

Introductory.

In accordance with a custom coeval in its existence with American Journalism, we devote the leading column of the first number of this paper to a self introduction to those whom it is hoped may be numbered among its future patrons, and to the exposition and announcement of the principles and measures which we shall advocate.

The rapidly increasing population of our county, the permanent homes that are springing up around us in such profusion, the golden harvest fields, the lowing of the countless herds that dot the hill sides and the valleys, the smiling plenty with which we in this favored section of our State are endowed, and the bright days of prosperity that seem to be dawning upon us, are enough in themselves to indicate to every mind, that the Printing Press cannot lag far behind such advancement of domestic happiness, such rapid progress of American civilization.

Practically too, the want of a public medium for the dissemination of local and other information, is seriously felt, and to obviate that want, is one of the several objects in commencing the publication of this Journal. As a necessary accompaniment to our onward march of progress and prosperity then, we set sail upon the tide, and spread our canvass to the ripening breeze.

In all things tending to the local advancement of our county in her future career, we wholly and devotedly pledge our constant efforts. In the dissemination of such knowledge and facts as may be calculated to benefit her agricultural interests, our columns will at all times be carefully filled with a large share of information connected therewith, and will be open to the use of all who feel disposed to contribute to the same end.

As a newspaper, conveying to the public news, and other information that is usually sought for in the columns of the public Press, we shall strive ever to deserve the commendation of our

friends and patrons. And while it will be our aim to give variety in our melange of matter for the public perusal, we pledge ourselves never to give utterance to a word that will put to blush the most modest cheek, or invade the pure precincts of the family hearthstone with aught that can grate harshly upon the nerves of the most fastidious.

The cause of popular education, in us will have an advocate ready at all times to exhaust our humble powers in its behalf. Civil and religious liberty in its broadest and most liberal sense, is, and always will remain with us, a most sacred maxim. Politically, our name indicates our position. That Democracy, as handed down to us by the illustrious Jefferson and other spirits, whose name and fame will live forever in the hearts of a grateful people – as handed down by them – and as illustrated in the administration of the present Chief Magistrate of the Nation, James Buchanan, uncorrupted by the taint of ism, unsullied by the blighting stain of the immoral practices of soulless political demagogues, and unscrupulous office seekers – that Democracy that knows “no North, no South, no East, no West,” – nothing but our whole country, with the right preserved intact, for the people to form the Constitution and the law, as they choose it for their own government, is, in few words, the embodiment of our political creed, the sum and substance of our political faith. If that creed, and that faith is assailed or called in question, we shall at all times defend, or maintain it, with all the ability which we possess, in firm and dignified terms, without resort to the usual too frequent use of disgusting epithets, or low abuse.

To keep free from taint or suspicion the good name of the Democratic party throughout the Union, to expose and set the seal of condemnation upon all immoral practices of individuals or cliques, in the attainment of their desired ends, for political schemes or political advancement, will be our constant care – nor shall we ever falter in that course, fall the blow where it may, so be it, we lay bare corruption and political fraud, and thus destroy it.

Morally, socially, and politically, such is our position, and such position we aim to maintain and preserve at all times, and under all circumstances. Under these avowed principles we are afloat upon the tide of public favor – by the fiat of that public we sink or swim.

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

- Sonoma Democrat, October 22, 1857

THE SONOMA DEMOCRAT. - We have received the first number of hebdomadal paper, bearing the above caption, published at Santa Rosa, by Alpheus W. Russell. From its name we suppose it to be the advocate of national democratic measures and principles, and the special champion of the democratic party of Sonoma county. As such it will probably receive liberal support from its political friends[.] Its editorials evince the ability and experience of their author. Typographically, the paper presents a fine appearance. - Trusting that neighbor Russell, "by industry will thrive," we cordially extend the [hand] of fellowship.

- Sonoma County Journal, October 30, 1857

DELINQUENT TAX-LIST.

We would again remind our readers that Monday next, in the day designated by the Sheriff of this county for the sale of property for delinquent taxes, in accordance with an act passed by the last Legislature and approved April 29, 1857.

We do not profess to be, what in common parlance is termed "learned in the law" — acquainted with the quirks and quibbles — but, after a careful perusal of all the sections and provisions of this act, defining as it does most plainly and unmistakably, the duties of the various officers connected with the levying and collecting of taxes, we have come to the conclusion that the

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

Sheriff has no legal right to sell the properly advertised, inasmuch as he has not complied with either the 13th or 15th sections of the act. There are other acts of non-conformity to the law of which we are cognizant, but the glaring violation of the 15th section, is sufficient for our purpose at present. The following is a portion of

SEC. 15. - "On or before the fourth Monday in November, the Tax Collector shall cause the delinquent list named in section 14 to be published, giving in said publication the name of the owner, (when known) of all the real estate and of all the improvements, together with such a condensed description of the property that it may be easily known, and also a similar condensed description of any real estate or improvements assessed in unknown owners, &c., &c."

Here is a plain, positive and definite law, — so plain that the way-faring man need not err, — the provisions of which are violated, both in regard to time of publication of notice of sale, and perspicuity in description of property. Even the mechanical execution of the publication is a violation of that portion of the statute which says the amount of taxes due shall be set opposite the name of each delinquent.

If the law means anything, it means something, and we think, without wishing to be considered invidious in our remarks, that the Sheriff should know that all the requirements of the statute had been strictly complied with, before proceeding further in the matter. An illegal sale would be an injury to the buyer as well as to the delinquent, and for which injury, the party causing it should be held responsible. It is only by strict conformity to the law, and a faithful enforcing of its mandate, that the requirements of justice can be attained. When an officer, either through ignorance or wilfulness, delegates to himself powers not conferred by the law, and assumes the right of interpreting and construing the statutes to suit his own convenience, which is too often the case, the provisional checks should be applied, in order to reduce him to the stature of a man.

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

For the purpose of testing its legality, we think it would be well for some of the delinquents to apply to the Court for an injunction restraining the sale, and by so doing all doubts in regard to the legality of the sale can be tested. By pursuing this course, it can be ascertained whether the assessment list was completed and given to the clerk of the Board of Supervisors, as required - whether the clerk gave the required notice of its reception - whether the Board of Equalization performed their duty within the allotted time - together with other requirements, which must be complied with, before the sale can be valid.

- Sonoma County Journal, December 18, 1857

The Petaluma Journal and the Delinquent List.

In the last Journal we see an article, purporting to be editorial, which manifests more spleen, chagrin, envy and malignity, than is usually found embodied in so small a space, accompanied by so little ingenuity and tact.

For the information of our readers we quote a portion of this sage document:

"We do not profess to be, what in common parlance is termed "learned in the law" – acquainted with the quirks and quibbles – but, after a careful perusal of all the sections and provisions of this act, defining as it does most plainly and unmistakably, the duties of the various officers connected with the levying and collecting of taxes, we have come to the conclusion that the Sheriff has no legal right to sell the properly advertised, inasmuch as he has not complied with either the 13th or 15th sections of the act. There are other acts of non-conformity to the law of

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

which we are cognizant, but the glaring violation of the 15th section, is sufficient for our purpose at present."

The writer next quotes an incomplete sentence from the 15th section of the law, and then says:

"Here is a plain, positive and definite law, — so plain that the wayfaring man need not err, — the provisions of which are violated, both in regard to time of publication of notice of sale, and perspicuity in description of property."

We will not stop to comment on the writer's boasted profound knowledge of the law, as is very forcibly implied by the construction of his language — that is, he is "not acquainted with the quirks and quibbles," but he would have us believe that he has stored his mind with all that richness of legal lore which looks with disdain upon all these attempts at prostituting the law to unholy purposes. It may be he has. We hope it is so. But, if so, why does he so suddenly abandon the honorable distinction to which these acquirements must entitle him, for the purpose of indulging his spleen and malignity, by ferreting out some of the most absurd and vicious quibbles imaginable, in order, as he evidently intends, to excite rebellion against a good and wholesome law, the provisions of which are so plain that "the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein"? A profound knowledge of the law, such as he would have us believe he possesses, is an honor to any man, even though he were endowed with ten times the caliber we believe him to possess. But can any man be stupid enough to think that he can convince this community that he is a profound lawyer, disdaining "the quirks and quibbles" of the pettifogger, while his sole effort is to force upon the mind of that public a quibble so low and shallow that no pettifogger before a backwoods justice presiding over a jury of three men, would dare stoop to it? For shame on so vain a boast, for the accomplishment of so mean an object. But though we do not intend to dispute his knowledge of the law, we must confess he has failed most signally to point out the violation of law he talks about so loudly. The following is the section referred to above:

“On or before the fourth Monday in November, the Tax Collector shall cause the delinquent list named in section 14 to be published, giving in said publication the name of the owner, (when known) of all the real estate and of all the improvements, together with such a condensed description of the property that it may be easily known, and also a similar condensed description of any real estate or improvements assessed in unknown owners, and also the name of every party delinquent for any tax on personal property, and also opposite each name or description give the amount of taxes including the costs herein before provided, due from each delinquent person or property. If a newspaper is published in the county, the publication by this section required shall be made by one insertion one time per week for three successive weeks, in some paper published in the county, or in a supplement to such newspaper; but if there is no newspaper published in said county, then the publication shall be made by posting up a written copy of the list in at least three conspicuous and public places in each township of the county, [Local provision for Contra Costa county.] Said publication shall also designate the time and place of commencing the sale, which time shall not be less than twenty-one days nor more than twenty-eight days from the first appearance of the publication, and the place shall be in front of the county court house.”

By the above it will be seen that “on or before the fourth Monday in November the Tax Collector “shall cause” the “delinquent list to be published.” If the wiseacre who writes for the Journal had studied the English language as thoroughly as he would have us believe he has studied the law, he would see that the text here does not say that on that day the Tax Collector shall have published, signifying an act complete and fully accomplished. Neither does it say that on that day he shall publish, which also, might be understood to mean an act that must be finished on that day; but, on the contrary, our law-makers very wisely avoided expressing themselves in language upon which a shallow-brained and superficial lawyer might hang his "quirks and quibbles," and so worded the law as clearly to express what they wanted, and in so doing, they have appointed the Sheriff to be the foreman of work to be done, not necessarily by himself, but by such agents as he may employ, and that on a day given, he shall see that the work of publication is duly put in process of completion – or shall do that which "shall cause it to be published."

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

But had the Legislature designed that the publication of the delinquent list should have been fully made on that day, they would have said so, and not left it subject to the "quirks and quibbles" of would-be wise men, who wish to evade the laws of the State. For be it known that the English language is capable of expressing such a wish, in words that will admit of no doubt. And moreover, we have evidence in this same law, that our legislators had a knowledge of that fact. For instance, section 13 says:

"On the third Monday in October in each year the Tax Collector shall, at the close of his official business for that day, enter upon the tax list or assessment roll, a statement that he has made a levy upon all the properly assessed in said roll and upon which the taxes have not been paid, &c."

Here, it will be seen, that an act is described which must be completed on the day specified. It is an act which can be accomplished by one person, and fully completed on the same day. Mark the difference in the way it is expressed.

Again, in section 14—

"On the Saturday next preceding the third Monday in November, the Tax Collector shall have completed a list of all the personal and property then owing taxes," &c.

The list here spoken of, is about the same as the one published. It requires three men working ten days to make it — about the same time required to put it in type. If the language here used had been thus: on the day mentioned the Tax Collector "shall cause to be made," could any man, unless blinded by envy, or bought with bribes, suppose that it meant the same that it now does? Certainly no one who knows as much as the Journal man thinks he does, could so understand it.

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

These examples show that the Legislature knew what they were doing when they worded the statute, and knowing there were men who would avail themselves of every possible "quirk and quibble" to avoid doing their part towards the support of the government, expressed themselves in language that defies the ingenuity of men of small capacity to misconstrue it. The provisions of the law quoted above, as to time, have all been strictly complied with, the duty prescribed in sec. 15 having been performed on Friday the 20th day of November, being two days in advance of the time allowed.

We scarcely need notice these wholesale slang assertions further. As to the description of the property, the list published in this county is a complete copy of the assessment roll, so far as pertains to the identification of the property, and contains a more complete description than any other delinquent list published in the State. — This part of the Journal's assertions is more ridiculously absurd than that in regard to time, and could we believe the author were sincere, we could regard him in no other light than that of a lunatic, so lost to all hope of recovery as to demand the sympathy of all who know of [illegible] mity. The truth is, there is too much "[illegible] ity" in this list to suit the individual presiding over the Journal. For, unwilling as he may be to pay his taxes, as a good citizen would do, he had rather conceal his own dereliction of duty, which is therein too plainly exposed.

Now, it is not a very hard matter to discern the real causes of the Journal's malignant attack upon the delinquent list; nor has the genius there presiding been over sagacious in concealing the cause of his chagrin. There is a thorn in his side, and he has conceived the idea that by giving vent to his spleen and malice, he would somewhat relieve the intensity of his suffering. The following sentence will serve to show where that thorn is located:

"Even the mechanical execution of the publication is a violation of that portion of the Statute which says the amount of taxes due shall be set opposite the name of each delinquent."

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

Here we are at once directed to the festering sore from which the Journal is suffering so intensely. It has enjoyed the exclusive patronage of the county officials all its life until quite recently, from which it has grown fat, and now seems to regard its place at the crib as a matter of right, and anything given in another quarter as something wrongfully taken from him. Thus, the Sheriff, the Clerk, the Board of Supervisors, and the Democrat, each in its turn, would suffer from the castigation of the Journal, were its splenetic tirade not built upon a foundation so palpably and ridiculously absurd as to rebound with increased fury upon its author.

- "Let the galled jade wince; Our withers are unwrung."

- Sonoma Democrat, December 24, 1857

For the Democrat.

MR. EDITOR: — Having observed in the last issue of the "Sonoma County Journal," an attack upon myself as Sheriff of Sonoma county; an attack as unjust, as ungenerous, as spleen and malignant feeling could invent, or as a mind bent on malicious mischief could publish, I deem it due to myself to make a short reply to the scurrilous article in question. And this reply shall be brief, and answer for all, for were I to attempt a replication to all who are disposed to avail themselves of technical quibbles in order to escape just taxation, there would be but little time left for official duties. Now, why does the editor of the Journal seek to incite his readers, the citizens of Sonoma and Mendocino counties to resist the payment of taxes? Why does he not himself commence the attack by an injunction? Is he not published as a delinquent? Most assuredly he is, and yet he would hide his diminished head, and ask others to do that which he himself has not the courage to do. But is there not another reason for this rebellious counseling? There is. The gentleman no longer enjoys official patronage, and in consequence thereof, with

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

Benedict Arnold for his model, he would sell his country for revenge. Away with such citizens. Neutrality in all things save opposition to the laws of the land.

This sapient editor most magnanimously admits that with the quirks and quibbles of the law, he knows nothing, but leaves us to infer that the law to him is as plain as the noon-day sun. Oh, ye gods and little fishes! that a legal luminary so dazzlingly bright should burst upon us in the 19th century. But I do not intend a discussion of the legal principles involved in the question. I shall proceed to discharge my duties and leave it to the courts of the country to decide whether the action is right or wrong.

E. L. GREEN, Sh'ff S. C.

Santa Rosa, 20th Dec., 1857.

- Sonoma Democrat, December 24, 1857

[reprint of Green letter to SD]

The above article, from the Santa Rosa Democrat of this week, signed by "E. L. Green, Sheriff," but evidently written by his man Friday, the model moral lawyer, shows conclusively that the article published in the Journal of last week, under the caption of "Delinquent Tax List," written and published by the undersigned during the editor's absence, has aroused the ire of the Santa Rosa junto, and called forth a maranotha from their chief counsellor upon the head of the editor of this paper.

Wou't [sic] somebody hold this high mettled charger? He has already bucked sufficient to show that he is unwilling to have the cincha of the law drawn closely around him, or to receive into his frothing mouth, the bit forged for such animals, by the assembled representatives of the people of California.

But pray, tell us what portion of the article referred to proves "so unjust and ungenerous." What is there wrong about it, and which point was it that touched the raw, and caused you to wince?" Did you think that some one of the clan had "peached," and that the Journal, as an independent paper, was about to unkennel the blood hounds and expose the schemes you were concocting to embroil the people of Sonoma and Mendocino in litigation, and thereby enrich yourself and your legal adviser, and at the same time liberally oil the machinery of the \$600 organ of the Santa Rosa clique? But why do you charge the editor of the Journal with trying to "incite the citizens of Sonoma and Mendocino counties to resist the payment of taxes," when you know that there was no such advice given in the article, and further, that he did not write it? Why also charge him with being a delinquent, when you well know how his name came thus advertised? Was not this "an attack as unjust, as ungenerous, as spleen and malignant feeling could invent?" And why refuse to discuss the legal principles involved in the question? Come, Mr. Friday, clear your throat, and speak out like a little man. If you can't see over nor around this pompous sheriff, stoop a little and peep between his legs, and tell the people why you are so anxious to make an illegal sale; and the cause of your sudden antipathy to an independent press. Have you just discovered that to the evil-doer - an independent press is a stumbling block, while to the honest it is a wall of defence?

But allow me, gentlemen, to ask you to take a second sober view of the offensive article, and ascertain if there really is any just cause given for venting your vindictive spleen upon one you knew to be innocent. There is no particular officer charged with dereliction of duty. So far as the Sheriff is concerned, I deem him guilty of wrong only so far as he willingly suffered himself to become the tool of the wily intriguers who advise and in whose counsel he no doubt placed implicit confidence. The burden of the guilt rests with his legal adviser, who, when he advised the sale of property for delinquent taxes, did it for the purpose of misleading the Sheriff and perverting justice, or else through an unpardonable ignorance of the law. I here venture tho

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

assertion that not one of the junto, dare in the face of the law and an enlightened public, say that that sale was legal! They well know that the requirements of the law have not been met.

What then are we to think of the man or set of men, who, Judas like, for a few pieces of silver, would deceive and betray those upon whose honest industry they are dependent for their support. But there are such men, and they invariably cry 'persecution,' when an independent press speaks of their acts of infamy. They also dodge the question, and try to divert attention from their own acts of duplicity by assailing the motives and actions of others. This blind will not answer this time; and if Sheriff Green has committed an illegal act, either through ignorance of the law or by following the advice of mercenary lawyers, it shall be made known, not withstanding the coyote snarling of a petty clique of political demagogues. Lest the authorship of this reply may be mistaken by the riled junto, I subscribe myself,

Pennypacker.

- Sonoma County Journal, December 25, 1857

THE DELINQUENT TAX SALE.

[..many lines of illegible microfilm..]

If, therefore, we view the sections singly or as a whole, the conclusion must be the same - that Sheriff Green has failed to comply with the law. The writer in the Democrat is certainly disposed to "quibble" when he interprets the word *cause,* to mean any time that will suit the whim of the Sheriff to have the work done.

But a word or two about the use and meaning of this word "cause," for on that string the Democrat man seems to play the loudest. Most generally, when the word *cause* is used in directory statutes, it is supposed that the officer directed is not capable (for want of time or otherwise,) of doing the act physically himself, but must call in the assistance of one skilled in the art, or who has the time; the officer being amenable to the law for its prompt execution. If it was one of the pre-requisites of the office of sheriff, that he should be a practical printer, then in all probability, if the job was not too large, they would say, instead of cause to be published, he *shall* publish, &c.

By way of illustration, suppose Sheriff Green owed his *disinterested* friend, the editor of the Democrat, a sum of money, and gave his note payable "on or before the 4th Monday in November," don't you think he would be very apt to conclude that on the 4th Monday in Nov. the note was due? Or do you suppose the time is merely mentioned as a sort of warning for "Old Ned" to "duly put in process of" gathering up the scads, or "shall do that which shall cause it to be paid," whenever he took the pious notion to "commence" to do so in the course of his official career. Such reasoning as your's [sic] won't do, Mr. Democrat. In this case you are as unfortunate in trying to convince the people that the Sheriff has complied with the law, as you were in your description of the wine vault at Sonoma, in which you wrote yourself a walking wine barrel!

In relation to the mechanical execution of the list, I am no judge; therefore cannot give an opinion as to all of its defects, if any. But it does appear to my uncultivated understanding, that that clause which says there *shall* be given "such a condensed description of the property that it may be easily known," has been but partially complied with, and that the amount of taxes due, is not exactly on a line opposite the name of the delinquent. But that, probably, is an accident which will occasionally occur among the best of printers. The mechanical execution of the Democrat, is sufficient evidence that it is "caused" to be well printed, "on or before" every Thursday in the year.

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

I attach no intentional wrong to Sheriff Green, but advise him to be a little more careful, in future, for paying taxes is not always a pleasant duty, particularly when the power to tax lands is doubtful. SAXON.

- Sonoma County Journal, January 1, 1858

THE COUNTY SUPERVISORS.

MR. EDITOR. - In looking over the report of the County Supervisors, published in the Santa Rosa Democrat of Feb. 18th, I noticed the allowing of some claims which struck me as being rather equivocal; and being a man of leisure, I at once repaired to the office of the County Clerk, and found on file the following bill...

[\$1,168 to print delinquent tax list and Board of Supervisors report]

...The above bill was signed A. W. Russell...

Some few weeks since, when you, in your exposition of the illegality of the proceedings in the delinquent tax sale, charged that there was a clique of third demagogues at Santa Rosa, who, to subserve their own ambitious, mercenary and corrupt purposes, had bribed the press of that town, with the paltry sum of six hundred dollars! I was loth [sic] to believe it; and in fact so informed you. But Time, the confirmer of truth, has revealed sufficient of the dark and hidden mysteries, to convince me that I was wrong and that you were right. Time, or rather the actions of some men, brought about by lapse of time, has shown that a clique, as venal, as corrupt, and

as mercenary as you described them to be, but much more influential, does exist; and that that same clique controls the columns, and is endeavoring to support, out of the County Treasury, a paper wholly devoted to their own individual aggrandizement. Time has made manifest, that through the influence of this clique, NINE HUNDRED AND TWENTY DOLLARS was ordered, by the Board of Supervisors, to be paid out of the County Treasury, for illegally printing an illegally got up delinquent tax list. Illegally published, because it was not done within the time the law specified, nor in the manner the law designated. Published too, after Mr. Russell was informed by all the reliable attorneys in Santa Rosa, that it would be illegal! But what cared Mr. Russell for an opinion, unless it "put money in his purse?" A consultation was held, and Sheriff Green and his advisers, said publish, and if the Supervisors reject the bill, we can pay for it out of the extra fees. -

The bill was made out against the County, instead of Sheriff Green, presented to the Supervisors, and by them ordered paid; not because a single member of the Board believed it to be a just and equitable demand against the County, but because a majority of the Board possess so little moral courage, that they prefer doing a willful wrong, rather than incur the displeasure of the clique, by doing right.

But if a man possessing all the virtues and attributes of morality and Christianity claimed by Mr. A. W. Russell, can solemnly swear to the correctness of a bill, after an enlightened public, every practising attorney, and two Courts, have pronounced the whole scheme illegal and unjust, and do no violence to his conscience, surely there is some allowance to be made for those of the Board who believed that their allegiance to the clique was paramount to their oath of office, and that they could best subserve the interests of their constituents, by voting for the support of the "Organ of the Clique & Zapskay Advertiser," nine hundred and twenty dollars of hard earned money of the tax-payers of this County. Of some of the Board, had reason to expect better things. Of others, their present acts are in conformity with their antecedents; they view every thing through the lense [sic] of party; are ever ready to sacrifice truth, honor, friends, country - every thing but self, for party for office.

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

It is time, Mr. Editor, that the tax-payers of this County arouse from their lethargy, and pay stricter attention to the manner in which the public business is being transacted. It is from their not overly well filled pockets, the government, both County and State, receives its support, and it is their duty, as well as privilege, to know in what way and for what purpose is expended.

Taxes are levied, collected, and paid into treasury for special and legally defined purposes; and the Board of Supervisors, any other body of men, have no power delegated to them, to divert those taxes from the legitimate purpose and use for which they were collected, without the expressed consent of the tax-payers.

Therefore, when the Board made an appropriation of nine hundred and twenty dollars, pay what they knew (and I dare them or Mr. Russell to say they did not,) to be an unjust demand, they not only forfeited all to respect and esteem as faithful and honest officers, but have branded themselves as knaves and fools; despised by one portion of the community, and rejected by other.

U. BET.

- Sonoma County Journal, February 26, 1858

INTERESTING FACTS.

It has become pretty generally known that the Petaluma Journal is ridiculously indignant at the conduct and management of affairs in Santa Rosa – particularly with regard to everything

connected with the Sheriff's office. Some people have been curious enough to ask why it is that the Journal should be so down on our excellent Sheriff, and all his acts, which have, in fact, been punctual and exemplary to the utter satisfaction of everybody, except a few of the foulest mouthed black-republicans in the county, who have an irresistible itching to handle the county funds. If enough has not already been said to satisfy every one of the envious origin of all this matter, we would give the following bit of information as a solution of the enigma.

During the canvass preceding the last general election for county officers, there was a certain individual ambitious of becoming Sheriff of Sonoma County, and to accomplish his object, managed to get up the settlers' delegation from several precincts in the county, devoted to his cause. The Petaluma delegation came up under the leadership of a certain man named Pennypacker, who, it was understood had it all his own way, in that body. This Pennypacker, it seems, had an itching to serve the dear people somewhat, and as they would not let him do it in the name of a Black Republican, he was induced to take the leadership of the "people's party." The People, in this sense, of course, means a few old broken down hunker politicians, who, though ever ambitious, are always repulsed when their sympathies lead them to offer their services. Thus arranged, it wanted only to reconcile and bring into the scheme some prominent disaffected Democrats and Americans. We will only give the result of an interview had with one man, a prominent citizen of the county, and an American.

This same Pennypacker, who, by the way, is supposed to be the ruling genius in the Petaluma Journal office, Weston being but a cats-paw to be used for his purposes – approached the individual alluded to, with confidence believing he would enter into his infamous scheme to swindle the people out of their choice of officers, first broaching the subject of a suitable man for Sheriff, naming his man as the only one on whom the people could possibly be united. His friend, however, not entering fully into the scheme, and snuffing the breeze, thought to humor the thing a little, and see what it would amount to, and replied, – we give the conversation in his own language:

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

“We must look that we get a man who will be acceptable, and qualified in every sense of the word, and who will be supported by Americans, Republicans, and disaffected Democrats.”

To which Pennypacker replied:

“Yes, that’s the fact; and now - is the very man. He will get all of that vote, as he is an American, and will get the entire vote of the Republican party.”

I said to Pennypacker that “I must be sure that such was the case before I would be satisfied.”

He then said: “I am to be under sheriff if - is elected, and as I am a Republican, the entire Republican support will be cast for him.” He then qualified these details upon the honor of a gentleman that such an arrangement as the above had been made between himself and -. Here the conversation ended.

This was enough; the gentleman, who, by the way, was about as far from being a Black Republican, as his besieger was from acting for the disinterested good of the people, and turned upon his heel and left him.

The results have been, that Mr. Pennypacker’s man was not elected sheriff, he is not under-sheriff, and the Journal has not been favored with the exclusive patronage of the county officials; and they are yet bellowing over the loss of these hoped for opportunities of fleecing the county.

- Sonoma Democrat, March 4, 1858

“U. BET.” – CLUBS ARE TRUMPS – I WIN.

In the last Petaluma Journal I see a communication over the above equivocal signature, in which the author deals out an unmeasured abundance of accusations against myself and the county officers of this county. As it is a personal matter between the author of the communication and those arraigned in it, I do not feel myself called upon to defend or justify others, except as the alleged transactions are put down as myself being a party thereto. The author calls himself “a man of leisure,” and intimates that he has a thorough knowledge of things about Santa Rosa generally.

I will first notice some of the charges made by this invisible author, and then see if he cannot be identified by some of his own acts by which he has left an indelible impression on the minds of the people of Sonoma county.

The assertion that a Santa Rosa clique has bribed the press of this place with six hundred dollars, and that they control its columns – and are endeavoring to support it out of the county treasury, embraces so many and so glaring falsehoods, that the author evidently did not expect any one to believe them. In all these there is not even the shadow of truth, and the author, when writing it, was fully aware of its falsity. We know of no such clique, as is here represented – and if one exists, it never has exercised the least possible influence over the columns of the Democrat – no attempt of the kind has ever been made—and if made, they never could succeed. There never has been one dollar contributed to the support of this paper from any source, except in the way of legitimate patronage, honestly earned and justly merited.

Making use of H. L. Weston, as a suitable tool to do his dirty work with, he urges that envious, little-souled being to re-open his vile charges and random assertions in regard to what he calls

the illegal publication of an illegal tax sale. He says it was published "after Mr. Russell was informed by all the reliable Attorneys in Santa Rosa, that it would be illegal." This is a cool and deliberate falsehood, and the author intended it as such when he wrote it. "A consultation was held, and Sheriff Green and his advisers, said publish, and if the Supervisors reject the bill, we can pay it out of the extra fees." I am fully aware that there were men using every effort in their power to instigate opposition to the payment of taxes, prominent among whom was the rotten carcass of "the man of leisure" calling himself "U. Bet," and his second fiddler, H. L. Weston, who never pay taxes, though their desires to finger the hard cash belonging to the county are not always satisfied with such disbursements in their favor, as they can cover with even the semblance of legal right. But if any such consultation as is there described, resulting in such a conclusion was ever had, we are quite certain they forgot to report that result to me. I never heard of it before. Besides, it is not generally believed that our Board of Supervisors are in the habit of bestowing extra fees with so bountiful a hand as is here represented. On the contrary, they are accused of being even too close to do full justice to those who work for the county.

But I shall pass over many of the minor accusations contained in this wonderful document, and approach at once that part which he evidently intended as an utter extinguisher. It is a direct charge that "A. W. Russell" wilfully perjured himself by swearing to an account, "after public opinion, every practicing attorney, and two courts had pronounced the whole scheme illegal and unjust." It is too absurd to require a contradiction to this allegation; but as such assertions, oft repeated without contradiction will sometimes gain willing listeners, and even believers, I will just say that no such decision ever was made either by the bar of Santa Rosa, nor any one court, much less two, and then turn to an examination of the character of the witness who thus sweepingly condemns the acts, and impugns the motives of others.

It is well known that some eight or ten thousand dollars of the missing public moneys for the loss of which Wm. A. Buster is now serving a term of years in the State Prison, was abstracted from the county safe without any agency of his. Since that time, it has been a matter of wonder how certain men not more than sixteen miles from Santa Rosa, having no lucrative business, could become "men of leisure" and always have plenty of money. And it is pretty plainly intimated, if not positively asserted that "U. Bet," knows as well as any body else who shared in the spoils of that robbery, and who "got the lion's share." No wonder, then, that he should watch

with such jealous solicitude, every dollar of the public funds that is appropriated to its proper purposes, and calls, with stentorian voice, upon the voters of the county to turn the present office holders out of place, as they leave no chances for him to practice his lucrative art — beseeching them to install another order of politicians in their place, which may bring him a little nearer to the county treasury. I now say to “U. Bet,” you, sir, are watched, by eyes as piercing as those you so anxiously endeavor to direct to the contemplation of other men’s foible. Your own guilty conscience tells you this, and your cowardly manner of assailing the character of another’s, with false accusations bolstered up to give them the appearance of plausibility by equally false assertions, only confirm your guilt, by removing the last lingering doubt that your moral degradation had reached the degree necessary for so base an act. It stands you in hand, sir, to be looking after your own safety, as the eyes of an injured public are upon you and your friends, and only want as strong legal as they have moral evidence of your guilt to insure your election to San Quinten, where you would much more truthfully represent the people of this county than you would by scribbling for a venal, envious, prostituted press, or serving them in official station. The vilest rogue is always first and loudest in crying “stop thief,” and you have verified the truth of this proverb.

And such characters are suitable associates for Henry L. Weston — a man who prides himself in his willingness and capacity to bring other and better men, down to the filthy pool of corruption in which he so boastingly wallows. How much of the spoils acquired in that successful foray on the county treasury, fell to the lot of this same Weston, I know not; but this I remember well, that a few weeks ago, he admitted that his reason for denouncing the Democrat and the county officers, was because he had been deprived of his share of the spoils he had been in the habit of receiving.

Least this article should be attributed to the combined efforts of the “Santa Rosa Clique,” I subscribe myself, most respectfully,

A. W. RUSSELL.

- Sonoma Democrat, March 4, 1858

The Journal and its Spleen.

The last Petaluma Journal having got another cue from its master, comes out again in all the richness of its vulgarisms, in denouncing the Democrat, the delinquent tax list, the Board of Supervisors, the Sheriff, &c., all of which goes to show what he admitted, a few weeks ago, that the real cause of all his fault finding was that our county officers were of a political and moral stripe differing from himself, and because they did not give him the exclusive privilege of fleecing the county treasury. He calls the bill presented to the Board of Supervisors for allowance, enormously large, and a base fraud.

In regard to the alleged enormity of the charge we will only remark that in the Journal's "prices of advertising," we find the following...

[...LONG comparison of advertising insertion rates...]

...It is the loss of opportunities to make such hauls as this that stirs up the abolition blood of the pusillanimous little puppy who presides over the Petaluma Journal.

Mr. Weston takes it so wonderfully hard since his chances at the public crib have been diminished, that one can scarcely help thinking that he has been deprived of more than the public are apprised of. He don't do all this howling for nothing. One of two things is certain — either he has had some exceedingly fat pickings taken away from him, or he has the promise of

others, which he expects to receive by ousting the Democratic party, and placing men of his own color, (politically we mean,) in their stead.

“Citizens of Sonoma and Mendocino,” won't you assist Mr. Weston in driving these honest Democrats from office, so that he may have uninterrupted access to the public treasury? It would be so nice. Besides, if you will only do it, he will fondle and cringe like the basest of slaves, and will lick the spittle from the very ground on which you walk.

The course pursued by Mr. Weston towards the Democrat, since its establishment, has been most contemptible and vile. Incapable, as he appears to be, of an honorable competition, or of meeting argument with argument, there is no billingsgate too low, no filthy epithets too coarse, no falsehoods too ridiculously absurd for him to make use of. There is a certain detestably filthy little animal that infests the inhabitable portion of the world, which this deformed specimen of an editor may be justly compared. It is diminutive in its proportions, contemptible in its physical habits and stupid in intellect. It is shunned by all the rest of creation, yet it is always encroaching others. It boasts of its capacity to contend with its neighbors, and pursues them with impunity and no animal, however much superior in strength or sagacity, after having once engaged him, was ever known willingly to undertake it again; for though the filthy little wretch should perish at the first encounter, his antagonist is fully conscious of having suffered more than he. This filthy little animal will not remain where his deformity would naturally consign him, but proud of his filthiness, he invades the sanctuary of decency, and if any one comes in his way while engaged in his depredations, he erects his plume in a defiant manner and says: “Don't come in my way, or you shall stink as as bad as I do.”

- Sonoma Democrat, March 4, 1858

MURDER WILL OUT.

[..]

...Your course in this controversy, compels us to give to the people of Sonoma county a true history of your political proclivities, and to publish to the world your political disgrace.

That you was an active Republican while residing at Nevada, and have also reiterated the same political sentiments since your arrival in Sonoma county, and but a few months before committing your paper to the cause of democracy, we have been well aware from the first; but a sense of honor, and a desire to treat you and your paper with that degree of courtesy which properly belongs to the craft, has kept us from avowing that knowledge. - The uncalled for and unjustifiable attack you have seen fit, in your spleen, to make upon us, removes this obligation; and we therefore give the following affidavit, from a gentleman with whom you are, and ought to be familiarly acquainted, inasmuch as you were both candidates for office on the same ticket:

[...notarized statement by W. R. Coburn that Russell was a Republican convention delegate and ran as a Republican for Supervisor and Public Administrator. Signed March 8, 1858...]

If, after this, Mr. Russell can make, either his masters and keepers, or the Democracy of Sonoma county, believe in the genuineness or purity of his democracy, we greatly err. His newly embraced political faith, looks too much like a moneyed conversion for us to think it otherwise; and therefore, as a member of that party, against which he fought at the last Presidential contest, we spurn his pretensions even to the semblance of a Democrat. - Hereafter, the supporters of that journal will probably cease to wonder at its silence upon all of the leading political questions of the day; or at his avowing himself a "Douglas Buchanan man."

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

And now, we are done with him and his journal, unless his future course shows that he has so far crept from that pool of filth, corruption, and moral degradation, into which his phrenzy [sic] hurled him, in his last week's issue, that we can approach him without becoming besmeared and infected with his rottenness; and for the present, therefore, we leave him in the worst of company - his own.

- Sonoma County Journal, March 12, 1858

PLAIN QUESTIONS.

It will be seen by the following communication from "Inquirer," (who, by the way, we know to be a patron of the Democrat) and addressed to "A. W. Russell, Esq.," that notwithstanding the strong desire manifested by the editor of the Democrat to shirk the responsibility of either admitting or refuting our charge, that he, Russell, was a Republican before coming into Sonoma county to publish a Democratic paper, that his patrons in this section of the County at least, ask, aye, *<i>demand</i>* of him, a reply to the charge. The sooner made, the better; for let him rest assured the Democracy of Sonoma county are not composed of such a set of block heads and dolts, as to be thus insulted and imposed upon without showing their displeasure. So toe the line, Mr. Russell, and hold up your head like a little man, and answer the questions propounded by "Inquirer," in a plain, straight-forward, and gentlemanly manner:

Petaluma, March 30 1858.

A. W. Russell, Esq.,

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

SIR: In the Sonoma Democrat of the 18th inst., you say "We do not feel called upon to pursue the controversy he (the editor of the Sonoma County Journal) has forced upon us, any farther."

I confess myself somewhat at fault, as to your meaning. The quotation you make from the Journal's columns, does not assist me in any way, as it is simply a reavowal of what has been the "position" of that sheet since its establishment; nor do I think it anomalous for so far as my experience goes, it is, and ever has been, the course of all independent journals. It is in fact, as I conceive, one of the rules of newspaper publishing. As an individual then, not as an editor or publisher, do I address you; and as the sentiments of a political editor are public property, I take this medium of correspondence. There are honest queries in my mind, and as I consider it my right as a voter of this County, and a patron, to some extent, of the Democrat, I ask of you honest answers to them: -

Did you support John C. Fremont for the Presidency, in 1856?

Did you support Edward Stanley for the Governorship of California, in 1857?

Were you nominated for any office by a Republican Convention, in the county of Nevada, in 1856? If so, did you accept the nomination? and did your name appear in the election returns of that year?

With the principles of a private man, politically or otherwise, I have nothing to do; but your frank answers to the above, are necessary to set yourself right before the community in which you reside. May I hope that you will pay them proper attention?

INQUIRER.

- Sonoma County Journal, April 2, 1858

SEE HIM. - In his last week's issue, the Santa Rosa Democrat man intimates a desire to see a copy of the Nevada Journal of March 12th; that being the date of the Journal from which we copied a capital hit at Mr. Russell, for the "amount of cheek" displayed, in charging upon us the very political faith that he himself has for years been hugging to his bosom.

Lest this strangely "morally constituted and politically hypocritical editor should, in his blindness, also fail to discover the following, from the pen of an old acquaintance, we publish it for his particular benefit:

<i>FUNNY. - The Sonoma Democrat is doing valiant service in behalf of the Democracy, and pitching into its neighbor, the Petaluma Journal, calls its conductor a Black Republican! Abolitionist, &c. The funny part of the story is, that the Democrat is published by A. W. Russell, late candidate on the Republican ticket in this county, and its reported editor, E. R. Budd, late of this place, and at the time supposed to be tinctured somewhat with Republicanism. We like to see consistency in all things, and can't help showing up the lack of it, even if it does hit a little on "our side" - speaking individually. - Grass Valley Telegraph, March 20.</i>

- Sonoma County Journal, April 2, 1858

OUR POLITICS.

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

The Grass Valley Telegraph, of March 20th, notices the recent controversy between this paper and the Petaluma Journal, in which it takes occasion to say that

“The reported editor, E. R. BUDD, late of this place, and at the time supposed to be tinctured somewhat with Republicanism.”

This being the first time the editor of this paper has ever been called upon, either directly or indirectly, to avow his political faith, we deem it a duty to ourself, as well as to our readers, to give them a fair statement of our position. Although the editor of the Telegraph evidently called the matter in question with anything but a desire to make our path straight, we nevertheless regard it as a favorable opportunity to set ourself right before a community where we hope to remain for a time to come indefinite.

Aside from the equivocal construction of the above quoted sentence, we would say in reply to the Telegraph, that the amount of Republicanism attributed to us, then, or at any subsequent time, must have been quite limited. It is true, we do not claim to be, and never have claimed to be a Democrat of long standing. From the earliest days of our recollection, we were a Whig; we were born a Whig – and by education, habit and practice, remained a Whig, until the total dissolution of that party. Thus, having spent, under ordinary circumstances, more than half our life in direct opposition to the Democratic party, it would hardly be expected that we would fall into their ranks at the first appearance of the downfall of our own party; but with that tenacity with which men will ever adhere to a party or theory in which his whole sympathies have once been engaged, we very naturally, we should think, continued for the next three years to oppose our old enemy, to some extent. We say to some extent; for, with the exception of the election at which J. Neely Johnson was elected Governor, we never voted a straight ticket of any kind, and even then we steadfastly refused to be called a Know Nothing, preferring to remain what we had been all our life, a Whig, although without a party. That we have voted for Republicans, and Know Nothings, as well as Democrats, therefore, is not strange – nor do we look upon it as strange that we should have been called by either of these names, from the simple fact that we were not

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

a Democrat. But that we ever advocated the radical doctrines of either, or abandoned the name or faith of the old Whig party, until we declared ourself a Democrat, is untrue.

We never were an abolitionist in any sense of the word — not to the least possible degree — for in no case nor under any circumstances, could we ever lend an influence, at any period of our life, to disturb the property in slaves — or countenance any attempt, the tendency of which would be to turn the hordes of Africans in the United States loose, to be in any sense of the word on an equality with the Saxon race. We need not here give our reasons for this. But such is the fact.

Nor have we been less opposed to the ultra exclusiveness of the Know Nothing or American party. We have always regarded their ultra Americanism as unjust to adopted citizens, as well as injurious to the American institutions. Moreover, were we to admit that the naturalization laws needed more restrictive provisions, (which we do not,) we regard that organization even subversive of that object.

But we have a word to say about the consistency of our turning Democrat. — We have been accustomed from boyhood to mingle more or less in the strifes of political parties. We have lived thus too long now to quietly sit down and see the strife go on, and feel no interest in the issues at stake. We withstood the temptation over two years, because, as we had made ourself believe, there was no party to which we could attach ourself. But during that time, we had opportunities to witness the tendency of parties which those actively engaged in the strife could hardly be expected to have. And here we would beg leave to say, that with all our devotion to the Whig party, there was one vital article in their creed to which we never were, and never can be favorable. We mean their tenacious advocacy of a paper currency. Since the dissolution of that party, most of the issues contended for by them have been dropped, and do not enter into the contest between the Democratic party and the factions of the present day. Some of the better points of policy contended for by the Whig party have been embraced by the Democracy, while others have righteously been kicked out of company. For instance, Henry Clay's land policy is now the policy of the Democracy. All that is tenable of his internal improvement system, is admitted, and now being put in practice by our present Administration. Any sane man must

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

admit that our present tariff system must work more healthfully than the ultra high protective system for which they then contended.

Then where is the inconsistency of our being to all intents a Democrat in this day, and in the present modification of parties? We cannot find it. We feel satisfied that the good and permanent prosperity of the nation depends in a great measure upon their steady success. And although we may at times have occasion to differ with him who is our acknowledged standard bearer, yet, while we believe the general course of the party is tending to the greatest good, we should not think even for one moment, of making that a reason for an abandonment of party ties.

We set up no claims upon the Democratic party, for past services. We have in our editorial labors uniformly and honestly expressed our most sincere convictions. The Democracy of Sonoma County have them, and know what they are. If we have given you good Democratic doctrines, you know where to find us. If we have not, you need not look for them. We cannot alter the course there laid down.

- Sonoma Democrat, April 8 1858

PERSONAL.

Last week while standing in the store of Ellis & Bro., in this place, I was struck with a buggy whip by a fellow by the name of Jas. Boggs while he, Boggs, was drunk. I was standing with my back towards him at the time he struck me in conversation with a gentleman by the name of Stump, and did not see Boggs until I was struck.

Circumstances which led to the affray are as follows: On the 12th of March last. Boggs in company with Major Jno. Brown, started for San Francisco — while in Petaluma Boggs told Brown that I had told Harry Crowell, our Co. Clerk, something about him in relation to an estray notice that had been published in my paper that was calculated to injure him, (Brown) very much, but refused to tell what it was. Accordingly Brown wrote to me on the subject. Not knowing what the letter meant, I said nothing until Brown came back from San Francisco, at which time I asked Brown what the letter meant that he sent to me. He told me James Boggs told him that I had told Harry Crowell something in relation to an estray notice, that was calculated to injure Brown. We then went to Harry Crowell and asked him what it was that I had said about Brown that was calculated to injure him. Whereupon Crowell said he had never heard me say anything about Major Brown in any way especially about an estray notice.

Thus things ended, until the 6th of April, when passing up the street from the post office Boggs called to me to go over to the opposite side of the street to where he was standing. I crossed the street, shook hands with him, whereupon he showed me a No. of the Petaluma Journal, and asked me to read an article, published in that paper in relation to myself. I told him I had read it, and declined to again. He then asked me why I denied telling Harry Crowell that Major Brown charged \$5.00 for taking an acknowledgment of a sheriff's deed. I told him I know nothing about it in any shape, manner or form, and Crowell would not say that I said so. He then said if I did not tell Crowell, I published it in my paper; and if I said I did not tell Crowell nor publish in the paper, I lied anyhow. I told him I would settle with him when he got sober — (he was then drunk.) He was in my office at this time. I left him.

That was the last I saw of him until the 7th in the store of Ellis & Bro., where he struck me. Not having been notified, either by words or indications that anything of the kind was up, I did not fairly comprehend its meaning at the time, but stepping towards him, asked him what he meant, upon which Sheriff Green stepped up and demanded peace, and Boggs walked off. It then became understood that Boggs, partly to gratify his own spleen, and partly instigated by others, had intended it for a personal indignity, that it should be said he had publicly castigated A. W.

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

Russell. The Grand Jury, being in session, indicted him; he was fined \$50, which, it is understood, was paid by one of his friends.

I have regarded this explanation as necessary, in order to correct an erroneous report which has to some extent been put in circulation, to the effect that I had been threatened with a whipping, and when done, dared not resist; not even a shadow of which is true; but, on the contrary the lack of resistance originated solely from the causes above stated.

Since the affray, I find it is reported that there are other parties implicated in the affair besides a drunken man.

A. W. RUSSELL.

- Sonoma Democrat, April 15 1858

WILL HE ANSWER?

Petaluma April 13, 1858.

A. W. RUSSELL, ESQ.,

SIR: - You have seen fit to pass by unnoticed my "queries" addressed to you in the Journal of the 2nd inst. - Your reasons for so doing, are, I hope, satisfactory to yourself but can you for a moment suppose your course will be so to your readers and patrons?

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

You have, it is true, an article in your last issue, headed "Our Politics," in which you take occasion to say that the Grass Valley Telegraph has called upon the Editor to avow his political faith, and that "this is the first time" such a demand has been made. In this one sentence, there are two positive misstatements. The Telegraph asks no questions, makes no demand; and you sir, as the responsible editor, have been called upon, long since, for *<i>your principles.</i>*

[Reprint of the "Funny" snippet from the Grass Valley Telegraph, seen above]

Now sir, let me ask, who are WE? and who is E. R. Budd? Your article is so indefinite that I may err; but do I understand properly, when I say that Mr. Budd is the editor of the Democrat? If so, permit me to say, that he has in this instance, attained the art of saying nothing, in a column article, to a greater degree than any other writer I have ever known. He is a gentleman whom I do not know, nor was I aware until the publication of his name, that there was such a person in existence. But if there is, and he is the editor, that matters, not. A professional editor, hired to write upon certain subjects in a certain way, does, of course, as he is bid, no matter how repugnant to his own convictions his argument may be. A lawyer, in the same manner, defends with all the zeal and eloquence he can assume, a criminal whom he well knows should swing from the nearest gibbet.

I say again, I do not know Mr. Budd, and if I did, he cannot be made responsible for any opinion advanced in the Democrat, though he may write every word and line of your editorial. Sir, the editor has been "called upon;" Mr. Budd has not. If you, (Russell) are not responsible, put up some other name, that we may know who is. How dare you, sir, hide away behind Mr. Budd, who, for aught I know, is a creature of your own imagination, and at the same time allow him to place your name at the head of the paper. An honorable method, truly, to go on week after week, carrying your name on your imprint, and making no reply to statements and affidavits, charging you with base hypocrisy, until some one a hundred miles away discovered, I know not how, that you were not the editor of your own paper! Then comes the statement: "The first time the editor has been called upon." &c. Are we then obliged to be acquainted with every editor and reporter, compositor and roller-boy in an office, ere we know who to address as the editor, the

responsible man. As well put up a man of straw in your stead, who, having no principles, could not be held responsible for the nonavowal of his faith.

Now permit me a few words as to the 'Editor's' politics. He says he was a Whig, and remained so as long as there was a Whig party. Then he withstood the temptation to turn Democrat, for two years; but alas for frail mortality, he was at last conquered, and has resigned with so good a grace, that the principles for which he labored so long have become entirely contrary, he says, to the reason of any "sane man." I am glad his eyes are open to the enormity of his former ways.

"He is not and has not been a Know Nothing." My good sir, I never heard that he or you were. "Never was an Abolitionist;" who said he was? I never heard either of you called a Border Ruffian, Tory, Red Republican or *Democrat,* and I presume you can say you are not and have not been. But I cannot refrain from expressing the conviction, your course has forced upon me. You were a Republican until you found it "didn't pay," and then turned Democrat, for the sake of "such hauls" and "exceedingly fat pickings" as you might chance to get. - You have not the frankness to avow an honest change of belief, when called upon to do so, but attempt, by the miserable subterfuge of a mass of verbiage, with no direct avowal or denial of any one principle, to hoodwink the eyes of your readers, as to your real political character. I therefore reiterate the charge made by the Journal that you, A. W. Russell, the proprietor of the Democrat, have been, during one or more campaigns, a Republican.

Until Mr. Budd's name, or some other than your own appears in your columns, I hold you alone responsible. You can act as you please, but the charge is fully fastened and sustained.

INQUIRER.

MODESTY.— There is an individual, (we know not who he is — whether he is black or white — whether a street sweeper by compulsion or by choice, or whether he is one of Estill's escaped convicts from the State Prison,) who assumes more than sensible, or respectable men are expected to assume. Though he hides himself exclusively behind an assumed name—calling himself "Inquirer;" — he peremptorily demands of "A. W. Russell, editor of the Democrat," to answer any questions he may choose to ask. We would like to know of this silly sap-head if he does not know that such arrogant assumptions on the part of an individual who screens himself from the public eye, are usually regarded as unworthy the serious notice of a gentleman? Do you not know that the man who will habitually indulge in personal criminations and censures, while he dares not make himself known, is not only contemptible for such littleness, but a downright coward? No respectable man has asked the questions you propound. On the contrary, all such are, so far as we can judge, satisfied; if they are not, we are ready at any time to give them satisfactory information when called for.

And who, let us ask, authorized you, to hold any body responsible for any thing? Who are you? that we should be responsible to you. You, so far as we know, are a knave, a fool, a disreputable, ungentlemanly vagabond — and, we even doubt if you have the right to call any respectable man to an account, even if you had a name, which it seems you have not. But you have called for information, and as it seems you are really in want of that article, we will give you a little, as laid down in Webster's Dictionary, thus:

PUBLISHER— One who sends a book or writing into the world for common use.

PROPRIETOR—An owner, the person who has the legal right, or exclusive title to a thing.

EDITOR—One who superintends the publication of a newspaper. If you will study these definitions two hours each day for the next two weeks, it may save you from exposing your stupidity in future, as you have done in time past.

- Sonoma Democrat, April 22 1858

A BRACE OF 'EM.

Petaluma April 21st, 1858.

A. W. RUSSELL, ESQ.,

SIR: - The positive silence maintained by you in regard to your former political principles, is to me a source of some surprise. You have had every opportunity offered you to disprove, deny, or explain the charge preferred against you, which you have made no effort to do. The fact of your being a Republican, was well known to me, but I have ever had the candor to permit any man an honest change of opinion. Now, sir, suppose the 636 votes you received in 1856, had been sufficient to elect you, would you now publish a Democratic paper - Buchanan pro-slavery organ? The Republicans could not pay you well enough, I suppose.

Yon have, craven-like, forced your second - Mr. Budd, into the ring, hoping he will receive the buffetings that should fall upon your own head. You have, in him, a weak supporter, as he has first his own political character to clear, before he offers you assistance. To show that you two are "birds of a feather," I will simply say, that only last year, some seven months since, Mr. Budd waa a Republican candidate in Nevada. Previous to that time, he was a Whig and Know Nothing. He has boxed the political compass so effectively, that he is now your associate Democrat. I have unwillingly said thus much of Mr. Budd, as he is an entire stranger, but as it is, the facts above cannot be denied, and are sufficient to stamp you both as traitors and hypocrites.

- Sonoma County Journal, April 22, 1858

Petaluma April 27, 1858.

A. W. RUSSELL, ESQ.,

SIR: - An article in your last issue, bearing the fanciful title of "Modesty," demands my attention. Why this title is assumed, I know not, unless you mean to point it out as a pattern of a modest style, for which the Democrat is becoming so well known. But I do not quarrel with you, either for the title, style, or matter; and, as you ask questions, I am ready to answer. First of all, I am a white man, though your Black Republican proclivities compel you to see every thing through a colored light, and cry "[N*****]" at every one you meet. In this, you remind me

[...six lines of illegible microfilm...]

changes, and having ever cast my vote as conscience dictated, I am not ashamed to own them. This sir, every gentleman, and especially every public man, presuming to be a political teacher, will do, and that without bandying words, and assailing the inquirer with vulgar epithets. Billingsgate is not argument nor proof of your honesty, however well it may suit you to use it.

My "authority," as I have before said, is vested solely in myself as a paying patron of your paper, and when I employ any man to do any business for me, I wish to know whether he is honest and capable.

I am not aware of "habitually indulging" in personal criminations unless it be criminal to profess allegiance to any political party, in which case you can use the term to your heart's content.

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

I am not so ambitious of notoriety as to wish to see my name paraded in the columns of any paper, but it is at your disposal, whenever you choose to ask it, provided always, that when you are convinced of its respectability, you will answer in your columns, concerning the matter of my first communication.

I am exceedingly obliged to you for your quotations from Webster's Dictionary, but as I am fortunate enough to have access to its valuable pages, farther information of that nature is unnecessary. - Should you look somewhat more closely yourself, you might be spared the necessity of coining words to express your ideas.

But you have refused, thus far, to give information that was asked of you, and I deny, point blank, your assertion, that no respectable man has asked such questions as I propounded. Think of me as you may, I am not the first who has endeavored to find the different platforms upon which your feet have rested.

INQUIRER.

- Sonoma County Journal, April 30, 1858

UNMASKED. - The Santa Rosa Democrat hoists the name of E. R. Budd, as editor and part proprietor. This is right; the bantling needed a god-father. We trust, now that Mr. Budd has taken it under his fostering care, he will at once remove from its columns the obscene and demoralizing advertisements of Czapsky and others of like ilk.

- Sonoma County Journal, April 30, 1858

VALEDICTORY.

After a most pleasing acquaintance with the patrons of the Democrat of a few months, I feel it to be my interest to retire from my position confidently believing, however, that in the hands of the gentlemen who are in future to conduct the paper, my friends will have little to regret. I would therefore recommend them to the favorable consideration and support of a liberal community — hoping and sincerely trusting that they and their patrons may find their enterprise mutually beneficial and satisfactory to all concerned.

With many regrets for thus suddenly having to part the so recently formed, but pleasing associations, I return to my friends my most sincere thanks for the many evidences of their esteem and good wishes I have received, and, bequeathing them this evidence of my solicitude for their prosperity, I most respectfully bid you all good-bye.

S. H. FISHER.

CHANGE.—By reference to our imprint it will be seen that S. H. Fisher has retired from his connection with this paper, having sold his entire interest to B. F. Pinkham, who is well, and we believe, favorably known in this community.

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

Mr. Pinkham, like our retiring friend, is a practical printer, a capable and experienced business man, and a gentleman of good literary taste. While we always feel a reluctance in yielding to the necessary changes which time and the dispensations of Providence bring about, that reluctance must necessarily be materially mitigated, when we have so great an assurance that the place thus vacated is to be so worthily filled.

Editorially and *politically* the paper will continue to be precisely what it has been, Democratic in every particular.

- Sonoma Democrat, November 4 1858

APOLOGY.—It is probably necessary that we should make some apology for the delay in the publication of our paper, as well as for the small amount of reading matter contained in this number. The circumstance, however is unavoidable, and as another instance of the kind is not likely to occur again soon, we hope a bare reference to the matter will be sufficient to insure an excuse, and the patient indulgence of our readers. The two succeeding weeks that the delinquent list has to be published, the most of it will appear on a supplement, and we will endeavor, by giving an extra amount of reading matter hereafter, to make up for the lack in this number.

- Sonoma Democrat, November 18 1858

SUPPORT YOUR PAPER.

For nearly a year and a quarter we have been laboring, and faithfully, too, to sustain a respectable paper in this place. While doing this, we have done whatever was in our power to advance the interests, good name and prosperity of Santa Rosa. We flatter ourselves that our efforts have been in some measure rewarded with success, and we have contented ourself with this conviction, trusting to the business men and citizens of the place to give us the support necessary to sustain us in the position necessary to make our position available for good. We now, for the first time, call attention to this matter, for the purpose of reminding our friends that some of them have not done their part towards the support of their local paper. It is true, we have, for a country paper, a very respectable subscription list, but it is well known that the subscription to a country newspaper goes but a short way towards its support. It is the advertising custom that gives it strength. In regard to the expense of advertising, we sometimes hear men speak of it in the light of a voluntary contribution towards the support of a paper. This is not so; and although our present object is to urge men to be a little more liberal towards us, in the way of advertising, it is not our purpose to ask — nor would we wish to accept of such contributions as matters of charity. On the contrary, we regard, and have facts within our knowledge to demonstrate that a limited, but liberal amount of money expended for the support of a paper, by advertising, instead of being a loss, is as good an investment as could be made to the same extent.

There are six dry goods and grocery merchants in this place, and out of that number, only one advertises; we have good reason to believe the business of that house is equal to all the other five. We would ask each of these gentlemen if they candidly believe this state of things argues much in favor of their liberality and enterprise, or tends to center the business of the county at Santa Rosa? Now think — men are reflective beings. If the idea is established that the merchants of Santa Rosa are narrow minded, selfish men, it would be unnatural for them to receive a liberal patronage — because customers do not like to deal with that kind of traders, to say nothing of the fact that by advertising, you attract the attention of customers directly to the goods offered for sale. We prefer to associate with, to deal with, and to encourage men of liberal views, who go upon the principle of "live and let live." But when we know a man prefers to be the only one who is doing a good business — when we have reason to believe he is aiming to monopolize

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

prosperity, and is satisfied, if not gratified, to see all branches of enterprise languish except the one over which he holds a controlling influence, men are instinctively led to avoid transactions with him, as much as possible — he is called selfish, envious and miserly.

Under the existing state of things, we cannot think it strange that one half the people composing this community go to Petaluma to trade. The result is a natural one. Experience establishes the fact that an advertiser gains additional custom enough to pay for his advertising off of the increase of his trade. If the wants of the community require mercantile transactions to the amount of two thousand dollars per week, the policy pursued by the selfish man, would content himself to let one-half of this trade go to another town, rather than expend five dollars to support a paper, the effect of which would be to bring the balance of the trade to his own home, in doing which his additional trade would give him a clear profit of twice or thrice that sum.

Santa Rosa needs enterprise. We candidly believe it needs to retain the publication of a paper here. In order to secure that object, you must support it. Now, we are not saying that we cannot live here. But from whence comes our support? Is it from Santa Rosa? Look at our advertising columns, and see. If Healdsburg, Sonoma and Petaluma, are allowed to do more towards its support than Santa Rosa, what inducement could we have to continue our labors for the interests of this place, when they are antagonistical with those of other places? We ask our friends in this town to take these things into serious consideration, and when duly considered, extend to us the most liberal hand their interests will allow.

- Sonoma Democrat, December 16 1858

TRUE DEMOCRAT AND SETTLER. - The campaign paper, bearing the above title, announced to appear last Saturday, made its debut in our streets, agreeable to promise, and was the principle

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

topic on all sides. It is edited by J. J. Pennypacker, formerly a "jour" in this office, and who in his new position of editor, pitches into the fight with a vim and a will, fully entitling him to the position of "the big dog with the brass collar."

- Sonoma County Journal, July 22 1859

Budd & Pinkham vs. County of Sonoma.

This was an action brought by the proprietors of the "Sonoma County Democrat" for the recovery of a sum of money amounting to about \$2,400, for the publication in said paper of the delinquent tax list for Sonoma and Mendocino for the year 1858. The bill had first been submitted to the board of Supervisors, who refused to allow the same on the ground of its being an exorbitant charge. The case came up this week before the District Court, Judge, E. W. McKinstry. The plaintiffs' claimed that the work had been faithfully and legally performed by them, and the price charged was in strict compliance with their published rates of advertising, (\$6 per square for three week's insertion,) and that in the absence of a special contract to the contrary, they had just and legal ground for exacting the payment of such rates. The defence was based mainly on the ground: first, that the rates charged were enormously large; and secondly, that the said list was not published in conformity with the statute requiring its publication, which act provides that it must be published once a week for three successive weeks. To this end, evidence was introduced to show that while the first publication of the paper containing the said tax list was made on the 18th day of November, the latter portion of the list (issued in a supplementary form) was not published until Monday, Nov. 22d. The Court charged the jury as a matter of law, that, in the absence of a special contract to the contrary, the publishers of a newspaper have a right to charge for advertising in accordance with their published rates; and as a matter of fact, that it was the jury's duty to determine whether in this case the publication of the tax list should be classed as advertising or as job work; and further,

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

whether the same was published in conformity with the provisions of the statute requiring its publication.

The verdict of the jury was adverse to plaintiffs, the finding being upon the ground that the list was not legally published.

- Sonoma County Journal, October 21 1859

Budd & Pinkham vs. County of Sonoma.

In the Sonoma County Journal of last Friday, is an article purporting to ho a statement of the above entitled cause, which is not entirely correct. The editor says, among other things: "The bill had first been submitted to the board of Supervisors, who refused to allow the same on the ground of its being an exorbitant charge."

We do not know by what authority he presumes to say the bill was rejected, in the first place, on the ground of its being an exorbitant charge. No such evidence was produced on the trial. Nor were we made acquainted with such objection, at the time the Board rejected the bill. On the contrary, the bill was made out exactly according to our advertised rates, because the Board refusal to negotiate with us as to what we should receive. We are aware that persons who did not have the success of the Democrat at heart, I have circulated and given currency to the report that we originally refused to accept of a reasonable compensation; and to magnify the prejudice thus created, it has also been industriously circulated that the Board offered us \$1,000. As these reports have heretofore only circulated in that under-current whose mischief-making has its strong hold, while at the same time it was too vague and too destitute of respectability to allow

of an answer, we have been compelled to know of their existence, but quietly to submit to the disadvantages under which it placed us in the minds of the public. But emboldened by the success with which these reports have been allowed to pass unnoticed, it has at last claimed the privilege of a place in the columns of a rival paper — and we fear a desire on the part of the editor, to nourish these prejudices, had more to do with leading him to this conclusion than any evidence produced in court, or his knowledge of the facts.

We will now make a statement of facts, which will give a better and truer knowledge of the matter: After the Democrat was established, it became an object of envy to the proprietor of the Journal. — The Board of Supervisors were frequently solicited, indirectly, to give them the county printing, with intimations that they would do it at a greatly reduced rate, and at the same time, they were quite busy in finding fault with the charges of the Democrat. While Copeland and Estes were in the Board, these efforts proved successful, and they seconded them. During their time, the tax list was published. A question was raised, as to whether they had any control of this printing. Without presuming to settle this question, the Sheriff conferred with them and with us, in order that a price might be settled upon, satisfactorily to all. The Board did not manifest any degree of concession, or, we might say, even courtesy in the matter, and consequently nothing satisfactory was arrived at. — Sheriff Green brought us the copy and told us to print it. We did so. Between that time and the time for presenting the bill, we repeatedly mentioned the subject to members of the board, in hopes of ascertaining what they were willing to do, and by mutual conference arrive at something satisfactory. While the Board was in session, the day before we present the bill, we again made an effort to get some expression as to what they would allow us. This time we were more successful, but our success was not very gratifying. At that time there was in the treasury \$272 of the money collected on the 25 cent cost on delinquents. The answer to our inquiries was, that they would give us that \$272; and this, to the best of our knowledge and belief, was all they intended to give us. This we could not accept. We still held ourself ready to accept of anything that was just. But the prospect was, that we would never get it unless we got it by a suit at law. But we still determined to do all that we could to avoid the difficulty — and before putting in the bill, consulted our attorney, instructed him as to what we would be willing to take, in preference to going into a suit, requested him to be present when the bill came before the Board, and when we deposited the account with the Clerk, requested him to notify our attorney, that he might be present. He willingly consented. But when the account came up for action, time was not given even to proclaim his name at the door. No

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

time was taken for deliberation — no offer was made to pay a part or any part thereof - no questions asked as to whether we would take less. The proceeding had was something like this: Thu bill being read, the question was asked, what shall we do with this bill? The District Attorney being present, said, reject it. And it was rejected.

We had already, repeatedly expressed our willingness to compromise — to negotiate with them for a settlement, but all those advances had been repulsed. Under these circumstances, what could we do? A thousand dollars, promptly paid at the time the work was done, would have been better for us, than \$2,000, with the uncertain chances and delays of a law suit before us. We therefore made out our bill, precisely at our advertising rates. We had no other rule by which to be guided.

This statement of the case, and we believe it to be a true one, proves one of two things: Either that the editor of the Journal maliciously perverted those mischievous rumors which circulated among our enemies, as evidence in the case, not knowing the truth — or maliciously stated a falsehood.

We had already paid out, as necessary expenses in the work double that amount of money, to say nothing of the incidental outlays inseparable from an expensive business — wear and tear of materials, &c. The offer of \$272, if viewed as an offer at all, could only be regarded as an offensive dictation to a professional man to work for less than he deserved, without regard either to justice or propriety, or manifesting a commendable degree of enterprise, to sustain a useful profession. It was contemptible — it was insulting — it was degrading.

Where is the man, who, knowing that he is driven to the necessity of a law suit to procure his just demands, will not sue for all his legal claim? He might be willing, on a large piece of work, to make any reduction on customary rates, and would leave him a reasonable profit of his labor, provided payment was made promptly and without unnecessary irritation. But touching this matter, every thing had been done, that could be done to create hard feeling. We were publishing

a Democratic paper, the only paper at the county seat. The Board were elected by a Democratic constituency, in the political struggles before and since then, we had labored incessantly and willingly for the Democratic cause. In those campaigns we have never asked the questions, as between the opposing candidates. "Which of you, gentlemen, will pay us the most, for our services in procuring your election?" We have labored for them, because they were Democrats. We believe it is just as necessary to sustain a Democratic paper, as it is to have the County offices filled by Democrats. What principle, we would ask, is there involved in the election of County Clerk, Sheriff, Treasurer, Auditor, District Attorney, &c. None at all. We work for them on the ground that the general success of the Democratic party, depends upon the united strength of the party, upon the unanimity with which they support and sustain each other. There is no individual whose efforts will do more to accomplish this than the editor of a local paper. Suppose, then, Dr. Boyce, Mr. Faught, Mr. Southard, and others, late opposition candidates, had come to us, and said, we will fill these respective offices, if elected and deduct a certain percentage from our fees, if you will give us your support, and secure our election. We would publish this proposition to the world, and proclaim against the extravagant charges of officials — requiring the Democratic candidates to bid still lower, or we would give our support to the opposition. Such an operation, we have no doubt, would have a salutary effect upon the elections. But we, as a laborer in the Democratic party, would not feel that we had done our duty. And yet, we would occupy precisely the same position that the Democratic Board of Supervisors occupy now. They have encouraged a system of bidding and underbidding between the Democratic paper at the county seat and an opposition paper in another town. They have said, substantially, that unless we did the county work without any profit, and make our living from other sources, we could not have that work, and accordingly, they have formally pronounced the Petaluma Journal — an opposition paper the "official paper of the county." This they did, before we commenced suit against the county, and in the face of our offers to do all their work at a reasonable rate.

It is an object to that paper to break this one down. Petaluma is a thriving business town, and can support a paper without the county printing. The ability of Santa Rosa to do this, is questionable. Then, it is an object to them to break down opposition in this quarter; and they could well afford to do any work which locally belongs to this paper, and which belongs to its legitimate support, even at a loss, until this opposition is removed. They could then have this

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

additional support, upon which they would have no difficulty in demanding their former entire rates, whereby they could in three months reimburse themselves for all their former losses.

In all this, we have not assumed the position that the Democracy should give us any extravagant price for county printing, by virtue of our position as publishers of a Democratic paper. We do not ask it. We never have. But we do say, and think, that as such, in a Democratic county, and this being the only paper at the county seat, when we offer to do the work at a reasonable rate, which may be agreed upon beforehand, if desired, we should have it, without bidding against an opposition rival in another town.

- Sonoma Democrat, October 27 1859

SETTLED. - We are told that the claim of Budd & Pinkham against the county, for the publication of the delinquent tax list for 1858, has been compromised by the county paying \$800.

- Sonoma County Journal December 9, 1859

A CHANGE. - Mr. Pinkham, having disposed of his interest in the Santa Rosa Democrat to Mr. Budd, has retired from the concern. The paper is now under the entire control of Mr. B, who promises his best efforts to make it an acceptable visitor to its patrons.

<http://santarosahistory.com/wordpress/2023/03/the-weekly-feud-is-on-page-2/>

- Sonoma County Journal, January 13 1860