

THE STAR, And North-Carolina State Gazette, Published weekly, by BELL & LAWRENCE.

Subscription, three dollars per annum. No paper will be sent without at least \$1.50 is paid in advance, and no paper discontinued, but at the option of the Editors, unless all arrears are paid.

THE PRESIDENCY.

THE FOUR LETTERS.

From the Richmond Enquirer.

The friends of Mr. Crawford are indeed very active in supporting his pretensions to the Presidential chair. In doing this, if they would confine themselves to facts and not overstep the bounds of decency, there certainly would be no ground for complaint.

Let the reader cast his eye for a moment over the four letters addressed to the people of the United States by a fellow-citizen, which have lately appeared in the Enquirer. These letters were pompously introduced to the public, and we were led to believe, from the parade which the author made about candor and impartiality, that his labours at least in some measure would have partaken of those qualities.

We have noticed what wonderful pains have been taken to give these letters general circulation. We have seen them republished in other prints by request, and they have been called able, &c. All this management and address will not avail.

I have read over those four letters addressed to the people of the United States. And I have been really at a loss to discover what part of them is distinguished either for ability, truth, or candour. The author it is true gives us words in abundance, but seldom branches his weapons of argument and reason.

Let us in the first place cast our eye over what he says about the Augusta Address. The friends of Mr. Crawford first affected to treat this charge with levity. It was called a phantom, a mere bubble. But when it was discovered that the people of the United States were not inclined to yew it in that light, their tone was quite changed, and we find now that every champion in the cause of Mr. Crawford draws his quill and endeavors to refute it.

The federalism of Mr. Crawford in '98 can be established, his elance for the vote of this state would be vain and fruitless. Hence you bear them so often cry out that the charge is refuted and falls to the ground. Let us now see whether this be the fact. We had tho't that the charge was so well established that had the writer of the letters been silent upon the subject, we should not now have touched again upon that head.

This writer, as well as all others in favor of Mr. Crawford, has called upon the most distinguished men of Georgia to prove his republicanism in '98. The writer of the letters represents Mr. Crawford at that period as an "obscure usher, nothing dreaming of politics," &c. His "means were perfectly inadequate to the objects he had in view, and he was once more compelled to resort to the low but honest calling of subordinate teaching," &c.

But then Mr. Watkins, chairman of the meeting, personally knew Mr. Crawford at that time, has been introduced. This old gentleman was and still is a federalist. He it is true asserts that Mr. Crawford was a republican in '98. But what is this to the purpose? All federalists assume that garb and call themselves republicans. Therefore Mr. Watkins could, very consistently with his creed, make that declaration. But this gentleman manifested rather too much zeal on this occasion. He went rather too far with his evidence.

To shield Mr. Crawford further from the merited reproach of signing that address, he says that in '98 the political parties were not so marked as they were at a subsequent period, nor had those measures which sunk the administration of Mr. Adams been then adopted. Is this truth—is this candor? Will not the good sense of the people frown upon such declarations? Those who are acquainted with the history of that period, and it is presumed that all who have ever read must know it, that the parties were as violent, and the line of their distinction as completely drawn then as at any time afterwards.

The author of the letters has not hesitated to stoop to the lowest grade of sophistry in order to serve and uphold his favorite. He gravely undertakes to prove that the address was not even of a federal tinge. After this we shall not be surprised at any attempt that is hereafter made by the friends of Mr. Crawford. I shall not go into any analysis of that address; it is before the public and will speak for itself. Its verdict is already formed and is federal hue is no doubt discerned from beginning to end.

cy which the then administration had adopted towards France. British outrages and enormities were daily whistled at. Upon this head Mr. Adams was almost perfectly silent. But whenever poor France, then struggling for her existence against a coalition of despots, gave him the least ground for murmur and complaint, he never failed to attempt to rouse and excite the nation against her, and repeatedly declared "that the finger of heaven pointed to war." This then was the principal cause of contentions between the parties. One condemned while the other applauded it. Let us hear what a distinguished citizen of our state at that period said upon this subject. He gives us the true history of those times.

"I do not wish to confound our controversy with France, with the subjects of discussion upon which the American people differ. The administration have adopted this policy with a success most flattering to them, and fatal to their country. The words of Calhoun have been the cabinet's guide, inasmuch as they have silenced all opposition and accomplished every measure. Our unfortunate rupture with that republic, has given an unnatural popularity to the friends of aristocracy and monarchy. It has enabled them to propagate principles which were once heard with disgust and horror, and it has enabled them to accomplish designs which could not have been attempted two years ago without producing an immediate and universal insurrection of the people. Your party have exaggerated the cruelties and enormities of the French revolution, in order to excite an excessive and frantic indignation against France. And then they have artfully availed themselves of the angry passions which they kindled, in order to bring detestation upon republican principles. When they have excited a horror of French principles, they are enabled by a very natural association of ideas to produce an abhorrence of republican principles—because these are the avowed, if not the actual principles of the French nation."

The author of these eloquent remarks was John Thompson, the immortal author of the letters of Curtius, a citizen of our state—a name dear to his country and consecrated by the affections of his native state. These eloquent and unrivalled essays were written and published about the time that Mr. Crawford got up his Augusta address, and joined in the crusade against republican France. Thompson spoke the language of Virginia and the republicans of the United States. The conduct of Mr. Adams towards France was universally condemned by them. It was too well known that his policy was to provoke a war with that unfortunate republic; then to push forward his high-handed measures, and to prostrate the constitution of his country. Virginia protested against this course. But it appears that Mr. Crawford thought otherwise, and therefore gave his support to an address applauding Mr. Adams for his wisdom and energy against a devoted country. So much in reply to the author of the letters respecting the Augusta Address. Well I have spoken in plain matter of fact, beyond the reach of contradiction. We will now proceed to some other charges against Mr. Crawford; and see how he is defended by the writer just alluded to.

Another serious charge against Mr. Crawford is his speech in the United States' senate upon re-chartering the United States' Bank; the abuse which that speech contained against Virginia and other large states. In reply to this, the author of the letters, like every other writer before him, acknowledged that this was a fault, and sorely lamented it. But, as if any consolation can be derived from that source, he says that all the other candidates were guilty of the same sin. This is denied. Although it is true that some of the other candidates were in favor of the renewal of the charter, yet they did not indulge themselves in a strain of abuse against the large states for instructing their senators upon this great constitutional question. They did not accuse them of wishing to usurp the powers of the general government and to destroy the influence of the small states. In these sentiments Mr. Crawford stood single and alone. The author of the four letters slid over this subject with singular agility. He was wise enough to say but little upon this head. He knew too well the tender ground upon which he trod. He well knew how revolting it would be to the pride of Virginia to be called upon to give her support to a man who had been her calumniator, and who had traduced her in our national councils. Now these two acts, the Augusta Address, and the abuse of Virginia, are the two principal charges which affect the character of Mr. Crawford: we have seen what the author of the letters has said in reply to them. In the first case he has said nothing to relieve Mr. Crawford from the reproach which attends him, but his defence has actually added to his condemnation. In the other case, he has said literally nothing. Thus then those two prominent charges stand still in force against Mr. Crawford—stare him still full in the face—and so long as they remain upon the memory, so long will Virginia withhold from him her confidence and support.

In order to shield Mr. Crawford also from the charge of intrigue, the writer of the letters has ranged at large in the field of declamation, and given us indeed some singular logic upon this head. He avers that Mr. Crawford cannot be guilty of this crime, because no evidence has yet been adduced to establish it. He tells us Mr. C. was intimate with all the great men of the nation, of both political parties—federalists and republicans. He then gives us a long list of names in which is comprised men of all political denominations—from the rankest federalist down to the most democratical republican. This charge of intrigue, I confess, I know nothing of—it may be true or it may be false. But it is certain that the author of the letters has done Mr. Crawford but little service in his reasoning and deductions upon this subject. He represents him as the intimate associate of both federal and democratic characters—that he has acted, and is in friendship, with all of them. Now, had Mr. C. been an uniform, unwavering republican, true to the principles of the orthodox faith, it is utterly impossible that he could ever be the intimate friend, the social companion, with many upon that list. It is not the nature of things for federalists and republicans thus to harmonize and agree. There must be some trimming—some shuffling in the ranks. Hence we may conclude from the lights which have been shed upon the politi-

cal history of Mr. Crawford, if he has not been guilty of base intrigues, any great compromise of character, he has for a firm, undeviating republican, been rather, we suspect, too plain in his political principles, or he never could be intimate with such men as Rufus King, Danas, &c.—Yet these are some of the characters which the author of the letters deponimate "worthies," the intimate associates of Mr. Crawford. This portrait of the secretary of the treasury, as drawn by his friend, can never suit the palate of Virginia. She will certainly prefer a man of a more inflexible, unbending character, than the one here given of this gentleman. Her Jefferson, her Madison, never were distinguished for that flexibility of temper, as to make them at the same time the friends and companions of republicans and federalists. They never mixed and associated with your Kings, and Danas, your Harpers and Otises. They never countenanced and supported addresses to Mr. Adams, approving of against a sister republic. Here let us ask the author of the letters, whether any of the distinguished men of our state ever were guilty of that political sin? No—never if they had, the frowns of the people would most assuredly long since have consigned them to political annihilation.

These remarks are proceeding to a length to which the author did not intend to go. He is aware that long and labored essays do not suit the taste of most readers. It is not words, in whatever dress they are uttered, that can carry conviction to the human mind. Arguments and facts can alone operate and wrought a change in the opinions of men. To this test must the friends of Mr. Crawford be brought. They cannot expect to gain and secure the confidence of the people in the course they have taken. The people of Virginia are plain, firm and decided, devoted to the principles of liberty and true to the republican faith. Declamation, however splendid, will have no effect upon them. Declamatory appeals to their passions are idle, and can by no means affect their understanding. They are too enlightened to be duped by artifices of that kind. The author of the letters has greatly mistaken their character when he presumed to address them in the manner he has done. They cannot be seduced by words nor led away by the tinsel sophistry which marks every line of his productions. They are not to be deceived, and cannot blind and mislead for a single moment. The veil is too thin and slender not to be penetrated by the most superficial eye. Fixed and unchangeable in her principles, Virginia will never sully her reputation by giving her support to a character who stands arraigned before her upon charges which deeply affect his republican standing. A suspected character can never expect to claim her support. Pure and spotless herself the man who is honored with her confidence must be above suspicion. A Clay, a Calhoun, a Cleeves, or a Macon, she would greatly prefer to a man who has been guilty of the political offences attributed and sustained against Mr. Crawford. Were she to act otherwise, she would be guilty of her own political suicide and blast forever her republican character. But she is not reserved for such a degradation. A higher and more brilliant destiny awaits her. Time will show whether the opinions I have expressed are correct—till then let us patiently await the day of trial—we will see whether they are then the offspring of fancy or the solemn warnings of truth.

PLANTER.

Chesterfield, Sept. 13, 1823.

COMMUNICATIONS.

FOR THE STAR.

Messrs. Editors.—It was with sincere regret I read the remarks contained in a "letter from a gentleman at Washington City, to the Editors of the Star," as published in your paper of the 10th inst: first, because he should so far have mistaken me, and misconceived my object, as to suppose I wished to do an injury to the cause of Mr. Calhoun, in that covert way; and, secondly, because he has permitted the warmth of his friendship, and the overflowing of his zeal, to betray him into the expression of sentiments, unauthorised by facts, with a generality of application to persons who do not merit them, of which he will hereafter himself be sensible.

If your Washington correspondent had given himself the trouble to ascertain my views, (which he might easily have done by attending to my expressions,) he might have found that I had no intention of entering upon the merits of either of the candidates for the presidency; for I expressly declared, "without touching the relative merits of either of the aspirants, I would only ask you, if you still think Mr. Crawford's popularity is on the wane?"

The chief object I had in view, in writing the piece alluded to by my Washington friend, (for, I think, I know him,) was to vindicate the character of the state against an unjust imputation, cast upon her independence by you, in ascribing her opinions to the influence of Virginia; and to rescue from obloquy, if possible, the character of some old and tried patriots, against whom Mr. M'Duff had opened the battery of his eloquence, and threatened with destruction; whom he charged with "unchastened and unhallowed ambition!" For what, Messrs. Editors, were these heavy charges made? Because they refused to comply with the requisitions of the Secretary of War, until certain points were cleared up; and because some of that number were supposed to be friendly to Mr. Crawford's election. Was this such a mighty offence? Even

your correspondent admits there was some good cause for delay, when he says, "there was a large body of highly honorable and independent men in Congress declined voting any further appropriations for the contract?"

Why, Messrs. Editors, this extreme sensibility on the part of Mr. Calhoun's friends, that one cannot even at a glance of the eye towards him, as he is charged with some improper motive "Is the servant above his master?" If Mr. Calhoun is above corruption, or suspicion, is he also exempt from error, that it should be thought criminal for a plain man to ask for information upon any of his acts? Has the officer so imbecile so pure, and its officers so imbecile, that an individual who, in proper views, or stigmatised with opprobrious epithets?

I thought ours was a government of laws, and not of men; that there was no man in the nation whose acts were beyond the reach of the law; no officer under the government who was not responsible for his conduct. And pray, what responsibility is there, if the door of inquiry is shut, and the applicant contemptuously driven away by a party of zealots who guard the entrance, and charge him with "Radicalism," or upbraid him with "unchastened and unhallowed ambition;" who watch over the character of Mr. C. as if it was so pumy, that the slightest breath of falsehood would cast the rot of malice and tarnish it forever? Surely your correspondent did not see the point to which his argument extends; and I feel no disposition to press it. If Mr. Calhoun's public life has been so irreproachable as he seems to think it, investigation ought rather to be courted than avoided, as every inquiry would add new lustre upon his character.

I do declare most solemnly, that I have no personal hostility to Mr. Calhoun; far otherwise. I admire him for the brilliancy of his talents, his high attainments, and his many virtues; I respect him for the distinguished services he has rendered our common country. The greatest injury Mr. C. is likely to sustain, will be inflicted by his friends, who, from an over ardent desire to serve him, indiscriminately apply the lash to all who do not respond to their dogmas. As well might the term of apostate, or even traitor, be applied to the friends and supporters of Mr. Calhoun, as that of Radical (under any of its various definitions) to Mr. Crawford and his friends. It is true, gentlemen, I wish Mr. Crawford's election; but I wish it upon very different grounds to those, which seem to influence some of Mr. Calhoun's supporters. If Mr. Crawford has not strength of character sufficient to entitle him to the confidence of his countrymen, without traducing that of his competitors, or tarnishing the well-earned laurels of his rivals; then let him fail. Not so with his opponents; there is not a word in the English language too opprobrious to be applied to him, and those who advocate him; they narrate things which common sense revolts at, and tell anecdotes which credulity itself cannot believe. Nor are they satisfied with this: they are attempting to break up the very foundation of the Union! destroy the harmony of the States, by sowing the seeds of discord and jealousy among them, by invoking the pride of North-Carolina, to induce her to vote against Wm. H. C. to sacrifice the man of her choice, to prove she is free from Virginia influence. These and many other devices have been resorted to by honorable men, for the attainment of an honorable end; still W. H. C. stands firm in the opinions and confidence of the Republicans.

It is upon principle I advocate the election of Mr. Crawford; it is because I believe he will, if elected, administer the government within the rules prescribed by the Constitution; that he will consider the happiness of the citizen to consist rather in the peaceful enjoyment of the fruits of their domestic labors, than in having their substance swallowed up in the payment of heavy taxes to build a large fleet, support a numerous standing army; to erect forts 3 or 400 miles in the Indian territory, to awe the poor natives into submission to the lawless hunter, who trespasses upon their lands and robs them of their game; to protect a trade worth \$250,000 at the expence of half a million; contracts and advance of money not noticed. Already have I heard some of Mr. Calhoun's friends say, "I wish our fleet was a little larger, that we might go to war with France, for refusing a passage to the Congress frigate." I do not charge these sentiments to Mr. C.—I only mention them to mark the disposition of his friends.

It would be highly gratifying to me, and many others who support Mr. Crawford upon the same principle, (not from personal consideration,) believing him