

*The Cherokees and the Journal of Commerce.*—We have ever condemned the undue interference of one state with another, where the subject is wholly a matter of local concern. In politics as in trade, we hold the axiom as one founded on sound economy, "let us alone." One state has no right to interfere with another in her internal regulations. We are each sovereign and independent, and entitled to the sole direction of our own affairs. What excuse have we then for an interference with each other? How can the municipal regulations of New York affect the state of Georgia, and vice versa? And not being affected, why should we trouble ourselves or our neighbors in what does not concern us? In this respect we are happy to say the southern states have been "more sinned against than sinning." They have acted towards their northern brethren with dignity and generosity; while, from the formation of our constitution—yea, even from the declaration of independence, there has been attempt after attempt on the part of the north to interfere in our local polity, and to dictate to and influence our course in affairs which belong wholly to ourselves. Not as government against government—here we hope the harmony of the Union remains unshaken—but by prying, querulous, meddling individuals, who are never so well pleased as when they can find aught, however imaginary, upon which to vent their spleen in other men's business. Knights errant of the true quixotic stamp, who will risk life and

limb, political and domestic harmony and happiness, for the love of broil and adventure; and who are ready to run a tilt for every dowdy Dulcinea, and draggle-tailed blanketed squaw, whom they imagine may need their services. Where do we find the southern states interfering with the internal regulations of the north? They were allowed to pursue their own policy in regard to the aborigines inhabiting within their jurisdiction, without any interference on our part. We are not continually pestering them and finding fault. Even in their darling "American system," whose inevitable tendency will be, should it succeed, to make more abject, absolute slaves of free born American citizens, than is the *veriest African with us—whose tendency will be not only to build up an absolute aristocracy over men born free, but over God's fairer portion of creation, and their darling little ones—for this is a never failing consequence of overgrown manufacturing establishments—we say with these things glaring in our faces, when have we interfered, or even complained?*

These remarks have been elicited from us by a notice taken in the New York Journal of Commerce of our article of the 7th ult. in relation to the conduct of the state of New York towards her aboriginal inhabitants, as contrasted with that of the state of Georgia. We shall now endeavor to reply to that article in as concise a manner as we can. As to the charges of "pert," "personal abuse," and the like, they can go for what they are worth. We would barely remark, that they who live in glass houses should not throw stones; and ask whether the wish that the Indians "had the power to chastise their persecutors," was not also somewhat "pert" and "personal."

"Seizing upon 1,167,360 acres of Cherokee territory, under pretexts which we now venture to say will never bear the light." Not so, Mr. Editor—but "seizing" (if you choose to use that word) upon lands which have long since been ceded by the Creeks; lands, which were "seized" upon by the Cherokees, and which they have been long labouring to obtain something like a title to from the United States, knowing they had none from the Creeks, to whom it belonged, by whom it was ceded to the United States, and by that power to the state of Georgia. This is the true state of the question, and here is the ground of our title. So far from seizing upon the Cherokee lands we are actually wresting from them what *they* have seized upon, and to which they have no more shadow of a title than to the state of New York. Does the editor of the Journal of Commerce want proof of this fact? We refer him to the letter of Gen. Jackson (a disinterested witness) of as early a date as June 1816, for an impartial report. There it will be seen that a false statement was got up as to the boundary between the Creeks and Cherokees, by these "persecuted Cherokees," and which, but for the watchful perspicacity of our now excellent president, might have been credited, and the lands have remained with the Cherokees. Lest they might not have Gen. Jackson's letter at hand, we will give them his own words in two short extracts. "At an early period after reaching what is now called Fort Strother, information was given me by the Creek chiefs, that the lands of their nation extended much higher up than Will's Creek, the boundary shown by the Cherokees; that they extended as high as the mouth of the Hightower, and along the Creek path to the Tennessee, where it crossed that river. They stated that the Cherokees were settled on lands belonging to them as low down the Coosa as the mouth of Will's creek, which had been loaned them by their nation." Again—"They [the Creeks] stated that it was insisted by the Cherokees, that now as they [the Creeks] were about to cede a portion of their country to the United States, they should previously to concluding the treaty, recognize their [the Cherokees] boundary to include lands to which, as they [the Creeks] allege, the Cherokees had not, nor ever had a title: this they positively refused." Here is the title of the state of Georgia clearly set forth to lands which, the Editor of the Journal of Commerce says, "one year ago no Georgian ever dreamed of as belonging to the state."

"The conduct of Georgia in relation to these people, since the accession of George M. Troup to the chair of government, has been violent and unmerciful in the extreme." Here is another *genical* sentence, which we presume in the eyes of the editor of the Journal, is neither "pert" nor "personal." We will, however, endeavor to answer it. We commence with the broad assertion, that the Georgians are the best friends the Indians have. We have already asked what has become of the Delawares, the Iroquois, the Mohawks, &c. of the state of New York, and we might refer to many other large and powerful tribes who have met their melancholy fate elsewhere. Where are they now? Why they remained among us, and they are extinct! "butchered, persecuted and oppressed by the white man, till the memory of their glory is written only in the monuments of past generations!" This the editor of the Journal admits has been their sad fate in New York, and can we hope that it will be otherwise in Georgia? What is the language of Georgia to the Cherokees? Leave us--fly--save yourselves from annihilation--all the laws ever made cannot protect you here--your fate is inevitable if you stay among us--the effects of ardent spirits and the cupidity of the whites are certain destruction, which no law can reach--go to a land provided for you beyond the Mississippi--a land much better than that which you leave--there your brethren stand ready to receive you--there the government of our common country will shield you--there you will be safe, prosperous and happy. Is this violent and unmerciful? Or is it not much more unmerciful to let them remain among us to perish? Do we not manacle the maniac? Do we not wrest from him the deadly weapon? And shall we not use every means to save these people from self-destruction by remaining where they are? But we have not as yet deprived the Cherokees of *their* lands, or driven them away. The lands which we have taken are *our own*, and the Cherokees yet remain on their own lands, with the exception of such of them as have chosen voluntarily to emigrate.

It is an easy matter to pen high-toned speculations, fraught with the best feelings of kindness and humanity, towards these people, when they are viewed through the softening atmosphere of a thousand miles. But go among them--see the degradation that they are already sunk into--the abject poverty which they are in--and the absolute despotism exercised by a few leading men among them,--their councils, the press, and every other engine that they are in possession of wielded at their behest and for their behoof--and humanity calls loudly for a different order of things. It is a fact, that some of them died last year from absolute starvation; and many of them move about without sufficient clothing to protect them from the weather, or to cover their nudity.

But the most important feature in this matter has, by some means or other, been entirely overlooked by the editor of the Journal; and that is, that *every step which Georgia has taken in it, has been pressed upon her by urgent necessity. The laws of the state have been*

prospectively extended over their territory. But were they not erecting an independent government within our jurisdiction, and were we not under the necessity of either admitting their right, or asserting and establishing our own? The true line has been marked, and the land run off: But would the Indians designate or admit such line without our interference? We ask whether New York or any other state would not have done the same under like circumstances? Surely they would. The first step was necessary to our sovereignty, and the last to a knowledge of our boundary.

In conclusion, humanity and necessity call loudly for the removal of the aborigines from among us. If they go not, they may, for a while, retard the progress of the useful arts and civilization in that part of our state, and they themselves will perish. Nor have they generally a wish to stay. A few interested half-breeds and quarteroons, who have risen to eminence among them, and who are fattening upon their lands, these are the men who are so violently opposed to removal; but the poor destitute red man, who is roaming a solitary amid the desolations of his tribe, would gladly remove to the west of the Mississippi, were not disgrace and assassination threatened as the consequence of any overt movement. How far these men are sustained and encouraged by the countenance and support of such articles in the northern prints as that which we are animadverting upon, we leave to the editor of the Journal of Commerce to determine.