

THE STAR,

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

Subscription, three dollars per annum. No paper will be sent without at least \$1.50 in advance...

State of North-Carolina.

In obedience to the Act of the General Assembly of 1823, Chapter the 7th, the Public Treasurer hereby gives notice that he will purchase of the Stocks or Shares of any or all of the three several Banks of this State...

JOHN HAYWOOD Pub. Treas. Raleigh, Oct. 25, 1824.

Valuable Property for sale,

In Granville county, North Carolina, viz one Tract of 1000 acres of Land, on Grassy Creek; one Tract of 300 Acres, on the same creek; one tract of 800 acres on Tobacco Creek...

The soil well adapted to the culture of Corn, Tobacco, Wheat, Cotton, &c. and may justly be ranked with the valuable Lands of this County...

Granville County, Oct 12, 1824. MAURICE SMITH.

Notice

To the Officers and Soldiers of the Revolutionary War in the North Carolina line, and to the heirs of such who have not as yet obtained the portion of Lands due to them for such military services.

A convenience to such claimants many of whom through old age, must be in a measure unable to travel to Raleigh, together with the wishes and opinions of several influential and well informed men, suggests the utility of the establishment of an office in this city...

The subscriber living in Raleigh, offers his professional services as an Attorney, in all persons so situated, and promises to attend to, and put all claims transmitted to him, supported by affidavits, in train for adjudication by the Commissioners to whom the subject has been referred...

As the act above cited of the last session constituting the said Board, for the adjudication of all such claims, will expire on the first of July next, and the subject be at rest for ever after, persons wishing to avail themselves of the subscriber's offer, and professional services, will apply as soon as possible, so as to give time to have their several claims maturely considered, and determined and adjudicated.

He further informs those interested in such claims that he has made such arrangements with gentlemen of intelligence, and integrity, as will enable him to have any Lands they shall obtain, located, or otherwise disposed of to the best advantage for a proportion of either the Lands or proceeds.

The subscriber will expect every application to him on the subject accompanied by a moderate fee, and delivered at his office in Raleigh, free of expense to him.

JOHN D. DELACY.

Raleigh, Jan. 28th, 1825.

Just Published,

And for Sale, at the Star Office, the

SERMON,

Preached before the Bible Society of North Carolina, on the 12th of December, 1823, by the Right Rev'd John S. Ravenscroft, Bishop of the diocese of North Carolina; accompanied with an appendix. Price 20 cents.

Jan 20, 1825.

Notice.

Books and accounts are placed in the hands of Mr. Alex. J. Lawrence, one of the Editors of the Star, to whom those indebted will please to make payment.

THOS. HENDERSON.

Oct. 27, 1824.

GEN. EATON & MR. CLAY.

From the National Intelligencer. Messrs. GILLES & SEAYTON: You are requested to publish in the Intelligencer the enclosed letters, explanatory of the meaning which should attach to particular expressions contained in Mr. CLAY's Address to his Constituents. Respectfully, JNO. H. EATON.

Washington, 28th March, 1825. Sir: In the National Journal of this morning, over your signature, I find my name introduced with the following remarks:

"A few days after the publication of my card, another card, under Mr. Kremer's name, was published in the Intelligencer. The night before, as I was voluntarily informed, Mr. Eaton, a Senator from Tennessee, and the biographer of Gen. Jackson, was closeted for some time with him. I pretend not to know the object of Mr. Eaton's visit to him. I state the fact as it was communicated to me, and leave you to judge. Mr. Kremer's card is composed with some care, and no little art, and he is made to avow in it, though somewhat equivocally, that he is the author of the letter to the Editor of the Columbian Observer. To Mr. Crowninshield, a Member from Massachusetts, formerly Secretary of the Navy, he declared he was not the author of that letter."

The imputation which your phraseology would seem to convey, is that the letter which appeared in the Columbian Observer, and acknowledged by Mr. Kremer, was not written by him, but was in fact written by me; and that by me he was made to avow himself, "though somewhat equivocally," the author. Your language and meaning are somewhat equivocal too; but as by fair interpretation they appear to warrant this construction, I present myself before you, to require you distinctly to state whether or not any such meaning was by you designed to be conveyed. If this be the idea intended to be communicated, I will not persuade myself but that at least you are possessed of facts and circumstances to fix against me the opprobrious charge of writing a letter, which, as the inference must be, I was not merely afraid to acknowledge, but which, through finesse, arrangement, and closet management, I had caused to be avowed by one, who was innocent of producing it.

I have the honor to be, respectfully, your most obt. JNO. H. EATON.

Hon. HENRY CLAY, Sec'y of State.

Washington, 30th March, 1825

Sir: Your letter, under date the 28th inst. was handed to me yesterday. After referring to an Address of mine to my late Constituents, published in the National Journal of Monday, and from which you quote certain passages, you observe, "the imputation which your phraseology would seem to convey is, that the letter which appeared in the Columbian Observer, and acknowledged by Mr. Kremer, was not written by him, but was in fact, written by me, and that by me he was made to avow himself, though 'somewhat equivocally,' the author. Your language and meaning are somewhat equivocal too; but as by fair interpretation they appear to warrant this construction, I present myself before you, to require you distinctly to state, whether or not any such meaning was by you designed to be conveyed."

In the part of my Address to which you refer, having stated a particular fact respecting you, I observe, "I state the fact as it was communicated to me, & leave you to judge." I cannot, therefore, admit your right to call on me for any inferences from a fact which I have submitted to my constituents, leaving them to draw their own conclusions. But, in the spirit of frankness, which has ever guided me, I have no hesitation in stating that, in regard to the letter in the Columbian Observer, I have not formed, and therefore did not intend to intimate, any opinion of the person who was its real author. I was satisfied to take Mr. Kremer's declaration, that he was not the author of the letter, as made to the late Secretary of the Navy.

In the same spirit of frankness, however, it is proper for me to add, that I did believe, from your nocturnal interview with Mr. K. referred to in my Address, that you prepared or advised the publication of his card in the guarded terms in which it is expressed. I should be happy, by a disavowal on your part of the fact of that interview, or of its supposed object, to be able to declare, as in the event of such disavowal I would take pleasure in declaring, that I have been mistaken in supposing that you had any agency in the composition or publication of that card.

I have the honor to be, your obedient servant, H. CLAY.

The Hon. JOHN H. EATON.

Washington, March 31, 1825.

Sir: Your letter in answer to mine, was received at 4 o'clock yesterday; from the delay, I was disposed to think you had concluded not to reply.

On reading your communication to your late constituents, I had understood you as intending to convey the idea, not "by inference from a fact," but almost by actual avowal, that the letter published in the Columbian Observer was written by me; and that, to escape or avoid responsibility, by me, Mr. Kremer was made to acknowledge himself its author; your reply to my letter disavows this, and states that "you have not formed, and therefore did not intend to intimate, any opinion of the person who was its real author, being satisfied to take Mr. Kremer's declaration that he was not the author of the letter, as made to the late Secretary of the Navy."

Having nothing to do with this controversy, further than as I considered the introduction of my name intended personally and directly to affect myself, I might omit any notice of the concluding part of your remark as derived from Mr. Crowninshield, late Secretary of the Navy. In justice, however, to an absent individual, with whom my name has been associated, I shall not forbear the opinion, that Mr. Kremer never did use the language imputed to him. It is a mistake; any thing but

fact, and, without intending to ascribe the error to you, I claim the right of saying, that error revolts at the idea, that he should have made Mr. Crowninshield his confessor, and to him uttered a language, at war with his public and repeated private declarations made to his friends.

The concluding paragraph of your letter expresses a belief that I "prepared, or advised, the publication of his (Mr. K's) card, in the guarded terms in which it is expressed," and you desire yourself ready to acknowledge the mistake, if I will offer any disavowal.

If you had properly reflected as to that belonged to courtesy, you would have sought from me information about this before my name was introduced before the public, and your belief formed. You knew me sufficiently well, to believe that I would not decline candidly to answer any inquiries necessary and proper to be made. This was not done; but on the information you had received, you yielded it your confidence, and proceeded to a defence before the public. Without intending to be understood, as either spitting or denying any thing respecting my imputed visit to Mr. Kremer, on the evening preceding the publication of his card suppose the fact to be, that I did visit him; and suppose too, that it was, as you have termed it, a "nocturnal visit," was there any thing existing that should have denied me this privilege? or does it therefore necessarily result, that I should have been engaged in any plan against your rights, or conspiracy against you? There is no one more interested than yourself in denying the force of conclusion as derived from circumstance; and it is a little strange, that while, in your own case, you should object to it, as a rule of proper application, you should at the same time claim it as rightfully entitled to operate in the case of others.

You will excuse me from making an attempt to remove any belief, which you entertain upon this subject; it is a matter which gives me no concern. In the communication made to you, my object was to ascertain, distinctly, your meaning as to the letter published in the Columbian Observer, and to that you have frankly replied. Had you referred to me five days ago on this subject, I should with pleasure have answered you; but having exhibited your belief and opinions to the public, I am precluded from any explanation; you have no right to ask it; nor I in justice to myself any right to give it.

Respectfully, your obedient servant, JNO. H. EATON.

Hon. H. CLAY, Secretary of State.

Washington, 1st April, 1825.

Sir: I received yesterday your note of the 31st ultimo. With respect to mine in answer to yours of the 28th (in your reception of which you seem to think there was some delay,) allow me to remark, that it was my intention to have dispatched it through a friend, who, when I sent for him, happened to be out of the City, in consequence of which I dispatched it through another channel; that, amidst my official engagements, I cannot mark the hours with the same precision as a gentleman can of your presumed leisure; that I received your own note, the day after it bore date; and that, by your own admission, you received my note at 4 o'clock of the day succeeding that on which yours was delivered.

What you disclaim having any thing to do with the controversy into which I have been most reluctantly drawn by others, under Mr. Kremer's name, you have chosen to observe, entirely in justice to that gentleman, that he never used the language to which Mr. Crowninshield testifies; "that it is a mistake; any thing but fact;" and to claim the right of saying "that reason revolts at the idea, that he should have made Mr. Crowninshield his confessor." Why this solicitude to defend Mr. Kremer? Why question the credibility of Mr. Crowninshield? He has not claimed to be confessor of Mr. K.—a term the religious associations with which might have suggested to you the propriety of abstaining from its use, whatever occasion he may have for the office. The American public is the best judge, whether a gentleman of Mr. Crowninshield's well known character, for honor, probity, and veracity, has falsely testified, or Mr. Kremer has been prevailed upon to avow himself the author of a letter which he never wrote.

In regard to your polite intimation, that I had not properly reflected upon what belonged to courtesy, I have two observations to make, the first of which is, that I am yet to be made sensible of any particular claim that you have upon me for an extraordinary observation of its rules; and the second is, that when I may think I shall have occasion to learn them, I shall not be tempted, even by a gratuitous offer, to renounce my indisputable right to choose my own preceptor.

I made no demand upon you for an explanation of the object of your interview with Mr. Kremer, the night preceding the publication of his card. The privilege of any one to derive from his society whatever enjoyment it can afford, literary, scientific, or political, was never contested, as it never will be envied, by me. My intention was to afford you an opportunity of making an explanation of the object of your visit to him, if you chose to do so. In declining it, I acquiesce entirely in your determination.

I have the honor to be, your obedient servant, H. CLAY.

The Hon. JOHN H. EATON, &c. &c. &c.

Washington, 2d April, 1825.

Sir: Your letter of yesterday is received. As there is nothing now of inquiry or argument between us, I might forbear offering a reply; but, from a desire to correct some perversion given both to the meaning and expression of my last communication to you, I shall notice but one of them.

I did not assert that Mr. Kremer never used the language imputed to him by you, as derived from Mr. Crowninshield; it is given as matter of belief only. "I cannot forbear the opinion," is the expression used, accompanied by a full and sufficient reason why that opinion could not be incorrect, and thus your informant must be mistaken. It was unnecessary for you to talk of Mr. Crowninshield's honor and veracity to me. I entertain as high an opinion of them as you can; but that he is

mistaken, I have no more doubt than I have that Mr. Kremer is also a correct man. His differing with you can assuredly not render him a better or worse member of society.

I admit, most cheerfully, that I have no claim on your courtesy, and to "any extraordinary observance of its rules." I have claims, in this respect, on no one; society, not me, creates the claim, and has long since established amongst her subjects, that lets are rules every where in fashion, and "always to be regarded." I am a little surprised, that you should claim to enter any protest against them, while you evince such warmth of regard for the catholic principle of confession. Permit me to assure you, that with such avowals before me, I have not the least desire to question "your indisputable right to choose your own preceptor."

For the privilege conceded by you of visiting Mr. Kremer, and of deriving "from his society whatever enjoyments it can afford, literary, scientific, or political," I ought to feel grateful, however I may omit to express my gratitude. Mr. Kremer is considered an honest man; he bears with him, every where, this reputation; and, whilst he bears it, is fair company for any one, although he may not, like false coin, aim to assume any gloss appearance, or to pass for any thing beyond a real value.

Respectfully, your most obedient, JNO. H. EATON.

Hon. H. CLAY, Secretary of State.

GEN. SWARTWOUT & MR. CLAY.

From the New York American, of April 5.

To the Editors.

Gentlemen.—In the letter of Mr. Clay, published in your paper of the 31st ult. I find the following passages:—"My letter to Judge Brooke was published in the papers in this city, (Washington,) on the 12th February. The General's note declining the invitation of Mr. Swartwout and others, to a dinner, was published on the 14th in the National Journal. The probability therefore is, that he (Mr. Swartwout) did not leave the city until he had a full opportunity to receive in a personal interview with the General any verbal observations upon it which he might have thought proper to make. The letter to Mr. Swartwout bears date the 22d Feb. If received by him, it must have reached him on the 25th or 26th. Whether intended or not "as a private communication," and not "for the public eye," as alleged by him, there is much probability in believing that its publication on the 4th of March was then made, like Kremer's address, with a view to its arrival in this city in time to affect my nomination to the Senate. In point of fact it reached here the day before the Senate acted on that nomination."

It may be true, as Mr. Clay states, that his letter to Judge Brooke was published in Washington on the 12th, and Gen. Jackson's note declining the dinner on the 14th February; and yet not true, as he insinuates, that "I did not leave the city until I had a full opportunity to receive in a personal interview with the General, any verbal observations upon it, which he might have thought proper to make." I left Washington on the morning of the 13th of February; but I never had a word of conversation with General Jackson at any time upon the subject of that letter. I did not see the General to converse with him during the day of the 12th February. In the early part of the evening, when I intended to have paid my respects to him, he had gone to visit Mrs. Decatur, and when, between 9 and 10, I did call to bid him farewell he had retired. I repeat again that I never had any verbal communication with him upon the subject, nor any correspondence, excepting that contained in a letter which I wrote to him on the 17th or 18th of Feb. in which I spoke warmly and pretty freely of the injustice and want of analogy of Mr. Clay's strictures upon the Gen. in his letter to Judge Brooke. The letter of the Gen. was read by me on the 25th or 26th, as conjectured by Mr. Clay, and was immediately thereafter, shown to several persons, who, upon reading it, declared it a plain and temperate vindication of himself, and expressed a strong desire to see it in print. I determined, therefore, to have it published, but without reference to the particular time or the effect which Mr. Clay supposes was intended. If Gen. Jackson designed it for publication, it was certainly unknown to me—He gave no such intimation to me, in the letter or otherwise, although he had a perfect right to do so. In justice to Gen. Jackson, I must add, that in making the letter public, without his authority, I trusted to his indulgence.

Should Mr. Clay's other statements and inferences rest upon no better foundation, feeble must be the effect of his elaborate conclusions.

I should not consider it at all necessary to vindicate Gen. Jackson's right to repel a slander—to converse with me and write to me too, and that for publication, upon this or any other subject—but, I feel it to be my duty to state the facts in their true light, and as they actually occurred, leaving all inferences, not to the vision of Mr. Clay, but

to the justice of our fellow-citizens, to whose decision Gen. Jackson and his friends are ever ready to submit.

SAMUEL SWARTWOUT.

P. S. The invitation to the dinner was given to Gen. Jackson on the 10th of February—the day after the election, which he declined on the same day. The publication of the Notes, in a newspaper, could not therefore have any thing to do with my stay in Washington, or departure from it. S. S.

From the Richmond Enquirer.

"THE NASHVILLE FORGERY."

We shall see whether all the papers, which have given currency to this infamous libel on Gen. Jackson, will have candour enough to publish the contradiction which it receives from the following letters from Nashville. It now appears beyond the possibility of cavil, that this miserable imputation has never appeared in the "Nashville Whig." Where then did it originate? The only paper in which it has yet been seen is the "Western Courier," published in the town of Charleston, in Kanawha county, Virginia. From this, the Richmond papers copied it—and thus it flew throughout the whole country. As soon as we suspected that it was a forgery, we attempted to expiate the injustice of which we had been the innocent instruments—we traced it to the "Western Courier," and we called upon him for his authority.—The Editor of the Courier says as follows:

The Nashville Letter.—The Editors of the Richmond Enquirer pronounce the "Nashville Letter" a fabrication. In common with other newspapers, we have inserted it. We did not note the paper from which it was copied; nor have we heard its authenticity questioned by any except the Enquirer. If it be a fabrication, they have the same light that we have. In their paper of the 22d ult. and in a letter addressed by them to this place, which we have seen, they more than insinuate that the article in question was an original communication in this paper. We pronounce the suspicion false.

Charleston (Kan.) Courier.

It was not an "original communication" in that paper, we call upon its Editor to spare no pains, to lose no time, in tracing it to its origin.—It has never appeared in the Nashville Whig; that is clear. If in any other paper, what paper? No body else has seen that paper, as far as we can learn, but himself. Not an Editor in the East or West, in the North or in the South, has seen any such paper, but the aforesaid Editor of the Western Courier. We call upon him, then, in the name of truth and justice, to point out the paper from which he copied this infamous production. Let him ransack his whole file of western exchange papers, and apply to each of them for information. If he does not in due time satisfy the public on this subject, let them be assured that they will believe this famous letter to have been an original communication in his paper, and he will have to bear the consequences of such an imputation. Our correspondent from Kanawha alludes to a source, to which this letter has been ascribed, but he vehemently protests against such an allegation, and we shrink, ourselves, from making the slightest mention of it.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE ENQUIRER.

Nashville, April 3d, 1825.

Gentlemen: In your paper of the 15th ultimo, is published a very extraordinary article, purporting to be an extract of a letter from an officer, formerly of the Southern Army, and having for its object, a detailed account of a conversation said to have taken place between the writer and Gen. Jackson, last fall, relative to the Presidential Election. The "Nashville Whig," a paper published in this town, has the credit of having originally published this article. This I am inclined to think, sir, is a mistake, as no such communication has ever been seen in that paper here by any of Gen. Jackson's friends. If it had made its appearance here it would have been immediately attended to, and the villain, whoever he may be, ferreted out and exposed to public execration. The whole of the circumstances alluded to in that extract is a most wicked and malicious fabrication, and got up to suit the sinking fortunes of Henry Clay, and to produce, if possible, a reaction in his favor in the Western States by inducing a belief that the General had himself brought out for the Presidency to cut up his (Clay's) interest in the West.

Gen. Jackson has scarcely ever been heard to converse upon the subject of the Presidential Election even to his most intimate and confidential friends, and never without its first having been introduced by them; it is not likely then that he would have unbecomingly "himself," at a public house, to one with whom, at best, he could have been but partially acquainted. I believe I am personally acquainted with almost every officer of the Southern Army, in whom the General would have reposed such confidence, and I know of none whose name begins with H. Not only this, but I have myself been personally and intimately acquainted with the Gen. for many years, and have no doubt he has communicated as freely and as unreservedly with me upon all subjects as any other person living, and I do most solemnly declare that I never have heard him, at any time or under any circumstances, express such sentiments or say any thing like them, as are attributed to him in that publication. He never did it; it is not like him—his sentiments