The Star, and North-Carolina Gazette.

No. 35 RALEIGH, (N. C.) FRIDAY, AUGUST 27, 1824. Vol. XV

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

Subscriber price, 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 arrearages are paid. Advertisements, not exceeding fifteen lines, inserted three times for one dollar, and twenty-five cents for each over instance.—All letters to the editors must be post paid.

COMMUNICATIONS.

FOR THE STAR.

Messrs. Editors—The Register of the 20th contains a piece signed "TIMOTHY," which I advise your readers to glance over, in order to form some estimate of the modesty and the disappointed rage of the Crawford writers. After the Washington Caucus, these gentry made a great display of calculating genius in showing the people the amount of popularity their candidate possessed. They proceeded thus thro' Numeration, Addition, and even Multiplication; but, finding all this unavailable, they dashed into the rules of Supposition and Vulgar Fractions.

This "Timothy," I have said to myself, must be no other than "NED," dressed in a new suit of *Virginia* cloth, dyed a darker color with galls and poison; for I would *bet* (after the fashion of his country) a trifle, that most of the communications for the Register are of his production.

Having read many of the communications on the Presidential question, I find this striking fact, in opposition to "Timothy's" statement, that the opponents of Mr. Crawford attack his public acts and character, while his supporters descend to all the low ribaldry of private rumor and scandal. The appeals of the former are to known official documents, or transactions fairly before the public; the latter utter and publish assumed facts without authority, and without the power of proof; or descend to all the pitiful arts of perversion and amplification, as most fitly suits their purpose.

I will refer your readers to the pieces which have appeared in the Register and the Star. What are the productions of "Ned," "A North-Carolinian," &c. but attacks upon General Jackson, with scarcely an appeal to the true character and history of Mr. Crawford's public life? What is that foolish story which follows "Timothy's" cammunication in the Register, from the Boston Statesman? What is the extract from the Washington Gazette in the same paper? This last named piece is a most empty contradiction in itself; for while it affects to contrast the conduct of some of the opponents of Mr. Crawford, in reference to him with his forbearance towards them, intimates, that were he in health, they would not *dare to offer him offence!* Aye, Messrs. Editors, you see here, that no merit is due to Mr. Crawford for his forbearence, for it is plainly intimated by the chief text-book of the Crawfordites, that want of nerve alone prevents his active prowess, and that too in a way and to an extent which would command, not respect merely, but *silence!* This is the wise, magnanimous, meek man, whose *negative* virtues are compared by "*Tim*" to the light of the sun. This is the man of "uncommon virtues and splendid talents," who, with all his infirmities, has had fortitude enough to keep his office for more than 12 months, while unable to attend to its duties; an instance new in the history of this or any other government, and furnishing conclusive evidence of forbearance of the President at least.

The friends of the Caucus Candidate may manœuvre, vaunt and rage; their cause only appears the more desperate. Members of Congress may write circulars, justifying their Caucus doings as the mere acts of *private individuals*, while their minions of the type proclaim those doings as the "National Nomination," the "Regular Congressional Nomination," &c. Mr. Crawford may be represented as one thing in the North, and another in the South, the whole machinery of Caucus influence and intrigue may work its way: The independent and patriotic part of the community must decide whether they will be *blinded* and *bullied* into acquiescence.

HOMESPUN.

FOR THE STAR.

OLD AND NEW PARTIES.

Messrs. Editors,—Since my last communication on this subject was written, a writer, who calls himself "One of the People," has appeared in the Register of the 10th and 17th inst. with a very serious lecture upon it, under the profession of giving a history of the origin and an application of the terms *Federal* and *Republican*, *Ultra* and *Radical*.

I will pass over his account of the two first characters. I will not controvert most of his positions. But I would ask for what purpose he has introduced them; for they seem neither to form any connection with the characters which he would oppose to each other at the present time; or to furnish any clue to the history of the "origin," or shew the "application" of his terms of the parties he terms "Ultra" and "Radical." Indeed, he seems to have fallen into such a dilemma when he had arrived at the second scene of his developement, that he forgot what he had undertaken. He gives us no description of the term *Ultra* or its application. It is apparent, that, had he pursued the subject in order, he would have discovered the rottenness of his cause at once; for had he introduced the character of "Ultra" in its proper place, he must have failed in placing the party so termed in a position which would have answered his purpose. If he had stated that the Ultras were a party formed upon the Federal stock, inheriting their principles, almost every reader would have marked the falsehood: for the men now stigmatized as *Ultras*, are the most conspicuous of the old Republican members of Congress, who have pursued the line of American policy—friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none—a separation from foreign politics; and a firm, persevering attention to our own internal security and prosperity. It would have been in vain for this writer to place the *Ultras* so called upon the old Federal ground which he has described; and how then he would have found a place for his *Radicals*, in the order he first proposed, no one can imagine, except by admitting the plain fact, as I have given it in my last, that they first appeared as an excrescence upon the Republican party, then formed an aberration; and afterwards collecting together all the incongruous materials of opposition, took the attitude of seeking popularity and importance by opposing every measure of vital importance for the welfare and security of the nation, either wholly or in detail, so as to claim the merit of great economy and exclusive vigilance. Projecting nothing, they had nothing to be blamed for. Opposing every useful measure, they covered the folly of their conduct by vociferating economy, opposition to patronage, &c.

In the abstract manner in which the above writer has thought proper to introduce his Radical party, he is easily met in his assumed garb of superlative patriotism. The origin of the word is as incorrect as the application he has made of it. The term Radical was unknown in England, either as a descriptive character amongst the advocates of reform, or as a term of reproach from their enemies. It originated with the circumstances of latter times; and furnishes a proper cause of its application in this country. It was after the oppressions of the British government had carried their effects through all the laboring classes in England during the last war, that this term Radical was applied to the incensed multitudes, who, galled by their sufferings, sought to level with the dust all those mechanic inventions which substituted their labor, and advocated the General discharge of the national debt by one operation of a "*dish-cloth;*" thus prostrating all national advantages over other countries in their manufactures, and all private credit by producing a general bankruptcy. The difference between a Reformer and a Radical was this: the first sought for universal suffrage and annual Parliaments, in order to bring about a general melioration of the condition of the people: the latter sought for the destruction of that which immediately weighed upon them, leaving all the consequences to chance.

The Radicals of this country acquire their name from their disregard of the true interests and security of the country; pursuing a plan of opposition calculated to make us the prey of foreign nations, and the sport of a blind and improvident chance. It has been the theme of the demagogues of this party to circulate pitiful circulars, boasting of the opposition they have made to the measures of the Republican administrations of the country, and members of Congress who have sought to promote the public welfare and the security of the country.

The difference between the Adams system of Federalism in 1798 & the Republican system which succeeded it, is, that the former sought to make the people's interests subservient to the power of the government, and the latter to make the operations of the government subserve the interests of the people, in rendering the country independent in the enjoyment of its own resources, and secure from the assults of all despotic powers. The Radicals regard neither the formidable attitude of despotism, the wisdom and foresight of true Republican government, or the independence of the country. Their system, if a system it can be called, is disorganization, dependent upon chance, in defiance of all the sage lessons of experience, collected as well from history, the knowledge of passing events in the world, and the common prudence of private life.

The particular measures of reduction referred to by this writer, are claimed by him as a specimen of the acts of his party. But, from his remarks, it evidently appears they were not exclusively their work. Congress deemed them proper at the time; and it remains for Congress to consider well their effects. No doubt they were effected partly by the clamors of his party, for sound wisdom and policy by no means mark their front to the extent to which they have been carried; and if, in the present perilous state in which we stand in reference to the powers of the old world, some of their plans should render it necessary for us to arm in our defence, the first sentiment of the patriot will be felt in opposition to them. But if all the propositions of the Radical party had been carried into effect, at this day we should have presented any thing but a Nation. If, too, the simple doctrine of economy is to be carried to its extent, and public men are to be estimated by the full measure of the standard, the most eminent Republican will be the man who can procure an entire abolition of all Government, with all its expenditures, leaving every man to protect himself against domestic fraud and foreign assault. If we are to have Radicalism, let us have it with all its *blessings*. Let us pull down our Federal and State Governments. Turn our Legislatures, our Executive officers, our Judges, and all the host of paid-men out of office; put off our Council houses at auction; set adrift our floating castles, to be dashed against the cragged rocks of the coast, or taken up by the heroes of other climes; and at once come down to the *radical* basis of individual, where every one shall act without control, so long as the vice and the despotism which rules in the world shall allow us thus to live; and, *perchance*, we shall find this is the only *radical* Republic.

SOUND POLICY.

GEN. JACKSON & THE TARIFF.

To the Editor of the Courtland (Alabama) Herald.

SIR,—I have seen some attempts made to establish a charge of inconsistency against General Jackson, from his votes on the Tariff. Supposing that General Jackson was one of the last men in the United States against whom a charge of *inconsistency* would ever have been made, I was not a little astonished when I saw a serious attempt to do it.

My long and intimate acquaintance with General Jackson, and a sincere friendship for him, induced me to address a letter to our highly respected Senator *Judge Kelly*, for correct information of the course pursued by the General, and the various *circumstances* under which his different votes were given. In reply, I received from Judge Kelly the following letter, which, as an impartial Editor, it is hoped you will publish in your paper.

Respecfully yours,

LEWIS DILLAHUNTY.

Moulton, July 20, 1824.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter of this date, I will give you with great pleasure, such information as my memory will enable, on the subject of Gen. Jackson's sourse in the Senate on the Tariff Bill. I do this more readily, because I have found a misunderstanding to prevail on the subject, in other parts of the state as well as this. On such articles as are essential in war, viz. arms, ammunition, and soldiers' clothing, he was disposed to lay such a duty as would lead to the production of a competent supply in our own country, & on all other articles he was disposed to lay such a duty as would best subserve the purposes of revenue.—These were his general principles, and I am well convinced, that every vote he gave on the various provisions of the bill, was calculated, in his judgment, to illustrate and carry them out into their practicable results.—When he thought the duty fixed by the House of Representatives was not too high for the objects above mentioned, he voted to retain it, and where he thought it was too high, he voted to reduce it.—Iron and hemp were examples of the former, and wool, woollen cloths, cotton fabrics, and bagging of the later class.—He voted to retain the duty on Iron and Hemp as it came from the House, and to reduce the duty on wool, woollen cloth, and bagging, considerably below the rate that passed the House of Representatives—On woollen cloths a progressive, duty was laid, increasing yearly from 25 per centum advalorem, up to 50; he voted with us, to reduce this increasing duty from 50 to 33 1-3 per centum; a similar increasing duty was laid on imported wool, and he voted for a similar reduction; 80 cents was fixed as the minimum valuation of woollen cloth by the square yard, for the purpose of revenue calculations; say the duty laid was 33 1-3 per cent. on the value of the cloth, that value must be known at the custom house, in order to calculate the amount of duty to be paid by the Importer.—Suppose a piece of cloth should cost but 20 cents a yard in Europe, which is said to be the fact, in relation to some coarser fabrics, and this cloth which cost but 20 cents in the foreign market, should be rated at the custom house as having cost 80 cents the square yard, it is clear that the actual duty laid on it would be 33 1-3 per cent. four times told, or 133 1-3 per centum ad valorem.—The tendency of the bill, would be to prohibit the importation of the coarser fabrics entirely.—This he voted against, and voted with us to reduce the minimum valuation from 80 to 30 cents the square yard; the minimum valuation on coarse cottons by the Tariff of 1816, was 25 cents the square yard, by the late bill it was raised to 50 as it passed the House of Representatives. He voted with us, to reduce it from 50 to 20 cents the square yard, making an increase of 5 cents only; covering such fabrics only as ranged from 25 to 80 cents the square yard, in actual value, for the former bill was prohibitory on all fabrics much below the value of 25 cents the square yard. The ad valorem duty was also raised on cotton fabrics, and he voted with us to reduce it, as well as my memory serves me; but my impression on this feature of the bill is less distinct than on the other. As to cotton bagging, the duty was fixed in the House of Representatives at 4 1-2 cents the square yard for the first year, and 5 1-2 afterwards.—The parties were so nearly equal for and against the bill, as to render it necessary to observe great caution in selecting the points of attack, as well as the time & manner of making the different movements. Upon a consultation with the Senators from South-Carolina and Georgia, it was thought most prudent to make our first experiment on the proposed increase of 5 1-2 cents the square yard, and the motion was limited accordingly, under a belief that a broader motion would fail at that time. The General voted to strike out the 5 1-2 cents. At a subsequent period, Mr. Macon of North Carolina moved to strike out the 4 1-2 cents, and if his motion had prevailed, by another clause in the bill the duty on bagging would have been 25 per cent. ad valorem, instead of 20, the former duty as laid in 1816. This motion was made by Mr. Macon while the bill was before the Senate as in committee of the whole, and while the duty on sail cloth and osnaburgs, &c. stood at 25 per centum ad valorem. In this state of things, the General voted against the motion to strike out; but in a different state of things, when the motion was renewed in the Senate, he voted for it, and it prevailed. Between the times of giving these two votes, which seem to stand in apparent contradiction, the ad valorem duty of 25 per centum on sail cloth, osnaburgs, &c. had been reduced to 15. The General was against the reduction, but after it was made, he voted to strike out 4 1-2 cents on bagging, in order that so great a distinction between the duty imposed upon the different fabrics of hemp should not be made. This intervening reduction of duty from 25 to 15 per centum on the clothing of the ships of the North and the black population of the South, all fabricated from the same, or a similar material with bagging, seems not to be generally understood by the people of Alabama.—When that important fact is known, it seems to me, that the charge of inconsistency or instability must *evaporate*, and the votes of the General will quadrate well with his own avowed principles of action, and leave his character for consistent stability on the elevated ground on which he has placed it, by a long course of splendid atchievements, and patriotic, and exalted actions.

Although I was opposed to the Tariff in every shape, I am sure that the General voted as honestly for the good of his country, according to the dictates of his best judgment, as any man ever did, or ever will upon any occasion; and whatever political adversaries may think, say, write and print to the contrary, I feel well assured, that he was actuated as far above the supposed influence of any one of his votes upon his canvass for the Presidency, as it is possible for human frailty to be.—I do not believe he would have changed a single vote to insure his election.—He will not conceal his opinions, and it is by his opinions as they really are, that he will rise or fall. In fine, I saw nothing to lessen, but much to increase my exalted opinion of him as a man and a patriot, in the course of our service in the Senate, at the late important and laborious session—nor do I see any thing so exclusively hostile to the interests of Alabama in his course as a politician, even upon the Tariff Bill, as to overbalance his strong claims to the gratitude and support of the nation.—I cannot see the justice of paying off the countless thousands we owe him for his splendid exertions in procuring the soil we cultivate, with a pitiful extra cent on a yard of bagging, or called, or a *picaine*, on a yard of broad cloth—and above all, it seems to be useless to abandon him for his support of the Tariff, unless we could be assured that some one of the opposing Candidates was against the Bill, or in favor of it to a less extent than he was. We have no evidence within my knowledge, upon which we can safely say, that Mr. Crawford or Mr. Adams would not have supported the Bill to as great an extent as he did, had they been in his situation.

I should have accorded without hesitation, the explanation you request, to the General, even if I had been opposed to his election to the Chief Magistracy of the nation—it is due to him on the plain principles of justice, and I consider it my duty to give to the people of Alabama, or any portion of them, such information as I may possess on all subjects in which their interest is concerned, whenever and wherever it may be required of me. Under this impression I have drawn up such a reply to your different enquries, as my recollection enabled me to do. It may possibly be incorrect in some particulars, as I have not at this place, access to the documents on the subject.

I feel confident that it is not materially defective or incorrect. You are at liberty to make such use of it, as in your judgment may be proper.

With great respect,

Your obedient servant,

WILLIAM KELLY.

P. S. It may not be amiss to add that the two Houses of Congress disagreed on two points, viz. striking out the 4 1-2 cents on bagging, and reducing the minimum on coarse woollens; and if the General had been disposed to pursue a fickle and changing policy, an excellent opportunity was presented to recede from his ground when the House disagreed to those two amendments of the Senate.—This opportunity he did not embrace, but voted to insist on our amendments: as to coarse woollens, his vote was essential. The Senate were equally divided, and the question decided by the casting vote of the Vice President. A committee of conference was appointed between the two Houses, of which the General was a member, by which our amendments as to woollens prevailed, and a specific duty of 3 3-4 cents the square yard on bagging inserted. Whether this duty is more than the former duty of 20 per centum or not is somewhat questionable. If it exceeds it at all, it is but little, too little, to make a fuss about, unless it be for the sake of the principle.—The amount surely can make no sensible impression on the progress of the cotton States—such a grain of sand can never overbalance the mountain of fame, against which it is weighed.

W. K.

NEW-YORK MEETING.

At a large public meeting of the citizens of New-York, held at the Tontine Coffee-House on Thursday evening, Aug. 12th, 1824, GEO. WARNER was called to the chair, and *Thomas Hazard, Jun.* appointed Secretary. The meeting was addressed by Gen. Robert Bogardus, Charles G. Haines, Esq. Stephen Rudd, and Thomas Addis Emmet, Esq.—The following resolutions, offered by Gen. Bogardus, were unanimously adopted:

1. Resolved, That the choice of Electors of President and Vice President of the United States belongs of right to the people, and that the withholding of this right, by the present Legislature of the state, is a proceeding, justly stigmatised as oppressive and tyrannical.

2. Resolved, That those members of the Senate and Assembly, who voted against the Electoral Bill, have abused the confidence reposed in them; violated the rights of their constituents; degraded the character of the state; and rendered themselves utterly unworthy to be the Representatives of freemen.

3. Resolved, That we will never cease from our efforts, until the passage of the Electoral Law shall be effected, and that we will support those men only, for office and political advancement, who are friendly to restoring to the people of this state, their just right in the election of President and Vice President of the United States.

[See 4th Page.]