

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

Subscription, three dollars per annum in advance, and no paper discontinued, unless all arrears are paid. Advertisements, not charged for, inserted three times for one week, and twenty-five cents for each continuation. All letters to the editors must be post-paid.

ADDENDUM TO THE CORRESPONDENCE with General Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun, President and Vice President of the United States, on the subject of the course of the letter in the deliberations of the Cabinet Mr. Monroe on the occurrences in the Seminole war.

[CONCLUDED.]

G. George McDuffie to Mr. Calhoun. Washington, May 14th, 1830.

DEAR SIR: In answer to the inquiry contained in your note of this morning, I submit the following statement. Very distinctly recollect to have seen Mr. Crawford (I think in the year of 1818) in conversation with General Jackson, relative to the proceedings of General Jackson in the Seminole war, and to the course pursued by the cabinet, touching those proceedings. Mr. Crawford spoke out any kind of reserve as to the active parts taken by the different members of the cabinet while the subject was under deliberation. He stated that you had been in favor of an inquiry into the conduct of Gen. Jackson, and that he was the only member of the cabinet that had concurred with you. He spoke in strong terms of approbation of the course pursued by General Jackson, not only in his military proceedings, but in prematurely leaving the grounds of his defence in the country, and forestalling publication, thus anticipating the administration. On this point he remarked that if the administration could not direct to public opinion, but to a military officer, who had his orders, to anticipate what was to be done, it was better to let a man do business to be at Washington, and had better return home. I remember that the National Intelligencer, which was lying on the table where Mr. Crawford was sitting, contained an article explanatory of the grounds upon which the administration had proceeded in regard to General Jackson's military movements. Mr. Crawford alluded to some part of the article, which laid down a principle of law of nations, if I mistake not, and went to show that a neutral territory could only be invaded in fresh attack of an enemy, and added, "Mr. Adams denies all that." He represented Mr. Adams as going much further in favoring Gen. Jackson than even Mr. Crawford, stating that the latter was inclined to pass over the conduct of Gen. Jackson without public censure, not a belief that he had not violated the laws, and exceeded his power, but political considerations connected with our relations with Spain.

Your obedient servant, GEO. McDUFFIE.

H. Extract of a letter from the Honorable Robert S. Garnett, formerly a Member of Congress from the State of Virginia, dated at Annapolis, January 12, 1831.

DEAR SIR: A very extraordinary man, whom I have seen in the Constituency of the Whig, purporting to give a correct account of the party which the seven members of Mr. Monroe's cabinet, when the conduct of General Jackson was before them, has induced me to send you the following statement. Some after Colonel Taylor's election to the Senate, and arrival at the Government, we paid a visit to Monroe, and, in the course of the Col. T. desired Mr. M. to give some account of the course that had been pursued towards General Jackson in regard to the Seminole war; in this conversation, Mr. M. declared that there had been no discussion in his cabinet, as to the course to be pursued towards the Seminole. This excited my astonishment, because in a conversation with Mr. Crawford, either before the debate on the Seminole war, or while it was pending, Crawford had used this expression: "General Jackson ought to be commended." I noted this expression down in a journal I kept, and frequently repeated it. I never told me that he had mentioned it to General Jackson, when he was at his house in Tennessee, and I said that the General expressed surprise.

Hon. J. C. CALHOUN.

From Mr. Garnett's diary for the 1st of January, 1831, referred to above.

DEAR SIR: The night before last, Colonel Taylor proposed we should go up and see the President, as Everett said he had just complained of our not going to see him. Newton proposed we should go, because he had to show up on a clean shirt. We found in the drawing room, with Hay, Moore, and Findley, M. and E. soon went out, and so did who was going to Secretary Eaton's. The President then talked freely about public affairs, as an account of the proceedings of the Government in relation to the

Seminole war. He stated what I have frequently heard before, that the whole cabinet were perfectly agreed that he should not censure General Jackson. It is, however, well understood that Mr. Crawford, out of the cabinet, used his endeavor to have Cobb's resolutions passed; and I could not forbear telling the President, that, in conversation with me about Cobb's resolutions, while they were pending, Mr. Crawford said Jackson ought to be censured. He expressed surprise, and seemed to look regret. He says the members of the cabinet are still in harmony among themselves, apparently.

J. John C. Calhoun to Mr. Monroe. Washington, May 17, 1830.

DEAR SIR: It has become important to me, in consequence of a recent circumstance, to ascertain whether General Jackson's letter to you of the 6th January, 1818—I mean the one in which allusion is made to Mr. J. Rhea—was seen, when received, by any one except myself, and, if it was, by whom. I will thank you to inform me by your return mail; and, also, whether the letter above alluded to was before the cabinet, or was alluded to by any of its members, during the deliberation on the Seminole affair.

With sincere regard, I am, &c. &c. J. C. CALHOUN.

J. MONROE, Esq.

K. James Monroe to John C. Calhoun. Oak Hill, May 19, 1830.

DEAR SIR: I have received your letter of the 17th, and hasten to answer it. I well remember, that, when I received the letter from General Jackson, to which you allude, of the 16th of January, 1818, I was sick in bed, and could not read it. You were either present, or came in immediately afterwards, and I handed it to you for perusal. After reading it, you replaced it, with a remark that it required my attention, or would require an answer; but without any notice of its contents. Mr. Crawford came in soon afterwards, and I handed it also to him for perusal. He read it, and returned it in like manner, without making any comment on its contents, further than that it related to the Seminole war, or something to that effect. I never showed it to any other person, and I am not certain whether it was he or you who observed that it related to the Seminole war. Having made all the arrangements respecting that war, and being some time confined by indisposition, the letter was laid aside and forgotten by me, and I never read it until after the conclusion of the war, and then I did it on an intimation from you that it required my attention. You ask whether that letter was before the cabinet in the deliberation on the despatches received from the General, communicating the result of that war, or alluded to by any member in the administration. My impression decidedly is, that it was not before the cabinet, nor do I recollect or think that it was alluded to in the deliberation on the subject. Had it been, I could not, I presume have forgotten it. I received the despatches referred to here, and had made up my mind before I left home as to the part I ought to take in reference to its management, especially if I should be supported in the opinion formed by the administration. That support was afforded it, and I pursued the course which my judgment dictated, with a view to the honor and interest of my country and the honor of the General who commanded.

With sincere regard, I am, dear Sir, yours,

JAME MONROE. Hon. J. C. CALHOUN.

L. John C. Calhoun to Mr. Wirt. Washington, May 23, 1830.

DEAR SIR: Circumstances which I need not explain render it necessary for me, in self defence, to call on you for a statement of any course in the meeting of the cabinet, in the summer of 1818, on the Seminole war. I wish you also to state, whether a private letter from Gen. Jackson to Mr. Monroe, such as discovered in the enclosed extract of a letter from Mr. Crawford to Mr. Forsyth, was before the cabinet during the deliberation, or whether any allusion was made to any letter of that description.

With sincere regard, I am, &c. &c. JOHN C. CALHOUN.

Hon. Mr. Wirt.

M. Mr. Wirt to Mr. Calhoun. Washington, May 28, 1830.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of yesterday relates to a meeting of the cabinet in the summer of 1818, relative to the Seminole war. I should not feel myself at liberty to disclose the proceedings of any cabinet meeting without the concurrence of the President and of all the members who attended it, but as your inquiry relates to your own course only, and I can speak of that without involving any one else, I see no impropriety in doing so at your request. Among other ideas thrown out for consideration, according to the usual course of cabinet consultations, I think that, at the first meet, you suggested

the propriety of an inquiry into the conduct of the commanding general; but I remember that the course ultimately adopted had your hearty concurrence; and I remember it the more distinctly because you mentioned it repeatedly to me afterwards, as a striking evidence of the practical wisdom of the President, who suggested it. Thus much I feel myself authorized by the case to say of those deliberations. The circumstances mentioned in the extract you enclose, purporting to be an extract of a letter from W. H. Crawford, Esq. to John Forsyth, Esq., dated April 30, 1830, have no place in my recollection. The letter from General Jackson to President Monroe, therein mentioned, is entirely new to me. According to the description of the letter, given of it in the extract, it is one of so singular a character, that, if it had been exhibited at any meeting at which I was present, I think that I could not have forgotten it. The occurrence is said to have taken place twelve years ago. I kept no notes in writing of any of those deliberations, and am speaking merely from memory. But still I think, that if such a letter had been produced and read in my presence, I should have retained some recollection of it; whereas it strikes me, in the description as a thing perfectly new, and of which I never heard before. In the close of the extract, the writer says: "After that letter was produced, I should have opposed the infliction of punishment upon the general, who had considered the silence of the President as a tacit consent." I have no recollection that punishment had been proposed by any one, unless an inquiry into the official conduct of the general can be regarded as punishment. It strikes me, too, that if that letter had been produced, and Mr. Crawford had placed his implied change of opinion on the inference of acquiescence which he supposed the general to be authorized to draw from the President's silence, it could not have escaped observation, and such a discussion as would have tended to have fixed the occurrence on my memory, that the general had not asked the President for an acquiescence to be inferred from silence, but for a positive hint of his approbation through some confidential member of Congress, say Johnny Ray." Upon the whole, Sir, if these things did really occur in my presence, I can only say that they have left not the slightest trace on my memory.

I remain, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

WM. WIRT. The Hon. JOHN C. CALHOUN, Vice President U. S.

N. Copy of a letter to Mr. Adams, 12th January, 1831.

Washington, 12th Jan. 1831.

SIR: A short time before the last adjournment of Congress, a copy of a letter from Mr. Crawford to Mr. Forsyth, in relation to the deliberation of the cabinet on the Seminole question, was placed in the hands of General Jackson, and became the subject of a correspondence between him and myself. In the course of that correspondence, it became necessary, in order to ascertain the truth or error of some of the statements made by Mr. Crawford, to refer to some of the other members of the cabinet, and I accordingly addressed notes to Mr. Monroe and Mr. Wirt, from both of whom I obtained statements. In selecting those gentlemen, instead of yourself and Mr. Crowninshield, I was not in the least degree influenced by any want of confidence in either of you, but simply by feelings of delicacy growing out of political relations, and which I trust to corresponding feelings on your part properly to appreciate.

I learn by a letter from Mr. Crawford, addressed to me subsequent to the close of my correspondence with Gen. Jackson, that he has written to you, and obtained your answer on the subject to which it refers, though he has not furnished me with a copy of his letter to you, nor that of your answer.

This step on his part has, of course, removed the delicacy which I at first felt, and which then prevented me from addressing you.

The part I took in the cabinet deliberation was dictated by a sense of duty, uninfluenced by either the feelings of friendship or enmity. That Gen. Jackson transcended his orders in taking St. Mark's and Pensacola, I have never doubted, then or since. In my opinion, the Executive neither did or could constitutionally give orders to take either of those places, or any other Spanish post. Under this impression, I was decidedly in favor, in the early stage of the deliberation, of bringing the subject before a court of inquiry, but finally yielded my opinion to considerations growing out of the political aspect of the question, as connected with Spain, which were presented by you and Mr. Monroe; but, in yielding to them, I still believed, and do now, that, apart from them, and considered under the military aspect of the subject, as at first view, my opinion was correct.

Having thus concurred in the final decision of the cabinet, I gave it a faithful support, without however abandoning the correctness of my first conceptions. I make this preliminary statement in order that you may perceive why my inquiry should be directed only to what might seem a mere collateral circumstance, whether the letter of Gen. Jackson to Mr. Monroe, in which allusion is made to Johnny Ray, was before the cabinet, which, though not calculated to affect the question of the correctness of my course, however decided, from the prominence that Mr. Crawford has given it, has assumed no small degree of importance in the correspondence. He, in his letter to Mr. Forsyth, says: "Indeed my own views on the subject had undergone a material change after the cabinet had been convened. Mr. Calhoun made some allusion to a letter the General had written the President, who had forgotten that he had received such a letter, but said, if he had received such one, he could find it, and went directly to his cabinet, and brought the letter out. In the Gen. Jackson approved of the determination of the President to break up Amelia Island and Galvestown, and gave it also as his opinion, that the Floridas ought to be taken by the United States. He added, that it might be a delicate matter for the Executive to decide, but, if the President approved of it, he had only to give a hint to some confidential member of Congress, say Johnny Ray, and he would do it, and take the responsibility of it on himself."

The object of my addressing you is, to obtain a statement from you, whether such a letter was, or was not, before the cabinet during its deliberation.

As connected with the subject of my inquiry, I must ask of you the favor to furnish me, if you can with propriety, with a copy of Mr. Crawford's letter to you, and a copy of your answer. I make the request on the assumption that the correspondence can contain nothing that would render it improper that a copy should be placed in my possession. I would make the request of Mr. Crawford himself, instead of you, had I not declined all communication with him in relation to the subject of the correspondence between Gen. Jackson and myself, except through the General, through which channel no opportunity to make the request has been afforded me.

O. John Q. Adams to J. C. Calhoun. Washington, 14th January, 1831.

SIR: I received this morning your letter of the 12th instant, and, in giving to it an immediate and explicit answer, I trust you will perceive the propriety of my confining myself to the direct object of your inquiries. In the course of the last summer, I received a letter from Mr. Crawford, referring to the consultations of Mr. Monroe with the heads of the Departments, in the summer of 1818, upon the proceedings of General Jackson in Florida, on the occasion of the Seminole war, and alluding to a letter from General Jackson to Mr. Monroe, which he stated to have been produced at one of those meetings, and to which his own letter appeared to attach some importance.

Mr. Crawford did not state to me the purpose of his inquiries, nor was I aware that any previous correspondence in relation to the subject had taken place. But as the contents of his letter appeared to me to be of peculiar interest to the character of Mr. Monroe, I answered him that I had no recollection of the production of such a letter as that to which he referred, and requested his permission to communicate his letter to Mr. Monroe himself. To this answer I have received no reply.

Neither the letter of Mr. Crawford, nor the letter book containing the copy of my answer to it, are at this moment in my possession, having left them both at my residence in Quincy. The letter from Mr. Crawford did not purport to be confidential; but, as it related to transactions secretly confidential in the cabinet of Mr. Monroe, I have not thought myself at liberty to furnish a copy of it without his permission, even to Mr. Monroe: the same principle applies to your request for a copy; but I will immediately write and direct a copy of my answer to be made, which, when received, shall be cheerfully communicated to you.

I am, with respectful consideration, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS. JOHN C. CALHOUN, Esq.

P. Mr. Crowninshield to Mr. Calhoun. Washington, January 30, 1831.

DEAR SIR: My recollection having been called to a letter received from the Hon. W. H. Crawford in July, 1830, wherein he asks my attention to "circumstances that transpired during the cabinet deliberations on the events of the Seminole war," and my reply thereto: It is proper for me to state, that I answered Mr. Crawford as though he alluded to transactions which took place while I was in Mr. Monroe's cabinet; but since my arrival here this session, I learn, for the first time, that the cabinet meeting alluded to by Mr. Crawford, was held after I retired from the cabinet. I left Washington in

* Mr. Crowninshield could not have been present at any cabinet council on the Seminole affair. The first meeting on that subject took place on the 15th or 16th of July, 1818; Mr. Monroe having returned on the 14th, from his residence in Louisiana. The National Intelligencer of the 7th July, announces

company with President Monroe and yourself, for Norfolk, by the way of Annapolis, on the 28th May, 1818. Now, Sir, I do not pretend to know one word of what was said or done at any subsequent meeting; and I do therefore disclaim and say that my letter in answer to Mr. Crawford must not be interpreted so as to affirm or deny any cabinet transactions which took place after I left the cabinet.

It is difficult for me to account how I could have blended other things, so as to connect them with events of which I could know nothing. It is a long time since those things occurred, and memory is treacherous; and that, I beg you to believe, is the only reason of the misapprehension on my part. I am, with high consideration, your obedient servant,

B. W. CROWNINSHIELD. Hon. J. C. Calhoun, Vice President.

Q. Mr. Calhoun to Mr. Crawford, returning his letter of 2d October, 1830. Fors Hill, October 30, 1830.

SIR: The last mail brought me your letter of the 2d instant, but post marked the 23d, which I herewith return.

I cannot consent to correspond with you on the subject to which it refers. The controversy is not with you, but General Jackson. You, from the first, voluntarily assumed the character of the informer. Under that character only can I know you, which of course precludes all communication between us in relation to the controversy, except through General Jackson. Regarding you in the light I do, you may rest assured that no abuse on your part, how ever coarse, nor charges against me, however false, can possibly provoke me to raise you to the level of a principal, by substituting you in the place of General Jackson in the correspondence. Should you, however, submit to the degradation of the position which you have thus voluntarily taken, and will send this or any other statement to General Jackson, and induce him to make it the subject of any further communication to me, as confirming in his opinion your former statement, or weakening my refutation, I will be prepared, by the most demonstrative proof, drawn from the paper itself, to show such palpable errors in your present statement as to destroy all confidence in your assertions; leaving it, however, to those who have the best means of judging to determine whether the want of truth be owing to a decayed memory or some other cause.

Having been taught by the past the necessity of taking all possible precaution where I have any thing to do with you, I deem it prudent not to deprive myself of the advantage which your paper affords me, and have accordingly taken a copy, as a precautionary measure. I am, &c.

J. C. CALHOUN. W. H. Crawford, Esq.

Since Mr. Calhoun published his pamphlet, the following additional letters have been given to the public:

To the Editor of the U. S. Telegraph.

SIR:—I enclose to you, for publication, my letter to Major Hamilton, referred to in Mr. Crawford's letter to me of the 30th April, 1830, which last forms so prominent a place in the recent address of the Vice President to the People of the United States. Had I believed this letter of any importance to Mr. Calhoun, it would have been voluntarily communicated to him, after the receipt of his answer of the 1st of June to my letter to him of the 31st of May. I give it to the public not because my opinion of it is changed, but because Mr. Calhoun, in his letter to the President of the 25th of August, 1830, after my offer to furnish him with a copy of it, if he desired it, reiterates the opinion that it ought to have been shown to him. This communication to Major Hamilton was made without inquiry into his motives for asking it. Certainly no hostility to Mr. Calhoun was imagined, nor is it perceived how the facts stated could of themselves be in any way injurious to him. Major Hamilton's character was to me a sufficient guarantee that the information requested was not sought for any unworthy purpose.

Justice to Mr. Crawford demands the publication of his letter to Mr. Calhoun. Having received from him a copy of it, shortly after it was written, I have submitted it to the inspection of some of those in whose judgments I know he reposes implicit confidence; and as they coincide with me in the opinion I have expressed, I send it to you for immediate insertion in your paper. It is for Mr. Crawford, and for him only, to decide whether anything more is necessary for his justification. I have found myself very unexpectedly compelled to say any thing about this trans-

action, and trust that none of those who are interested in it will find it necessary to introduce my name into the further discussion of it.

JOHN FORSYTH. Georgetown, Feb. 19, 1831.

R. Mr. Forsyth to Mr. Hamilton. Hillsborough, Feb. 26, 1831.

DEAR SIR:—Our friend, Wm. H. Crawford, was in this place a few hours yesterday on private business. I had very unexpectedly an opportunity to comply with the request made in your letter dated Savannah, January 25th. I had a long conversation with Mr. C. and afterwards read to him your letter. He regretted that your engagements did not permit you to pay him a passing visit. By his authority I state in reply to your inquiry, that at a meeting of Mr. Monroe's cabinet to discuss the course to be pursued towards Spain in consequence of Gen. Jackson's proceedings in Florida during the Seminole war, Mr. Calhoun, the Secretary of the War Department, submitted to and urged upon the President the propriety and necessity of arresting and trying Gen. Jackson. Mr. Monroe was very much annoyed by it; expressed a belief that such a step would not meet the public approbation; that Gen. J. had performed too much public service to be treated as a younger or subordinate officer might, without shocking public opinion. Mr. Adams spoke with great violence against the proposed arrest and justified the General throughout, vehemently urging the President to make the cause of the General that of the Administration.

In consequence of the strong excitement produced by the President's obvious embarrassment, Mr. Crawford interposed in the discussion, suggesting that there was no necessity for deciding upon the course to be pursued towards the General, as the question for which the cabinet was convened did not require it. They were called to determine how Spain was to be treated in relation to the Florida affair; the conduct of the General was a matter exclusively between the General and his own Government, in which, however Spain might feel interested, she had no right to meddle. This subject was then disposed of and was not renewed.

Mr. Calhoun had previously communicated to Mr. Crawford his intention to present the question to Mr. Monroe; an intention Mr. Crawford approved, although not believing, as he stated to Mr. Calhoun, that Gen. J. would be either arrested or censured by the President.

With great respect, I am, dear Sir, yours,

JOHN FORSYTH. Mr. Crawford to Mr. Calhoun. Woodlawn, 2d Oct. 1830.

SIR:—Since the adjournment of Congress, the copy of a letter from you to the President, containing eleven sheets, has been placed in my hands. The object of this labored essay is to prove that a statement contained in a letter from me to the Hon. John Forsyth, of the Senate of the United States, is incorrect. If there was no evidence but that which is contained in that essay, I should not be afraid of convincing every rational and unprejudiced mind, that my statement to Mr. Forsyth is substantially correct.

In the brief comment which I intend to make upon your essay of eleven sheets, I propose to avoid the example you have set me in three things, viz: I shall not begin by depreciating the official dignity and weight of character of the person I address, when I meet with a fact that I cannot feebly and distinctly deny. I will not attempt to prove a negative by argument; and I shall not falsely and hypocritically profess a forbearance which I do not feel.

I shall first notice your observations upon the disclosure of the secrets of the Cabinet, which you say is the first that has occurred, at least in this country. Do you really believe this assertion, Mr. Calhoun? How did the weight of opinions of Messrs. Jefferson and Hamilton on the first bank bill ever see the light? How were the facts and circumstances which preceded and accompanied the removal of Edmund Randolph from the State Department by General Washington, disclosed and made known to the public? If your assertion be true, those facts and circumstances would, at this moment, be buried in Egyptian darkness. While a Cabinet is in existence and its usefulness liable to be impaired, reason and common sense point out the propriety of keeping its proceedings secret. But after the Cabinet no longer exists, when its usefulness cannot be impaired by a disclosure of its proceedings, neither reason, common sense, nor patriotism, requires that those proceedings should be shrouded in impenetrable darkness. The acts of such a Cabinet become history, and the Nation has the same right to a knowledge of them, that it has to any other historical fact. It is presumed that all nations have entertained this opinion and have acted upon it. Hence the secret history of Cabinets, the most delicate in Europe. Hence the history of the mass of sinners, by Charles James Fox, which discloses the most secret intrigues between Charles II. and the French Minister, by which it was proved that Charles was a pensioner of Louis the

[See 4th page.]