us, because of the extreme desire of *some*, to force down upon the Republican, party of Georgia the new political creed of Calhoun, and others. No wonder that a reaction should have taken place and that men should be elected to office without the best wishes of those, who helped to place them there. We have always thought, that the simplicity of the Republican faith, was such as to recommend itself to the favour of every one. It was so obvious in its import so rational in its conceptions so common sense like so entirely stripped of *any thing* like mystery, that *doubt* could not for a moment intrude upon the devotion of its votaries; we found no difficulty, in embracing the faith ourselves and none in persuading others of its truth. But we must confess, that when Mr. Calhoun's version of it was presented to us, we did want faith to believe for ourselves, as well as to persuade others to believe with *him*.

We had imbibed the principles of 1825, and though we could not give vent to their convictions, yet we felt the force of our faith *instinctively*, pressing us forward to the support of the rights of the States, while we rejected the pernicious creed which was offered us, as the true and only means of their preservation. But we are relieved, and many others who were placed in like condition with ourselves, by the publication of this letter. We there see our own good faith presented in unchangeable, & unchangeable truth. We there see the creed of Jefferson, shaped in description which the simplest understanding can but compass and admire. The mystical refinements of delegated sovereignty, and reserved rights, are swept away; and the rights and being of the Federal, as well as State Governments, sketched and delineated, with a master's hand, such, that no metaphysical reasoning can again obscure.

We can most fully appreciate the truth of one of Governor Troup's remarks, for it has often pressed itself home upon our reflections; that nullification, as contended for by a dominant party, in a sister State, was a branch of the old Federal sin of construction. We did always esteem that doctrine, as thus taught, a part and parcel of that same Federal creed, which sustains the Tariff, the United States' Bank, Internal Improvement, and a Consolidation of the Federal Government. We could but view this doctrine, as that of the "General Welfare," federalists, designed to consolidate the government, turned to account, to advance the purposes of those, who seeking that object, and failing of its accomplishment, now prefer its dissolution. Strange as it may seem to the mind of a superficial observer, it is no less true, that the fact of consolidation, as well as the right of nullification, are both made constitutional by the same method of interpretation. And if it be true, as the latter contends, that less than a minority of one third of the States, can prevent the operation of any law, however constitutional, or arrest the exercise of any constitutional power, by Congress, how long would self-interest hesitate between consolidation and disunion? What, in effect, would be the difference of our condition, tyrannized over by many, or by few; with relief as hopeless in the one case, as it is desperate in the other? And how long would self-defence hesitate, at which first to aim resistance?

This remark is illustrated by the acts and professions of two classes of politicians, equally reproached by those from whom they have dissented in action, as well as those who have, always, differed from them in principle. They are the Calhoun nullifiers of Carolina, and the new treaty nullifiers of Georgia. The leading nullifiers of Carolina, always were Federalists. Calhoun, Hamilton, McDuffie, Dr. Cooper, Preston, Hayne, and others, never were distinguished until late, by any other name than that of Federalists; and even now, they do not, for a moment, deny, that they held any other political creed, than that which was held and maintained, by the Hartford-Convention-Federalists. They have often been reproached with inconsistency. This charge is unjust, as well as unfounded. If it exists, however, it is more the attribute of *vanity*, than of any real change in opinion. They *once* claimed only to be State Rights men. They now, from interest or *vanity*, have added the selfish title of *'exclusive.'*

When Mr. Calhoun, by construction, maintains the right of nullification, as constitutional and peaceable, he only reiterates the creed of Otis, Webster, and other federalists, in the Hartford Convention. He only employs the same method of construction, which sustains his federal Tariff of 1816; which gives constitutionality to that, as well as the United States' Bank; and to his system of Internal Improvement, which well nigh bankrupted the government; and the people. In pursuance of this creed, he was induced to sustain John Q. Adams, in 1825—6—and 7, in his attack upon Georgia and her rights—to assist Gaines Crowell, and Andrews—to uphold the New Treaty, and even to go so far with his interference, in our concerns, as to make his conduct the subject of animadversion, by Gov. Troup, in one of his letters to Mr. Adams. However much in error Mr. Calhoun deserves not to be called inconsistent. If evidence were wanting, that he had not changed in principle, by advocating nullification or that as an honorable man, he did so think, it will be found in his cordial support of that Federal Institution, the U. States' Bank, and its re-charter.

Mr. McDuffie, who, with his usual zeal, has gone fully into the support of nullification, has always contended that "the States, as political bodies, have no original, inherent rights. That they may have such rights is a false, dangerous, anti-republican, assumption which lurks at the bottom of all the reasoning in favor of State Rights." This is the "man who would contend that our government was a confederacy of independent States, whose sovereignty was in any degree renounced, cannot be regarded as belonging to the present generation. That when a conflict arises between the State and Federal Governments, "each party has not the right of judging for itself." To say that they have, would be a "political heresy." The foregoing constitute the foundation creed of the old John Adams construction party; and by Mr. McDuffie, have not been recanted.

Mr. Preston, the successor of Mr. Miller, in the Senate, from that State, was an active reviler of Gov. Troup and Georgia, in 1825—a supporter of the New Treaty—and a supporter of the principles taught by Mr. McDuffie. In truth, the conspicuous leaders of nullification in Carolina, were all New Treaty men—and, *then*, avowed federalists. Mr. Preston, at that time, advocated measures on the part of the Federal Government, towards Georgia, by far more odious and dangerous to liberty, than any principle contained in the Force Bill; for the passage of which, he called General Jackson, a blood thirsty tyrant. There is however, one exception to the general assertion just made. Turnbull, a conspicuous nullifier, was a supporter of Georgia, in 1825—and an ardent admirer of those principles, practically illustrated then, by Gov. Troup, and, now, so beautifully spread before us in theory. In his celebrated 'Brunns,' Mr. Calhoun is made to quail beneath this giant's rod, for his Federal principles and opposition to Georgia, and her Troup, in that period which tried our souls.

The other class of politicians to which I referred, as sustaining the truth of Gov. Troup's remarks, are the Clark men—supporters of the New Treaty in 1825—and now devoted Calhoun-construction-nullifiers. In carrying out their federal-construction views, they have been precipitated into an acknowledgement of *this*, their faith. The Troup State Rights presses which charge inconsistency upon these, are wrong. The old Clark presses should rather be ashamed that they have not acknowledged *now*, the creed they professed in 1825—and proved consistent in principle.—Among those who are accused of inconsistency, are Gen. Daniel Newman, and other stars of less magnitude and light.

These examples, thus drawn both from Carolina and Georgia, embracing the most prominent and zealous Calhoun nullifiers, strengthen most powerfully, the force of Gov. Troup's objection to nullification; that it was the result of construction, and construction was the old federal sin. For if it could give a constitutional resistance by nullification, it could give a constitutional Tariff, which could not be nullified. This objection is still entitled to greater consideration, from the fact, that Daniel Webster, Otis, Calhoun, McDuffie, and others, who have been, and still are, federalists, have been, and are supporters of that doctrine.

We would now ask, why has Gov. Troup's name and influence, been used for the advancement of South Carolina nullification; and that too by many of those who knew that he condemned it? We leave the answer to others. Why was not this letter published before? Mr. Pemberton, a leading nullifying Editor, says, that it was thought by the friends, that assertions in it, would injure the cause; and hence it was suppressed. With these motives for suppression, why have hundreds of the Troup Party, having the same objections to nullification, and entertaining the *same* views with Gov. Troup, been *denounced*, by those who knew better, as political turncoats—as 'renegades' from the Troup party—as 'deserters' of Troup and his principles? Why have they been so furiously assailed, and damned as 'Federalists,' for certain political opinions, which opinions were those of Gov. Troup; while *his* cordial adoption and support of them, were concealed from the public eye, because, if published, it was feared, would injure the cause? Now we would ask, who were the turncoats, those who adopted the doctrine disapproved by Gov. Troup, as containing a part of the 'old Federal sin,' or those who agreed with him? Or is it intended to charge inconsistency upon him? Is he a political weathercock? But, if Governor Troup is inconsistent, what are the Calhoun nullifiers? At the State Rights meeting at Milledgeville, they adopted a resolution approving, as their faith, the Kentucky resolutions of '98, as expounded and acted upon by Georgia, in 1825-6 and 7—and that too, with a full knowledge of what were the *opinions and exposition* of Gov. Troup, their expounder. If he is inconsistent, then *are* they *so*, likewise, in adopting his creed—if he is not, then *were* they turn-coats, in adopting their former creed.

We should suppose that this agreement, as to principle, should be adhered to; but we fear there is no disposition to do so, at least the resolutions of Mr. Chappell do not look much like it. Should it, however, be adhered to, the creed of the Republican party in Georgia, will be, that Nullification is *not a constitutional* mode of resistance; it may be peaceable, but is not peaceful; that when a State government resists a law of Congress, the United States government may enforce it. That when the people of a State resort to their sovereign rights, to resist a law, *she ipse facto, secedes*, and secession must inevitably produce disunion.—Gov. Troup may have *turned* a Federalist, if the people believe this, they must condemn him and ourselves.

ATTICUS.