The New-Orleans Bee.

No. 920. VOL. IX.—NEW SERIES.
VOL. XXII.—WHOLE No. 3080.

OFFICIAL PAPER OF GENERAL COUNCIL. ——NEW-ORLEANS, THURSDAY MORNING, JUNE 28, 1849.

MAGNE & WEISSE, Proprietors.
No. 62 CHARTRES STREET.

TERMS OF THE BEE.

DAILY PAPER, one year in advance.....$12 00
COUNTRY TRI-WEEKLY, do. do.....5 00
In all cases the subscription must expire once a week, notice in writing before he can be allowed to discontinue.

ADVERTISEMENTS—One dollar for every TEN lines, for each language, on the first insertion, and HALF that sum for each subsequent one. No Advertisement to be inserted for less than one dollar in each language.

Advertisements not specified as to time will be published one month and charged accordingly.

Advertisements inserted at intervals will be charged one dollar for every TEN lines, for each language and for each insertion.

☞ The privilege of Annual Advertisers is limited to advertisements strictly within the line of their business, and in extent to one square every other day.

Notice.

No person is authorized to receipt for the proprietors of the Bee, but Mr. E. Duverger, our book keeper, and Messrs. E. Morton Quirk and Delaney Wells, our collectors. MAGNE & WEISSE.

New Orleans 3d April, 1849.

FOR GOVERNOR,
ALEXANDER DECLOUET.

FOR LIEUT. GOVERNOR,
DUNCAN F. KENNER,

For Auditor of Public Accounts,
LOUIS BORDELON.

For Congress,
FIRST DISTRICT
O. P. JACKSON.

SECOND DISTRICT,
CHARLES M. CONRAD.

The New-Orleans Daily Bee

Thursday Morning, June 28, 1849.

The Republican Principle.

The monarchical organs of Europe are seeking every 5 minutes a sort of democracy to find the cure for all its diseases and strife. Popular governments, with them, is a thing to be dreaded, denounced and cursed. In their blind and fiery zeal against the so-called Republicans who are overthrowing and quelling riots and subverting heavy despotisms, the defenders of absolutism grasp at every argument, however unreasonable and shallow, that seemingly adds to give color to their theories. The London *Times*, for instance, which has an ebullition and inveterate reference for Kingly power, and which has labored most earnestly to prove that self-government can lead to nothing but misery and failure, does not hesitate to employ as cogent reasons such wretched sophistry as the following:

"What do the examples of the last year teach us? The people have had it all their own way, and what is the result? They have thrown up barricades, beaten regular troops, and decreed constitutions. And what are the fruits thereof? Germany convulsed; Italy upheaving with threatened war; France again committed to a conflict of two ancient parties; trade checked, commerce hampered and murdered, and Europe flood with new projects of social change, which exclude the idea of property." In spite of a fifty years' trial since the Chamber of Universal Suffrage in Paris had its first meeting under the protective auspices of horse, foot and artillery, it is now a settled maxim, that New York was pretty well governed, who has been distanced by the superior prescription of receiving riots. The same feeling which in America excluded in substantial abuse of Mr. Macready, and the British would, if it had the power, arrest all the property, order, and the common whatsoever between man and man.

The argument in the foregoing paragraph is equally false, in its application to Europe and to the United States. It can hardly be supposed that so able a logician as the *Times* can overlook the fact that in ascribing the throes and convulsions of Europe to the influence of popular government, he is mistaking causes for effects. The latter have not yet been witnessed, nor can they be until the principle of self-government is firmly established. At present, Europe is in the transition state. The people have dethroned monarchy, but they have not yet substituted Republicanism for it. They are struggling against the still resisting power of baffled Absolutism, and until they can successfully put their feet upon the monster's throat, they cannot expect true glory and peace. The *Times* has not seen the effects of popular sovereignty in Europe and pledges the case most unfairly, when it assumes that disturbances and commotion and insubordination are the necessary results of the application of the principle.

Last, however, its sophistical doctrine be at once annihilated by a reference to the condition of things in the United States, where, for more than half a century, the experiment has been attended with splendid success, the *Times* adroitly and gladly seizes upon the recent riots in New York, as an evidence that the principle is prolific of nothing but abuses. This would be deemed a stupid fallacy in a paper of less acknowledged ability; but we suppose the *Times* puts it forth, either for want of a better reason, or because any denunciation of republics, however involvedly sustained, suits a certain class of its readers. Every body in this country must be aware that the assertion of the London paper rejoices upon which Jeames calls "a false fact." The New York riots had not their origin in any struggle or spite between the Democratic and aristocratic principle. Such a sentiment never for one instant entered into the minds of the rioters. Their real cause was intense prejudice against Mr. Macready, cherished by the rowdy populace of New York, of which Mr. Forrest is a special favorite. The "Bowery b'hoys," as they are called, believed that Macready had traduced Forrest, and had endeavored to kill the dramatic reputation, and they were determined Macready should not play. The authorities and the supporters of law and order were equally determined that he should play, and hence the explosion and its consequences. It collision between aristocracy and democracy lay at the bottom of the fracas, we should have, every month, similar scenes to record in all our great cities. The *Times* must be hard driven for an argument against Republicanism, when it has to impress in its service such miserable twattle.

As to New York being "terrified" by the riot, this is a huge poetical license assumed by the writer to give an outside show to his argument. There was no danger whatever of any other violence than was attempted upon the Astor House. The energy of the proceedings too, by which the lawless outbreak was checked, speaks volumes in behalf of the vigor of a Republican government—a fact which the Tory journal deems it prudent to suppress. It might have added, too, that if disorderly sought trouble, it had the power, and could at all points preserve order, and to the utmost whatsoever between man and man.

The argument in the foregoing paragraph is equally false, in its application to Europe and to the United States. It can hardly be supposed that so able a logician as the *Times* can overlook the fact that in ascribing the throes and convulsions of Europe to the influence of popular government, he is mistaking causes for effects. The latter have not yet been witnessed, nor can they be until the principle of self-government is firmly established. At present, Europe is in the transition state. The people have dethroned monarchy, but they have not yet substituted Republicanism for it. They are struggling against the still resisting power of baffled Absolutism, and until they can successfully put their feet upon the monster's throats they cannot expect true glory and peace. The *Times* has not seen the effects of popular sovereignty in Europe and pledges the case most unfairly, when it assumes that disturbances and commotion and insubordination are the necessary results of the application of the principle.

Last, however, its sophistical doctrine be at once annihilated by a reference to the condition of things in the United States, where, for more than half a century, the experiment has been attended with splendid success, the *Times* adroitly and gladly seizes upon the recent riots in New York, as an evidence that the principle is prolific of nothing but abuses. This would be deemed a stupid fallacy in a paper of less acknowledged ability; but we suppose the *Times* puts it forth, either for want of a better reason, or because any denunciation of republics, however involvedly sustained, suits a certain class of its readers. Every body in this country must be aware that the assertion of the London paper rejoices upon what