

THE WEEKLY HERALD.

JAS. B. SWORDS, Publisher. W. B. SPEARS, Editor.

DAILEY SUBSCRIPTION: One Year, in Advance, \$10.00; Six Months, in Advance, \$6.00; Three Months, in Advance, \$3.50. WEEKLY SUBSCRIPTION: One Year, in Advance, \$1.00; Six Months, in Advance, \$0.60.

SATURDAY, OCT. 1, 1870.

REPRIEVE OF THE MURDERER, CREED TAYLOR.

This man was to have been hung to-day, but the execution of his sentence has been delayed by the Governor until the 21st inst. There was an error in the Executive order, but we presume the Sheriff will comply with the order without regard to the error. Taylor was sentenced to be hanged on the 1st day of October, which is to-day, Saturday. The stay of execution made by the Governor applies to a Creed Taylor, who was sentenced to be hanged on Friday, the 30th of September. We are aware that a strong effort was being made to secure a commutation of punishment for this man. Interested negroes have been industriously riding over the county, for a week or two, to secure signatures to a petition to Governor Alcorn, praying that Taylor might not be executed. Many names were appended to this petition but they were all negroes except here and there an office seeking carpet-bagger or scoundrel.

Early last spring, Taylor was employed as a laborer on the plantation of Mr. George Markham, of this county, and while so employed viciously murdered a son of Mr. Markham, a child of years of age. He was arraigned, tried before an impartial jury and sentenced to be hung on this day and the sentence would have been executed but that the Governor has seen fit to postpone the execution until the 21st inst. This action was generally anticipated and the probabilities are that he will never come to the gallows. We have yet to record the faithful carrying out of a death sentence against a negro in this section of the State.

During the late war in the United States much feeling was manifested and entertained in the South towards General Bragg for the stern discipline which he maintained in the army, and he was subject to much severe criticism because he found it necessary occasionally to order a military execution. The number of these executions were, however, greatly exaggerated, as shown in the statement which obtained soon after General Bragg was superseded by General Joseph E. Johnston, which was that Gen. Johnston had caused more men to be shot the first week that he was in command than General Bragg had during the whole time he was in full command. We present here a characteristic story of this alleged merciless and general execution by Gen. Bragg.

On one of his forced marches Gen. Bragg and staff espied a ragged, barefooted tatterdermalion, with cob pipe alight in his mouth, astride a sorry specimen of a horse, upon which was neither saddle nor bridle, but which was guided by the nondescript soldier, with his canteen strap, one end of which was tied around the lower jaw of the horse. General Bragg accosted him with: "What is your name, sir?" "Peter Jones," was the nonchalant reply. "Where are you going?" "Along this road." "To whose cavalry command are you attached?" "What cavalry?" "Why the cavalry of the army." "What army?" "Mine; Bragg's army. What other do you suppose?" In open-eyed astonishment, the soldier said: "Bragg's army! Bragg's army! Why! Bragg has no army! One half was killed at Perryville the other day, and he had the remainder shot yesterday morning before breakfast."

Now the telegraph informs us that Trochu has caused two hundred of the *Garde Mobile* to be shot in Paris for insubordination. This number, we venture the assertion, is greatly in excess of all the military executions known in the Southern army during the entire war, notwithstanding General Bragg had such reputation as a heartless, terrible, moody and bloodthirsty man, who caused his soldiers to be shot upon the most frivolous pretexts.

COINCIDENCES OF EVENTS.

The history of the American slave-holders' rebellion and the history of Napoleon's war against Prussia are singularly similar in their origin, incidents and results.

The slave-holders declared war without a reasonable excuse or a justifiable provocation. Napoleon did the same. The object of the slave-holder's war was to rescue their "peculiar institution" from apprehended overthrow, and to perpetuate its existence. Napoleon's object was to strengthen his tottering Empire, and perpetuate his family dynasty. The failure in the one case was as complete and disastrous as in the other. The slave-holders' darling "institution" was overthrown; Napoleon's Empire has been destroyed.

The rebels in our country expected to make the enemy's territory the scene of the war's blood shed and desolation. Napoleon expected the same. Both were sadly and terribly disappointed, the war in each case having been pushed into and confined to the territory of the beginner of the war.

To complete the analogy, both the leaders of the two unfortunate powers were captured, the one at the head of his army—the other in the act of running away in his wife's gown. It remains to be seen, however, whether the Prussians will let off their distinguished captive as lightly as we did ours.

"There is a divinity that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we will." The war that was inaugurated in this country to save slavery proved to be the means, in the hands of Providence, of its destruction and the establishment of a free Republic in its stead. Verily, "man proposes, but God disposes."—Chicago Journal.

Now it would be decidedly too great a compliment to the author of the above to say that he is mistaken both in his premises and his deductions, therefore, we shall, on this occasion, borrow language from the Honorable Horace Greeley, and say that the "Knaave lies, wilfully and maliciously lies."

There is no kind of similarity whatever between the two wars, and there is no "coincidence of events" either "strange" or otherwise.

The "slave-holders" never "declared war" with or "without a reasonable excuse or justifiable provocation." They simply defended themselves against a war, which was never "declared" on either side, but which was inaugurated by the North when it sent its armies on to Southern soil and made the first fight at Bethel.

The "object of the slave-holders" was not "to rescue their peculiar institution," but it was to become separated from an aggressive, interfering, dishonest and untruthful people, who were not satisfied to attend to their own legitimate affairs, but must be continually thrusting their blue noses, puritanical cant and peevish fingers into affairs which in no way concerned them.

"The rebels in our country expected to make the enemy's territory the scene of the war's bloodshed and desolation." They expected to do nothing of the kind. The policy of the Confederate Government was always averse to it, and only twice during the whole war was the "enemy's territory invaded," and that was towards the close. Opportunity was often recurring but it was rebuffed at the South since we simply desired to "be let alone."

The "analogy is" not "complete," because the Southern Chief was not captured "in the act of running away in his wife's gown." General Wilson, whose command captured President Davis, has time and again made public denial of this atrocious slander of a great, good, pure and brave man. One who, under the flag of the United States had shed imperishable renown upon the arms of the common country; one who in the Senate Chamber of the United States, was the peer of the brightest statesmen of the day; one who was never known to indulge in a little or dishonorable transaction of any grade, and who on every occasion and under all circumstances, has been recognized by

all classes of people of all sections, as being of the purest of the pure.

"The war that was inaugurated in this country to save slavery, proved to be the means, in the hands of Providence, of its destruction and the establishment of universal liberty throughout the nation." It did nothing of the kind. It destroyed the last vestige of true liberty; it saddled an enormous and consuming debt upon the people, and turned the forms of government, with unbridled power, over to a set of the grandest scoundrels, thieves, perjurers and villains who ever disgraced a nation.

"It remains to be seen whether the Prussians will let off their distinguished captive as lightly as we did ours." Here also the analogy ceases. The Radical, Yankee government seized President Davis, and manacled him like a common felon; immured him in a miserable prison, and kept him there for months, that their cowardly eyes might gloat upon the sufferings which he was forced to endure, with the hope, doubtless, that his proud, pure spirit would break and topple "as were breaking his physical powers. Indignities of every character were showered upon him, and the miserable, petty, tyrannical vengeance of a corrupt Government was wreaked upon one poor disarmed, defenceless old man, for acts which had been committed by a whole people. Napoleon, on the other hand, is given a luxurious home at Wilhelmsoeh, the Queen of Prussia detaching her own *chef de cuisine* from her royal household to attend upon him; while upon all sides, from the highest to the lowest, he receives naught but marks of respect and sympathy, and tokens of kindness.

The scribbler for the Chicago Journal, not satisfied with the butchery and annihilation of truth, indulges in horrible mutilation of his quotations. Imagine the horror depicted in the countenance of the author, should he see his lines rendered thus: "There is a divinity that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we will."

There is a vacancy on the Supreme Bench of the United States, occasioned by the death of Justice Grier. Now we presume His Excellency, Incompetency I. appointed the Hon. Amos Ackerman, Attorney General, that the South might be represented in the Cabinet (and an horrible representative it has too.) The next duty which His Excellency owes to mankind is to give the "man and brother" a representative on the Supreme Bench. Fred Douglas won't do because he is an aspirant for the Vice-Presidency and Revels is certain to receive the Radical nomination for President. Therefore, we know of no one more fitted for, or more entitled to the position than the Hon. A. Alpeira Bradley. It is said he has served a term in the penitentiary and is therefore eminently fitted to receive nomination and office at the hands of the Radicals. "By their works shall ye know them" and for their works, if sufficiently villainous, is Radicalism certain to reward them.

ELECTIONS occur on the 11th inst., in the following States: Indiana, Iowa, Nebraska, Ohio and Pennsylvania. In Indiana in 1868, the Radical majority for Governor Baker was 961, while in November the majority for Grant was 9,572. In Iowa the Radical majority the same year for Governor was 39,145. In Nebraska, in 1868, the Radical majority for Governor was 2,491, and Grant's majority in the November succeeding was 4,290. In Ohio, for the same year the Radical majority for Governor was 7,518. And in Pennsylvania the aggregate Radical majority for Congressmen in 1868, was 6,803. An election occurs on the 27th inst., in West Virginia, which in 1868 gave a Radical majority for Governor Stevenson, of 4,717, and elected three Radical Congressmen, Nathan Goff, Jr., James C. McCrew and John B. Wilcher, with an aggregate majority of 4,880.

HON. WILLIAM L. SHARKEY'S LETTER TO THE OLD WHIGS OF HANKIN.

HIS VIEWS IN RELATION TO A WHIG CONVENTION.

BRANDON, Miss., Sept. 14, 70. Hon. Wm. L. Sharkey—

DEAR SIR: The undersigned, among your old personal and political friends, would be pleased to learn your views on the political situation, and particularly on the proposition "for a meeting of Old Line Whigs, at Jackson, for consultation."

Very respectfully, Your obedient servant, Jas. S. Hobson, Joseph Hudnall, W. D. Bibb, Thos. S. White, A. G. Mayers, A. Harpers, A. J. Frantz.

JACKSON, Sept. 20, 1870. To Messrs. Joseph Hudnall, Thos. S. White, A. Harper, John S. Hobson, Wm. D. Bibb, A. G. Mayers and A. J. Frantz.

GENTLEMEN: By your favor of the 14th inst. you ask my views on the political situation, but particularly on the proposition "for a meeting of Old Line Whigs, at Jackson, for consultation."

The call for such a convention was to me matter of surprise, as I could not see how it could result in any good to Whigs or to the country. The criticisms which the proposition drew from the public press, I had supposed, had put an end to the project. In this, however, I may be mistaken, and as you ask for my "views on the propriety of the proposition," I proceed to give them. But my opinions, without reasons to support them, would probably be of little value; I must, therefore, to some extent, give you the reasons on which my opinions are founded.

The call professed to be for a meeting of the Whigs of the State "for consultation." The folly of such a meeting, merely for such a purpose, is so manifest that we must conclude there was some other motive, some ulterior purpose other than consultation—that consultation was but preliminary to action. The question naturally presents itself, what can that motive be? The Whigs, if they were completely organized as a party, would be in a meagre minority in the State, and, separated from Democrats, could not elect a single State or district officer.—They might possibly elect a few justices of the peace, but consultation for such an insignificant purpose cannot be necessary, even if an election were near at hand. Then, I repeat, what can the motive be?

There are now but two parties in the State, or in the United States—the Republican or Radical party, and the Conservative or Democratic party. Is it contemplated by such a convention to take the Whigs in a body to one or the other of these parties? and if so, to which one? It cannot be to take them to the Democratic party; for a great majority of them, perhaps four-fifths, actuated by their deep-rooted aversion to usurpation and mis-government, are already co-operating with that party, and, as far as I know, are satisfied with their affiliation.

As we must judge of men's motives by their actions, and must suppose they intended to accomplish that which must necessarily be the effect of their actions, in the absence of proof to the contrary, I must conclude that it was contemplated by the movement to give strength to the Radical party, for such undoubtedly would be its effect; and would result in one of three ways: First, by uniting the Whigs and taking them in a body to the Radicals; secondly, by inducing them to separate themselves from the Democratic party; and thirdly, by uniting them as a body in a third party. All of these plans would tend to the same result.

It is not likely the first would be successful, as it is scarcely probable the Whigs, as a body, could be induced to abandon the great and distinguishing principles of their old party, and to join a party with doctrines antagonistic to theirs, although some few may have already done so. The second would promise better success. If they could be induced to separate themselves from the Democratic party they would be in a condition in which they could do nothing, and would be likely, when the trial came, to co-operate with one of the parties. Having just broken off from the Democratic party, they would not be likely to go back to it, and besides, they would be abundantly courted by the other party, and probably might be induced to act with it, or at least a portion of them might be induced to do so, which would be just so much strength gained by it.

The third way in which this movement would strengthen the Radical party is this: unite the Whigs as a third party, co-operating with neither of the others, and of course it would be just so much strength withdrawn from the opposition party, and by just so

much would the other party be strengthened.

In any point of view, then, the Radicals would be the gainers. This is simply my view as to what would be the result of such a convention as that contemplated, if it should take any action at all, as it was no doubt expected it would. I do not charge the gentlemen who made the call with designs like these, yet I have no doubt such would be the consequences of their action if carried out. They may have acted, unwittingly, as the innocent instruments of others, for I am strongly inclined to believe the scheme had its origin in the hotbed of New England Radicalism.

But why should the Whigs be unwilling to act in unison with the Democratic party? There are now but two parties, and but a single issue before the country: that issue is, Is the Constitution paramount to the will of Congress? or is the will of Congress paramount to the Constitution? The party questions on which the Whigs and Democrats formerly divided are utterly obliterated, and if they formerly engendered animosities there is no sense or propriety in keeping these animosities alive when the causes which produced them have ceased to exist. The party now known as the Democratic party is an opposition party, a new party of Whigs and Democrats united for the purpose of restoring the Constitution to its primitive vigor by utterly abrogating every innovation that has been made upon it. This is the high, the chief purpose of the Democratic party, all other questions being subordinate to this.

What is the Republican or Radical party? The doctrines or principles which had originally distinguished that party from others, ended with the war. They were then exhausted, but very soon it began a new system of tactics. It commenced by denying representation to the Southern States, although the people had established for themselves State governments, as they had a right to do, which governments were in successful operation. Senators and Representatives were elected, who went to Washington and claimed their seats, which were denied them in direct violation of the Constitution. The next step was to tax the Southern people heavily without representation—the very grievance that brought on the American Revolution. Congress next assumed unlimited power over the State governments, abolished them and substituted military despotisms over the people, with unlimited power in the military commanders over the lives, liberties and property of the people, in utter disregard of the most sacred guarantees of the Constitution. But this is not all; State Constitutions and amendments to the Constitution of the United States were dictated to and forced upon the people. The validity and propriety of these measures now constitute the cardinal principles of the party; all other questions which may be put in platforms are but side issues intended to divert attention from the main issue. Of course, all who belong to the party must believe all these reconstruction measures to be valid and within the constitutional power of Congress. Any one who does not so believe should promptly abandon the party, for it is said to be hypocrisy to belong to a church and disbelieve its creed. I not only believe these measures flagrant violations of the constitution, but utterly destructive of the foundation and superstructure of the government; hence, as between these parties, the path of duty seems plain to me.

But, at the cost of being somewhat prolix, I propose to extend my remarks on this question somewhat further: Is it supposed that the Whigs throughout the United States will rally and unite at the call of a little band in Mississippi—break up their party affiliations and organizations which have existed for over three years, and thus abandon all prospect, all hope of defeating the Radical party, which is now, and has been their cherished object, and for which purpose they first united with the Democrats? Will they thus strengthen the party they have been so vehemently opposing, and insure its success? Will they abandon all hope of restoring constitutional liberty as guaranteed to them by their fathers?—They will be guilty of no such folly; and therefore, a Whig convention in Mississippi would be an object of ridicule, and nothing better for all the Whigs of the Southern States were to unite.—The Whigs, even if united as a national party, could do nothing, and our Northern friends see this, and will not place themselves in such a condition. In view of the former course of Mississippi they will not be very likely to follow its lead. Mississippians had better follow than attempt to lead: this should be our policy.

If any one should entertain such deep-rooted prejudice against the name Democrat that he cannot enter into that party for the ac-

complishment of even a good purpose, he is not governed by principle, but by passion: he sinks his principles under his prejudice. He should remember that the former difference between Whigs and Democrats was a question of degree rather than of principle. And how can he go to a party whose excesses as far surpass those of the Democratic party as the rays of the sun surpass in brightness the mild beams of the moon. I have no such prejudice, nor can I forget that opposition to the usurpations of Congress—opposition to its oppression of the South—opposition to its arbitrary exercise of despotic power over the Southern people—opposition to its utter disregard of all the reserved rights of the States, was first commenced by the Northern Democracy, though then greatly in a minority. Their noble efforts deserve the highest commendation, and I shall not abandon them to join the party that has oppressed us. I am not particular about names, but look to principles and purposes.

There may be some who reason in this way: "The Radical party is in power. It will pursue and carry out its policy at any rate, and why oppose it? It is better to go with it." Those who thus reason commit a great error, an error fatal to the perpetuity of any free government. It was once said by an eminent man that, "for a people to be free, it is but for them to will it." With far more truth may it be said, that for a people to be slaves it is but for them to assent to it, or to acquiesce in the abuse of power. The people ought to know that their liberty is protected only by their Constitution unimpaird and held inviolate, and that it will fall to protect them against the encroaching spirit of power when they passively submit to its violation. Their only hope lies in a determined, persevering resistance to every infringement, by all the means in their power. A bad precedent tolerated becomes law, and is sure to be followed by others still more aggravated. Thus their Constitution soon becomes an obsolete form, observed by none, respected by none. To this end is the policy of the Radical party rapidly tending; and for this reason—to arrest such a calamity—the Whigs and Democrats have united as a party to oppose them.

In view of the adverse policy of the two parties, the reader of English history will at once see the resemblance which they respectively bear to the two parties in England, the Democrats to the Tories, under the reign of the Stuarts. Then the Tories sustained the monarch in the almost unlimited claims to enlarged prerogative, which he set up under the new theory of the divine right of kings; whilst the Whigs opposed the theory of divine right, as well as the excesses to which it led. For their opposition to the Tory doctrine and its destructive consequences to the British Constitution, the Whigs were persecuted in every variety of form, as well with as without the semblance of law. They were charged with disloyalty, even with treason, on frivolous grounds; and it was then an easy matter to obtain convictions on any charge, as the judges and juries were but the servile instruments of the Tory party. Sidney was charged with treason, and suffered on the scaffold, without any proof of guilt except that he had written essays against the Tory theory of the Divine Right. The Radicals or Tories here seem to exhibit a similar spirit of vindictiveness; loyalty now means fidelity to the party, as in England. They ostracise all who do not give in their adhesion to the party; they usurp the power of disfranchisement, and even to resort to military power to carry out their purposes. To join the Tory party in England worked immediate abolition, and was generally rewarded, as I believe is done here, even in the case of prominent rebels. It is to be hoped the time is not distant when the noble example of Halifax, who, becoming disgusted with the Tory party, left it, will be more generally followed here.

You also, gentlemen, ask my views of the political situation.—Perhaps to some extent I have already given them to you. I will only add, in the language of *Julius*, to the English people, "Let me exhort and conjure you never to suffer an invasion of your political constitution, however minute the instance may appear, to pass by without a determined, persevering resistance. One precedent creates another. They soon accumulate and constitute law. What yesterday was fact today is doctrine. Examples are supposed to justify the most dangerous measures, and when they do not suit exactly, the defect is supplied by analogy." These words constitute the very essence of wisdom with reference to government "with constitutional limitations like ours. Your constitution has been violated, grossly violated, in the measures

have mentioned; and a precedent has been set for other and further violations, daily for its total annihilation. Never submit to them, and submit you must, never acquiesce in them either expressly or tacitly, but manifest the most determined, persevering opposition to them by all the legitimate means in your power. If you cannot have your Constitution unimpaird, you cannot have a free government; and you cannot have it unimpaird so long as these reconstruction measures receive even a silent recognition. They must be blotted out, declared null and void, and if this cannot be done through the judiciary, the people must do it through the ballot-box. This is the only way to restore the Constitution. Any other plan is temporizing patch-work, and leaves himself to similar breaches hereafter on the face of posterity. In the great work of reform, the Whigs take the lead instead of meeting in convention to defeat it. I am, gentlemen, Your obedient servant, W. L. Sharkey.

The beauty of political opposition, of time-serving, of sacrifice of principle to policy has just been established in New York. The New York World in its fine Spanish theories, and its columns of gracious advice to the South has created and nurtured a political combination known as the "Young Democracy." The Radicals have very shrewdly encouraged the sentiments of this faction; the Sun being always prominent in praise of it. The organization has been since its creation under the control of O'Brien, Ledwith, Fox, Hayes and Morrissey, and as the New York Star says, the "New Southern Radicals."

This insignificant wing of so-called Democrats, born of temporizing and time-serving, have been so corrupted by the praise and adulation of the Radicals, that it has formally declared in favor of Stewart L. Woodford, the Radical candidate for Governor of New York.

Mississippi had a lesson of this kind last year, and yet there are men here who are not willing to be taught by it, and who wish to revive another time-serving, milk and water affair in which to wreck the few remaining rights and privileges with which the people are vested.

It is thus the Philadelphia Enquirer, Radical, arraigns and lectures its party for its shameful corruption and outrage:

"Men are taxed, but are not permitted representation; they are made subject to laws, but are not allowed to assist in framing them; they work in field or shop, thus aiding the prosperity of the whole country, yet in the country, even their own State, they have no stake.

Injustice can go no further than this, and the sooner an enlightened public sentiment enfranchises the whole Southern people the better for the peace and progress of the entire Union."

The yellow fever is on the increase in both Mobile and New Orleans.

THE MYSTERY OF EDWIN DROOD; by Charles Dickens. Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, New York, Publishers. For sale by H. C. Clarke, bookseller and stationer, Washington street, Vicksburg, Miss.

It was upon this work that the life of the great novelist was closed. For years he had been a welcome visitor at every fire side almost in the civilized world; he was the cherished, honored and loved guest of all, and now none of earth know him in the body save the grave. This, his last effort, will be read by all with deeper and more absorbing interest than has ever been aroused by any of his previous works. In reading it we feel almost as if we were communing with the dead, and it stimulates a mellowness unaccountable. This peculiar sensation is intensified in melancholy speculation of what that great brain, now dead and inert, would have wrought, could it have pulsed on for but a few short months more. It is fitting though that he should thus have given up his life, clothed as it were in the harness of his duty. As there is no end to the love which he bore his art, as there is no end to the influence for good which he has set in operation, so there should be no end to his best labor. Unfinished as is his book, so is human life. We leave the labor of earth, unaccomplished, and then it is that life which knows no end.