

"Mr. Lumpkin---Clark Party! Beware!---We have it from unquestionable authority, that an arrangement is on foot between this place and Charleston, S. C. to injure Mr. Lumpkin's election: that a member of the Troup party, not a hundred miles from Milledgeville, who represents himself to be of the Union party in Georgia, and whose name has been communicated to us---is in correspondence with a gentleman of the Union party in Charleston, for the purpose of proving that Mr. Lumpkin is a Nullifier. Now, this Troup man is not attached to the Union party of Georgia. He has gone all lengths with Troup and his doctrines. He approves of the very worst parts of Troup's letter to the Nullifiers.---As our information is too direct and respectable even to be questioned, we must express our surprise, that the Union party in Charleston should be opposing the Union party in Georgia, and that, through the intervention of one of our bitterest enemies here. But we are not surprised that that enemy should pass himself off abroad, as attached to the Union party, or a particular friend of the Union, while he goes the whole length with Troup and his destructive heresies.

"Mr. Lumpkin is not a Nullifier---nor a Disunionist. We know this, so far as one man can know the sentiments of another. We are authorised to say so: and we challenge the secret plotter to his proofs."

Now here is a pretty business. The Federal Union has it from "unquestionable authority" that Mr. Lumpkin is to be proved a Nullifier, and forthwith cautions his party to "beware"---not to believe it? and why? Because, forsooth, the proof is to be obtained by a Troup man. Oh, fear, fear, to what desperate straits, to what palpable blunders, dost thou sometimes drive the objects of thy influence! But there is one thing for which the article above is invaluable---it presents to the student a new system of logic, by which he will be enabled to disprove every statement that can be made on any subject. Here is an illustration. It is about to be proven that Mr. Lumpkin is a Nullifier. The person who obtains evidence for this purpose, is politically opposed to Mr. Lumpkin, and consequently any testimony he may obtain, is not entitled to credit. Ergo---Proof that Mr. Lumpkin is a Nullifier is no evidence at all of the fact. Beautiful!! Beautiful!!

Will the Federal Union tell us who "authorised" it to say Mr. Lumpkin is not a Nullifier---the people, perhaps would be better satisfied if they knew more of this matter. Did Mr. L. himself authorise such a declaration? If he did, it is right the public should be informed of it---if he did not, it is wrong to make the assertion so boldly. Until we have more specific information on the subject, we shall be disposed to doubt whether the Federal Union was "authorised" to make its denial from a source high enough to make us bound to place entire confidence in it. On the contrary, we happen to have in our possession something which will go far to prove that Mr. L. is favorably disposed towards the doctrine of Nullification. We may be induced to give it publicity ere long.