The Star, and North-Carolina Gazette.

No. 16. RALEIGH, (N. C.) FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 1824. Vol. XV.

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

Subscription, three dollars per annum.—No paper will be sent without at least $1 for it paid in advance, and no paper discontinued, but at the option of the Editors, unless all arrearages are paid. Advertisements not exceeding fifteen lines, inserted three times for one dollar, and twenty-five cents for each continuance.—All letters to the editors must be post-paid.

POLITICAL.

The Raleigh Register gives to Mr. Crawford the states of New York, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia and Delaware. This is a very generous contribution, but unfortunately it is made at the cost of truth and justice. We were a little surprised that the Editors of the Register did not throw Maine into the bargain. After the unusual pains which the radical journals have taken to convince the American people that Maine is destined to swell the number of Mr. Crawford's supporters, we marvel much that she should be so suddenly abandoned. Let us look a little, however, into the facts as to the states which the Register has given to the radical candidate. Virginia is his native state, and Georgia his adopted one. In these facts, we may find reasons for their support of him; although it appears to be questionable whether Mr. Crawford will obtain the former of these states without a struggle; and we are certain that if he has a majority in Georgia, it is but a bare majority. As to the little federal state of Delaware, we have no indications of a preference for Mr. Crawford in any of the movements there; but if she should decide for him, we presume it will be on the ground taken by a federal member of the House of Representatives, some days since, that she will stick by an old federalist of '98, in preference to one of your republican candidates; and what effect a support on such grounds may have upon his popularity in Virginia and other states, our readers may judge. North Carolina too! She is evidently thrown into the scale, on a calculation that the election will develve upon the House of Representatives. The Editors of the Register consider themselves sufficiently backed when they have the representatives in Congress from that state on their side. Entrenched behind these gentlemen, they throw contempt upon the opinions of the people; knowing as they do, that these opinions are contrary to the sentiments expressed by their representatives, and in decided hostility to the claims of Mr. Crawford. With all their hardihood, however, we think these Editors will not venture to tell us that Mr. Crawford is, at this time, the popular candidate in North Carolina. They know the fact is not so; and if they persist in maintaining the contrary, it is the obstinacy of desperation, and not the tenaciousness of truth. Finally, let us look at the grounds on which New York is claimed for Mr. Crawford. Because her legislature has not passed the electoral law, Mr. Crawford will obtain the state! How is it then that there has been no caucus at Albany to sustain the nomination of the minority caucus here, and to echo the Richmond caucus? How is it, when the former caucus at Albany, some two or three months since pledged itself to support the regular nomination, that it should now hesitate to redeem its pledge? The friends of Mr. Crawford, we suspect, will soon join the cry of the friends of the people, and exclaim that the New York state delegates are not so fond of redeeming, as of giving their pledges. Every exertion has been made to get up a caucus; but defeat has inevitably followed; and we are now assured, on the authority of respectable citizens of that state, that, in no event which can now be foreseen, can Mr. Crawford be the candidate of New York.

We are sorry to see the Register treading so servilely in the steps of the Intelligencer. The time is near at hand when the mask will be stripped from intrigue, and the veil from misrepresentation; and, we would ask, with what face can these journals again ask for the confidence of the people, who shall be proved by the result to have been laboring only to scatter deception over the public mind, with a view to promote the views and subserve the interests of a candidate who had no hold on the respect or affections of the nation? They may labor to palliate their conduct, or seek to hide it in oblivious silence, but the people will remember the past, and will visit them with a just, although severe retribution.

Wash. Rep.

To the Editors of the Middlesex (Conn.) Gazette.

Gentlemen: A letter of extraordinary character having been accidentally found in this city, last Friday, it was thought expedient to advise with a number of our citizens as to the course it was proper to pursue respecting it.—A meeting of several gentlemen was accordingly called on Saturday, who appointed a committee to report on the subject, at a public meeting to be holden on this, next Monday evening; at which last meeting the following Report was submitted and accepted, and the resolution therein recommended was unanimously passed.—A Citizen.

"The committee to whom was referred the expediency of retaining and publishing a certain letter found on the public walk in this city, on the 26th instant, respectfully report: That the committee have been shown a copy of the letter referred to, which is as follows:

New-London, Connecticut,
October 9th, 1823.

Dear Sir: As you may have perceived, the Republican Advocate, of this place, has for some time taken an active and very decided stand in support of Mr. Crawford and democracy. The republicans here appear all united in the same cause. The Advocate, in conjunction with the Times, at Hartford, will undoubtedly have a just influence in this State and *out of it*. Cannot the Sentinel, of your place, be made to do its duty, in an *immediate* support of the interests of the country? Its co-operation *at this time* is very desirable.

I understand, on good authority, that the Mercury, of Hartford, would also do its duty in this cause, if they were not fearful of losing the printing of the United States' laws. *In the discharge of their duty, they certainly ought to be protected against a sacrifice of their interests*, and I should think there would be republicans sufficiently patriotic to guard them from any loss for their fidelity to the party. The New-Haven Register, it is to be feared, will be for *amalgamation*, &c.

It is undoubtedly a point of great importance, to get a *Senator of decided democracy*.

With the highest respect and esteem, I am your faithful servant,

George H. Richards.

Alexander Wolcott, Esq. Middletown.

This letter is directed to "Alexander Wolcott, Esq. Collector of the Port, Middletown," and was lying on the ground open when found. It is superscribed in a different hand-writing from the body of the letter, and is post-marked at New-London, Oct. 10. The nature of its contents being of so extraordinary a cast, it was thought to be of sufficient public interest to justify the detention of the letter, until the public mind with regard to it, could in some measure be ascertained.

The present is a very interesting period with our country; we are about to exercise our highest and most important privileges as freemen, and citizens of the only free government on earth! The time has arrived when the United States has taken a stand among the nations of the world; which, while it is peaceful and calm at home, is powerful and commanding abroad, by the influence of its example; its relations are daily assuming new importance; and the happiness and liberty of the citizens of the United States are to be vitally affected by the man who shall be elected President of the United States, for the four years next ensuing. It is of course a matter of high interest that he should be a man chosen by the people!—a man who shall be the President of the *United States*, ruling and governing them, as a great and powerful nation; and not the mere head of a faction, who shall obtain the office to gratify an insatiable thirst for power, and rule with a view to reward favorites, and such as have sold themselves to advance him to the office which he seeks. Every thing, therefore, which indicates the use of base and improper means, in order to increase, or create an influence upon the public mind, in favor of a particular candidate for that dignified and responsible office, ought and will, by a free and virtuous community, be watched with a jealous eye.

Some of the circumstances relating to the letter under consideration, which have presented themselves to the committee as of some moment, are, that the writer of the letter is said to be a clerk in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States; that it is directed to a man who enjoys his office under the patronage of the same officer, and that officer is Wm. H. Crawford, a candidate for the Presidency of the United States; that the letter discloses a set purpose to engage several of the publishers of newspapers in this State to support the claims of Mr. Crawford! The fact is announced that two have already engaged in the cause, and it is requested that a third should be made to do its duty immediately. The fears of one, lest they should lose the printing of the laws of the United States, are to be quieted. Who does not understand this? The most detestable crimes are often gilded with fair names.

Another circumstance, which is within the recollection of most of you, has occurred to your committee, as evidencing a degree of efficiency in this letter, which marks it as being not altogether of a harmless cast. You will recollect that the writer requests that the Sentinel, a paper published in this city, may be *made to do its duty*. Now mark the change—from being the avowed supporter of Mr. Adams until that time, on the 29th day of October the Sentinel commences in support of Mr. Crawford! The *immediate support* of the Sentinel is requested to be secured, in a letter dated the 9th of October, and the support is afforded on the 29th of the same month.—Surely this is a promptitude which should excite our admiration! And in the next number of the Sentinel, *Mentor*, the champion of Mr. Crawford, appears, and the praises of Mr. Crawford have been rung, in that paper, from that time to the present, to almost the entire exclusion of all the other candidates. Now, who is *Mentor!* If he should be ascertained to be the same gentleman on whom public opinion has long since fixed, he is not a stranger to him to whom this letter is addressed—what then is the language which it speaks?

When your committee reflect on the means which have been publicly exerted to carry the [illegible] friends of Mr. Crawford—at the seat of government, in their caucus—in the State of New-York, with reference to the choice of Electors, and the exclusive claims set up by them for patriotism, and republicanism, and the denunciations which are made against such as differ from them in opinion—they cannot but regard the detection and exposure of practices of this kind, as a duty incumbent on every citizen who would not sacrifice the cause of freedom and self-government on the unhallowed shrine of party feeling and personal aggrandizement.

Your committee, therefore, recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, as the sense of this meeting, that the letter referred to in the above Report, ought to be retained and preserved, as the best and only proper mode of furnishing correct evidence of its contents and authenticity."

Extract from the Address of Dr. James A. Craig, *to a meeting held in Orange county, on the 6th ultimo, at which Gen. Jackson was recommended as a suitable candidate for the Presidency.*

After taking a comprehensive view of the policy of the European powers, and their designs against political liberty, Dr. Craig proceeds—

If I may be permitted to speak plainly, have we not already, in the present electioneering campaign for a chief magistrate of the U. S. seen rapid strides towards aristocracy—a bold attempt by the *few* to wrest from the hands of *the people* that privilege which the constitution of our Country guaranties to them? You, no doubt, already anticipate me: I mean in a *Congressional Caucus nomination of a President of the United States*, when but a minority of the members of Congress, and a *lank* minority it was, that met the other week in Washington City. These officious guardians of our liberties assembled themselves, recommended *their favorite candidate*, and proposed resolutions favorable to his pretensions. Does not there appear to be something premeditated in all this? And it is a matter of no little surprise to us, that, in the lengthy address to that body by their chairman, Mr. Ruggles, he assigns not a solitary *reason* why either Mr. Crawford or Mr. Gallatin have had a preference over the other gentlemen who are named for President and Vice President. Can they pretend to say that either of these are the choice of the Republic? that these two possess superior qualifications to all the other candidates? They have specified nothing of the kind, and yet 64 men were wanting to palm upon *ten millions of people* the candidate who, perhaps above all the others, is their last choice. Is this "Republicanism?" Is this scholarship of the Jeffersonian school? I apprehend that it is not. But the friends of the caucus, in plea of their proceeding, retreat behind the shelter of ancient usage and authority. But is not this Tyrany, the very rampart that preserves invulnerable the despotism of Europe? May not the friends of the caucus system, therefore, still urge, Congress has exercised the right of electing a President; therefore congress may lawfully continue to do so? Exercise of power can never confer right. But we deny that any such nomination, as is now contemplated, was ever made by Congress.

When Thomas Jefferson was nominated by a Democratic Congress, the two parties at that day were nearly balanced, and the united democracy of the union pointed to Thomas Jefferson as the competitor of John Adams. This nomination was nothing more than promulging the will of the whole democratic party. Madison was nominated during the Embargo and war, in accordance with the known wishes of Democracy. Monroe, in 1816, was the well known candidate of the Democratic party; but so nearly was his nomination defeated, in defiance of the voice of the People, by a *Congressional Caucus*, that the "old mode" was abandoned by the Nation in 1820. But the friends of this measure urge further, in defence of their system, that it is to preserve unanimity in the Democratic ranks; that it is the voice of the Republican strength in Congress. If so, why was it not manifested? Can they pretend to say that 66 is the aggregate of the Democratic party in Congress? But, after the friends of this party failed to gain a more imposing recommendation for their favorite candidate, they tell us gravely he has yet the majority of the 261 members in Congress. If so, it is much to be regretted that there is so little unanimity among Mr. Crawford's friends; for their meeting has done nothing towards concentrating the opinions of the members of Congress, unless as to the *four* gentlemen who did not vote for *the Radical Candidate*.

We are told that there are no dangers to be apprehended from a caucus nomination of a President; that it is but a matter of mere recommendation; that the people are nevertheless left to exercise their elective franchise. The matter then, gentlemen, is reduced to this fact: either the caucus recommendation does contribute to the election of their favorite candidate, or it does not. If it does, you must admit that it is an assumption of power; the voice of not a constituent being heard, and we, the people, in whose hands this power is guaranteed by the constitution of our Country, our voice is to be suppressed. We, who should at least have equal weight in the selection, are compelled to stand silent spectators, and our acting in this passive mode is to be construed as acquiescence on our part. They, the *Caucus men*, without any instructions from their constituents, or without a single clause in the constitution to sanction them, want to dictate a supreme ruler for the nation. Thus this small minority of Congress want to say not only to the rest of the members of Congress, but to the United States, Mr. Crawford shall be your President. If we let such a flagrant violation as this be made upon our liberties, depend upon it, in a few more years, we may go to the poles of election and drop our votes into the ballot box, but it will be a mere form only. They, the *Caucus men*, will have the substance—*we, the people*, will hold but the shadow of the election.

I will now leave it to the candid decision of every well reflecting mind, if at Washington City, during the session of Congress, there is not laid open the most ample field for speculating in the Presidential election? We may suppose, for instance, that there may arrive a period in our republic, when the members of Congress, may not be characterised by as much virtue and Republican principles as they are at this day,—that there may then be a Candidate for the Presidency who is a *giant at intrigue*. Like other candidates, he will have his number of satellites at Congress. How easy it will be for him to say to them: my friends, as I am now a candidate for the Presidency, I wish you to use all the exertion in your power to promote my interest. Go amongst your acquaintances in Congress, sound them, and bring over all the interest possible in my scale, and if I should be so fortunate as to be the successful candidate, depend upon it, you shall be well compensated for it; you shall act in some diplomatic capacity, or you shall have the appointment of Secretary of War, of the Secretary of the Treasury, or you shall fill some other post of distinction and profit under my administration, and your friends shall not be losers by it. Can we suppose but that there will be some members who will not be of such sterling integrity, as to remain proof against temptation like this? I fear we shall have ambitious men there who will be looking forward for the opportunity to arrive, when they can obtain some post of profits and distinction in the government; nor will they be so very scrupulous about the method, so they can but ascend the steps to office.

Seeing there is ample room opened for undue exercise in the Presidential election *in caucus*, and room left us to apprehend the worst of conjectures to ensue to our *liberties*, it is incumbent upon us not only to denounce every transaction of this *solemn* and *august body*, notwithstanding their decree hath gone forth, as they suppose, like the decree of the Medes or Persians, *actum est*—it is done—it has become the law of the land; and *we, the people*, are to bow in submission.

If a caucus recommendation doth not foster their favorite candidate's election, I would ask why is there so much ado made about this nomination at Washington city? Why did we see invitation after invitation in the City Gazette and National Intelligencer, previous to their meeting, so courteously inviting the members of Congress to join in caucus on the evening of the 14th of last February? I will not say, that "they chose darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." Seeing that it is apprehended that undue influence may be made in our election of President by this illegal confederacy, and that it may prove to us, as the "wooden horse" to the Trojans, it may discharge from its cavity the enemy, armed, even in the very citadel of our *liberties*. If we wish to preserve our freedom free and unsullied as we received it from the hand of our revolutionary fathers, who fought and bled to secure it, I would say not only to North-Carolina, but to the rest of the Union, beware of *Congressional caucuses* and *legislative nominations*. Are we too much fettered to be independent, and, like sleeping centinels, lie upon the walls, and, although the enemy advances rapidly upon the last citadel of our freedom, yet we will not sound the "toscin of alarm?" In examining the history of the caucus party, we will find that where the people wither, they flourish; where the people flourish, they wither. In the state of New York, but a few years ago, the pospects of this party ran high, but now they have a minority in Congress. Their prospects are sinking in the great state of New York. In Virginia this party prevails; and why? Because the *elective franchise* is vested in free holders. In Georgia and in our own state this party exists; and why? Because we are unequally represented. For my part, I hope I shall never be associated with that party whose views are not in accordance with the interests of the people. But I wish to be joined to that party, whose views rest in the great basis of the people throughout the union; and, as for this *caucus party*, gentlemen, I claim neither brotherhood, nor sympathy, nor fellowship with it.

As the Presidential question is a matter of the utmost importance to us all, and one which measurably engrosses the attention of the People, insomuch that it has become the order of the day throughout our country: to canvass fairly the merits and pretentions of the several candidates to this high, distinguished and responsible office, cannot, I presume, be otherwise than desirable. The first candidate I shall mention, is Mr. William H. Crawford, who has, for several years, presided over the Treasury Department of the United States, and, from his opposing the views and measures of the rest of the cabinet of the United States, has gained the appellation of the *Radical candidate*. He has been represented to us, by his Editorial friends, as the "man of the People." If so, how does it come to pass that he is so offensive to a respectable portion of the citizens of his own state? If his character is unimpeachable, and his talents of the first grade, it is fair to suppose that the good people of Georgia would all have unanimously joined in elevating him to the high office to which he aspires; but, by referring to the debates of the late session of the legislature of that State on the question to give Mr. Crawford a legislative recommendation for the Presidency, we find that able members of that body said that, on examining the wishes of the people of Georgia, it was "highly probable that more than one half of the citizens of that state was opposed to his election; and why opposed? because they know him, and that knowledge would not permit them to espouse his cause. This spoke a language not to be misunderstood by the rest of the states in the Union."—We find it to be the case, that, in ordinary matters, the man that does not possess the confidence of his neighbors, is not thought worthy to be trusted by them; but when an individual of this character aspires at the highest office in the gift of a free people, the good sense of the nation, we hope, will always triumph over pretentions so preposterous. The President of the United States should be a man above suspicion; his whole life should testify to his unblemished moral and political character; and the inference is irresistable, that Mr. Crawford was not distinguished for either of these. If he were, he would be, above all the other candidates, the choice of Georgia, and we would not find him, as we do at this day, the candidate of an inconsiderable party—the caucus candidate. Legislative nominations for a President, are almost a novelty in the annals of our country, and I hope, for the honor of old Virginia and Georgia, we shall, in a few more years, hear nothing more of legislative recommendation for a President of the United States. We have frequent instances of legislatures, in a private, but not in a public capacity, passing recommendations for men each day to high posts. In this instance, the legislature of Georgia was called upon to say what the voice of Georgia would be nearly twelve months after that. How could that be done? And the Presidential question, in all probability, was not the pivot upon which the election of a single member of either house had turned, and yet the friends of this candidate—" were wanting to say, not only to Georgia, but to the rest of the Union, Mr. Crawford is the man of the people's choice." The legislature of the state, like the representatives of every other state, were elected to make laws for their constituents, but not to manufacture a *President for the United States*.

Mr. Crawford has been represented as a "consistent republican"—as a "scholar of the Jeffersonian school." Let us examine these assertions a little, and see how facts will present themselves. But that he is no republican, let us refer to the *Augusta address*, a precious document written by himself, in the year 1798, to John Adams, the then President of the United States, complimenting and eulogizing, in the highest terms, the wisdom and policy of that administration, which had just passed the *alien* and *sedition laws*, and the *acts to raise a standing army*, and to *levy direct taxes in time of peace*. He had the most "*unlimited* confidence" in the "wisdom and justice" of the *alien* and *sedition laws*. It has been shewn, from an Augusta paper, (which I have at hand) that intelligence of these measures had reached Mr. Crawford previous to the date of his address. From the foregoing we have indubitable proof to convict him of the charge of being a *federalist*, for, in two of the most important questions that have come before Congress for the last 20 years—the embargo and the late war—we will find that he strenuously opposed these measures, which were recommended by Mr. Jefferson, in order to save our immense mercantile capital from the desolating sweeps of the French decrees and British orders in council.

On the 10th December, 1807, in an able speech, he recommended to Congress, the immediate adoption of certain measures to give security to our Shipping and Seamen, as our vessels were captured and our Sailors impressed almost within sight of our coasts. The result was the "laying on of an Embargo," as the only alternative to an open war. The support of the administration, in that measure, was the touch stone of Democracy. Now, let us see whether all those who now *profess to be of the Jeffersonian School, have been uniformly consistent Democrats*, and more particularly whether that Candidate for the Presidency, who is now, by way *of pre-eminence*, called the *Democratic candidate*, thought or acted with Mr. Jefferson at that important crisis! No! unfortunately for Mr. Crawford, his name stands *recorded* in the *opposition*; and on the final passage of this bill, this same Candidate voted in a *minority of six* against it, in company with the famous Timothy Pickering, and others of the *Essex junto school*. And on the final passage of the bill for fortifying our "ports and harbors," Mr. Crawford, after a vain attempt to *defeat the bill*, voted against it in a *minority of eleven*, in the same good company as before. Altho' Mr. Adams is charged with being a federalist, yet he supported these measures, and he has no where voted against bills which manifest such direct & decided hostility to any measure of Mr. Jefferson's administration as those two votes of Mr. Crawford's. If any one doubt as to the correctness of what I state, I refer him to the journals of Congress, for the year of 1807.

It is proved by one of Mr. Crawford's speeches, in 1809, that he opposed the repeal of the embargo, when Mr. Jefferson and the party had determined to abandon it, and prepare for more decisive measures. Was not the embargo measure expedient in its inception when Mr. Crawford voted against it, and unwise in its continuance when Mr. Crawford voted for it? As a *Financier*, let us see how the case stands with him. We find that, in one of his celebrated reports to Congress, he made a mistake of three millions of dollars in the amount of the receipts at the public customs. If he is so "purified" a financier, why did he suffer so large amounts of government deposites to remain in certain Western Banks "even longer than their cashiers had a right to ask;" and until finally some of them failed, and the government sustained an immense loss?

That Mr. Crawford deserves no credit for his giving way to Mr. Monroe in 1816, when he found that he could not be elected, will not be denied; nor does his conduct evince him to be so modest and unassuming, since it is well known that he had no superior claims on his country's gratitude; and for him to step forward, and to oppose, by every measure in his power, this tried veteran of the revolution for the Presidency, and finding, from his strength in Caucus, that he stood no chance to be elected, withdrew. And yet his friends tell us he is wonderfully "modest" wonderfully "unassuming." Yes, gentlemen, Mr. Crawford withdrew; but it was after he had run the race, but lost the purse. This is the man who, at the eve of the last war, on the floor of Congress, declared the "navy to be a fungus that ought to be amputated." This has been, in part, the political course Mr. Crawford has pursued, and the public records place it beyond controversy; and no one can contest it, unless he be a disciple of Berkley, who denies there is any such thing as substance in the word. Some months ago, from the most authentic sources, we were led to believe that New York would be unanimous for him; but now ask the hundred editors of newspapers in that state, and ninety-seven of the hundred will tell you that his prospects are lost—that he is done in New-York.

The friends of this candidate, I believe, do not pretend to say that he possesses superior qualifications to the other candidates; but they urge his pretensions on the score of economy. Bear with me, while, in a few words, I present to you some views illustra-

[See 4th Page.]