

# The Raleigh Minerva.

FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 1819.

No. 13.

Vol. 1.

## RALEIGH, (N. C.)

PRINTED, WEEKLY, BY HARVEY AND CASSO,  
EDITED BY A. LUCAS.

Subscription: Three dollars per year, one half paid in advance. No paper to be continued longer than three months after a year's subscription expires, and notice thereof shall have been given. For advertisements, not exceeding 14 lines, are inserted for one dollar; for twenty-five cents each subsequent insertion; and in like proportion where there is a greater number of lines than fourteen. The cash must accompany those from persons unknown to the editor.

No subscription can in any case be received without a receipt of at least \$1.50 in advance; and no discontinuance without payment of arrears, unless at the option of the editor.

## Political.

### CORRESPONDENCE.

Between major general Jackson and brevet major general Scott, on the subject of an order, bearing date the 23d April, 1817; published by the former, to the troops of his division, and printed about the same time, in most of the public papers.

#### TO THE PUBLIC.

This correspondence is offered in manuscript, under the following circumstances.

On the 21st of February, 1818, the war department issued in orders, a regulation in these words:—“All publications relative to transactions between officers, of a private and personal nature, are prohibited. Any newspapers or pamphlets, of such a character, will be cause for the arrest of an officer, and the foundation of a charge against him. It is made the duty of all officers, having the power, to arrest and prefer evidence for charge on such publication, and whenever such charge is preferred, one specification of which will be the violation of this regulation, the proper authority will bring the officer on a trial before a general court martial.”

Up to this moment, general Scott has not violated this regulation, either in his letter or spirit. Indeed, he had no inclination to obtrude on the public, his difference with general Jackson, until the latter had, particularly during his recent tour between Nashville and New York, widely circulated garbled manuscript copies of the correspondence, and caused allusions to be made to it in certain public papers, in a similar spirit of malevolence and misrepresentation.

These facts having come to the knowledge of general Scott, he, on the 22d ultimo, called the attention of the secretary of war to the above regulation; not for the purpose of invoking the aid of the government, but to ask permission to defend himself by a fair publication in a pamphlet form, as that mode seemed to stand precisely on the same ground with a publication in manuscript—neither being expressly prohibited.

The secretary said, in reply, that the department was not in possession of evidence to the fact of the violation of its regulation, and even if such evidence were furnished, that would rather be a reason for enforcing the penalty against the guilty, than a motive for relaxation in respect to the other party.

Without deciding in his own mind, whether this could or would be done, in respect to general Jackson, general Scott on the 8th inst. furnished the secretary with the most unequivocal evidence of the garbled publication before asserted—leaving it to him, as the conservator of the discipline of the army, to say, whether his regulation was violated or not, and to act or acquiesce as he might think proper. But feeling at the same time, that whatever might be the result of his controversy with general Jackson, a vindication of his character before the public, was a preliminary step of the first necessity, general Scott in the same letter, submitted for the consideration of the proper authority, the following points:

1st seeing that the regulation in question had not received the sanction of congress, to which body the right is given to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; (1st section 8th article constitution) and according to the practice in such cases, general Scott suggested, that, perhaps, it might be recalled.

2d Supposing the regulation to be valid without such sanction, it was asked, whether a publication in a pamphlet form, like a publication in manuscript, might not be considered a casus, and, as, therefore, innocent?

3d If it were decided, that both those modes of publication were prohibited, general Scott desired that it might be particularly observed, that the regulation was, in the hands of general Jackson, at once an instrument of offence and defence.

It seems, nevertheless, that the regulation is not to be recalled, and that general Jackson will not be selected as the pivot on which to try the question, whether a manuscript publication be a violation of the regulation or not. As the weaker party, in the controversy, both before the government and the country, general Scott has no disposition to come to trial on the other point touching the pamphlet; although the principles governing the two cases appear to be precisely the same. It is enough that he admits, that “Laws are made for the weak,

and not for the strong,” without wishing the public should have before it, at the same time, and at his expense, two living and concurrent illustrations of the truths contained in that apophthegm.

General Scott, therefore, has no mode left him to counteract the machinations he complains of, or to vindicate his character, except by shielding himself under the precedent set by his opponent, in respect to the form of publication; and in this form the public shall have the entire correspondence.

But here, again, general Scott labors under a great disadvantage, in comparison with his opponent. He has not a numerous staff to copy, to certify, and circulate the correspondence. He in the discharge of the laborious duty confided to him, happens, at this moment, not to have an aid de camp with him. His occupations do not permit him to cry his papers through the principal cities of the Union, nor can he have recourse to any person about him for the convenient frank to relieve his pocket from the charge of postage. Laboring under these disadvantages, under fatigue and indisposition, he makes this appeal to the public, and begs that the few friends to whom he may have it in his power to send copies, will give them the widest circulation.—Some other persons will be furnished in due time.

Richmond, (Va.) March 13th, 1819.  
ORIGIN OF THE CORRESPONDENCE.

General Scott first saw, at his quarters, in New-York, about the last of May, 1817, the celebrated order. He read it in haste, and does not recollect to have made any particular remark on it at that time.

About the 9th of June following, gen. Scott went to dine at a private house, where he met a highly respectable family and company, and among the guests, the governor elect, of the state. By this time, the order had been printed in all the city papers, and was, as will be remembered, the leading topic every where. It soon became the subject of conversation (before dinner) between the governor and general Scott, who were seated near each other. The governor thought the order mutinous, and general Scott felt himself called upon, by the turn of conversation, if not expressly invited (which is his belief) to state, professionally, what were the principles involved in the question raised by general Jackson with the war department or president.

His opinion and his illustrations, or in other words, what was said by him, at the time and on two other occasions (the one before, the other after the 14th of August) will be found in substance, and almost literally, in the second letter of the series. This conversation was, no doubt, partially overheard by one or two other guests, though conducted in the ordinary tone, and not obtruded on the company.

The other conversation prior to the 14th of August (the date of the anonymous letter) was with three gentlemen, whose characters and pursuits, make it quite impossible to suspect either of them, of being General Jackson's anonymous correspondent.

LETTER I.  
General Jackson to General Scott.  
Head quarters, Division of the South,  
Nashville, Sept. 3, 1817.

Sir—With that candour due the character you have sustained as a soldier and a man of honour, and with the frankness of the latter, I address you.

Enclosed is a copy of an anonymous letter, post marked New-York, 14th August, 1817, together with a publication, taken from the Columbian, which accompanied the letter. I have not permitted myself for a moment to believe, that the conduct ascribed to you is correct.—Candour, however, induces me to lay them before you, that you may have it in your power to say how far they be incorrectly stated.

If my order has been the subject of your animadversions, it is believed you will at once admit it, and the extent to which you may have gone.

I am, Sir, respectfully,  
Your most obedient servant,  
(Signed) ANDREW JACKSON.  
General W. Scott,  
United States' Army

Anonymous letter addressed to Major General Andrew Jackson, post marked, “New York, August 14,” and received the 3d September, 1818. (Enclosed in the foregoing.)

“Your late order has been the subject of much private and some public remark. The war office gentry and their adherents, pensioners and expectants, have all been busy; but no one (of sufficient mark for your notice) more than major general Scott, who, I am credibly informed, goes so far as to call the order in question, an act of mutiny. In this district he is the organ of government insinuations, and the supposed author of the paper enclosed—which, however (the better to cover him) was not published until he had left this city for the fakes. Be on your guard, as they have placed spies upon Brown here—so it is probable you are not without them. The eastern federalists having now all become good republicans, and pledged to the support of the president, as he to them, government can now do well without the aid of Tennessee, &c.—A word to the wise is enough. The enclosed is taken from the Columbian, a paper of much circulation in this state, New-York. Certified and (signed) J. M. Glassell, aid-de-camp.

NOTES.—[on the above.]  
War office gentry &c.—If the writer meant to class general Scott among them, he was totally mistaken. The acting secretary of war, between the summer of 1816, and December,

1817, was the chief clerk of the department—a very worthy and highly respectable private gentleman, but previously unknown as a public character, and therefore, in the opinion of gen. Scott (as was frequently expressed by him at the time) an unfit person to preside over the army, or to represent it, before the congress or the country.—It is due to this gentleman to add, that whilst in the department, he conducted himself with great modesty and propriety. General Scott had nothing to expect or to ask from the department, except what the law and his rank entitled him to.

In this district he is the organ, &c.—This is utterly false. Gen. Scott has never, since the war, taken part either in general or local politics. He held no correspondence with the executive departments of the government, except on professional matters, and none with the president; and can almost say with certainty, that he never once had a conversation with a resident of New-York, on the politics of the state, except with one or two friends of the army, the particular admirers of Mr. Clinton.

They have placed spies upon Brown here &c. &c.—Generals Brown and Scott were, and are, on terms of friendships and intimacy. He has read this correspondence (in January, 1818) and frankly acknowledged that gen. Jackson had sent him a copy of the anonymous letter to put him on his guard against general Scott. The latter jestingly remarked to general Brown, that if a spy had been placed on him, the president was the person, for at the time the anonymous letter was written, the two were making a tour around the north-west frontier together, and on terms of much mutual respect and good will.—General Scott has reason to believe, moreover, that gen. Brown is well pleased with Mr. Monroe, as president, and the latter with gen. Brown, as the commander of the army. This is to the honor of both, for General Brown is known to be a decided Clintonian.

The Eastern Federalists, &c.—Here we discover the hand of a master. Never was gen. Scott seized with more avidity than a word to the wise is enough. The bait was swallowed, and gen. Jackson has put his character for wisdom beyond all controversy. “Be Wm. Clinton, our next president.” As since been, it is said, his standing toast. But let us recollect some of the political events of that day. Mr. Clinton had just been elected governor, and an election was then going on in Pennsylvania, from which he was supposed to entertain hopes of the most favorable results. Had he succeeded in electing gen. Heister, a republican Pennsylvanian, and gen. Jackson would have constituted a handsome addition to the nucleus of opposition. It is impossible, therefore, not to perceive that a Clintonian must have been the anonymous writer. Gen. Scott repeats, that he has been but a passive observer of these events—not that he had not all the rights of any other citizen, in regard to such questions, but because respect for himself (under his relation with the president, as commander and commanded) induced him, to waive those rights.

The following article was enclosed in the foregoing letter:  
General Jackson's doctrines of obedience.—Queries to the editor of —, and other learned essayists. 1. Suppose the government of the United States give orders to a general officer, or delicately signify their wishes and intentions, to remove from a certain command, one of the general's proteges and favorites? These orders, or intentions of government are not pleasing to either the chief, or his subordinate. They, therefore, employ their joint faculties of manoeuvring to frustrate the object of government.—By artifices, evasions, and pretended misapprehensions of meaning, they have so far prevailed as to hold a command in defiance of government itself, for nearly a year. Does not this case prove, that government, when restricted, according to the dictatorial system of gen. Jackson, may not only be tricked and insulted, but absolutely nullified? What redress would, an interested court martial afford?

2. Suppose that through the same general, positive orders were given, by government, for another officer to supersede his protege and favorite in the command of his usurped place. Suppose these positive orders, as they were not susceptible of subterfuge, be pocketed, laid aside, delayed, and not executed, for more months than it would be necessary to employ days or hours; would this case prove the utility of government relying for the execution of its orders solely on the integrity of a commander? Perhaps it may be alleged, that such cases are purely imaginary; let facts which have occurred in less than a year be examined, and will then be known whether they vary in any respect, from the cases as above stated.

A QUERIST.  
“Certified and signed, J. M. Glassell, aid de camp.”

LETTER II.  
Gen. Scott to Gen. Jackson.  
Head Quarters, 1st and 3d military departments,  
New-York, October 4th, 1817.

Sir—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 8th ultimo, together with the two papers therein enclosed.

I am not the author of the miserable and unmeaning article copied from “The Columbian” and (not being a reader of that gazette) should probably never have heard of it, but for the copy you have sent me. And whilst on the subject of writing and publishing, it may save time to say, at once, that with the exception of the substance of two articles which appeared in “The Inquirer” last fall, and a journal kept whilst a prisoner in the hands of the enemy,

have not written, nor caused any other to write a single line for any gazette whatever, since the commencement of the late war.

Conversing with some two or three private gentlemen, about as many times, on the subject of the Division order, dated at Nashville, April 22nd, 1817; it is true that I gave it as my opinion, that that paper, was, as it respected the future, mutinous in its character and tendency, and, as it respected the past, a reprimand of the Commander in Chief, the President of the U. States; for although the latter be not expressly named, it is a principle well understood, that the War Department, without at least his supposed sanction, cannot give a valid command to an Ensign.

I have thus, sir, frankly answered the queries addressed to me, and which were suggested to me by the letter of your anonymous correspondent; but on a question so important as that which you have raised, with the War Department, or in other words with the President of the United States, and in which, I find myself incidentally involved, I must take leave to illustrate my meaning a little; in doing which, I shall employ almost the precise language which was used on the occasion above alluded to.

Take any three officers—Let A be the common superior, B the intermediate commander, and C the common junior. A wishes to make an order, which shall affect C. The good of the service, etiquette and country, require, no doubt, that the order should pass through B; or, if expedition and the dispersed situation of the parties make it necessary to send the order direct to C (of which necessity A is the judge) the good of the service, etiquette and country require, with as little doubt, that A notify B thereof, as soon as practicable. Such notice, of itself, has always been held sufficient, under the circumstances last stated. But we will suppose that A sends the order direct to C, and neglects to notify B thereof, and such appears to be the precise case alluded to in the order before cited. Has B no redress against this irregularity? He may unquestionably remonstrate with A, in a respectful manner, and if remonstrance fails, and their be a higher military authority than A, B may appeal to it for redress. Now in the case under consideration, there existed no such higher authority.—The War Department, or in other words, the President, being the common superior (A), and the General of Division, the intermediate commander (B). A private and respectful remonstrance, therefore, appears to have been the only mode of redress which circumstances admitted of. An appeal to the army or the public, before or after such remonstrance, seems to have been a greater irregularity than the measure complained of; to reprobate that measure publicly, as the Division order does, was to mount still higher in the scale of indecorum, but when the order goes so far as to prohibit to all officers in the division, an obedience to the commands of the President of the United States, unless received through Division Head Quarters, it appears to me, that nothing but mutiny and defiance, can be understood or intended.

There is another view of this subject, which must have escaped you, as I am persuaded there is not a man in America less disposed to shift responsibility from himself to a weaker party than yourself. Suppose the War Department, by order of the president, sends instructions direct to the commanding officers, perhaps a captain at Natchitoches (a post within your division) to attack the body of Spanish royalists nearest to that frontier; if the captain obeys, you arrest him; but if, in compliance with your orders, he sets the commands of the president at naught, he would find himself in a direct conflict with the highest military authority under the constitution, and thus would have to maintain against that “fearful odds,” the dangerous position laid down in your order. Suppose this consequence could not have been foreseen by you, when you penned that order.

I must pray you to believe, sir, that I have expressed my opinion on this great question, without the least hostility to yourself, personally, and without any view of making my court in another quarter, as is insinuated by your anonymous correspondent. I have nothing to fear or to hope, from either party. It is not likely that the Executive will be offended, at the opinion, that it has committed an irregularity in the transmission of one of its orders; and, as to yourself, although I cheerfully admit that you are my superior, I deny that you are my commanding officer, within the meaning of the 6th Article of the Rules and Articles of War. Even if I belonged to your divisions, I should not hesitate to repeat to you all that I have said, at any time, on your subject, if a proper occasion offered; and what is more, I should expect your approbation, as in my humble judgement, refutation is impossible.

(Continued on fourth page.)

†Let it be here remembered, that this illustrative statement was strictly in reply. Gen. Jackson had said, “if my order has been the subject of your animadversions, it is believed that you will at once admit it, and the extent to which you may have gone.” Gen. Scott, however, omitted one remark made by him, on all the occasions alluded to: Speaking of the order, he said, “nevertheless, as this indiscretion on the part of Gen. Jackson, no doubt, proceeded from that vehemence and impetuosity of character to which we owe one of the most splendid victories, not only of the country, but of the age, he (Gen. Scott) hoped, that the one act might be tolerated on account of the other.” This was omitted for opposite but obvious reasons, both by himself and the anonymous writer. Gen. Scott can confidently appeal to, perhaps, more than a thousand persons, in Europe and America, in proof of the pride and enthusiasm with which he has uniformly spoken of the defence of New Orleans; and agrees to be held infamous, if two respectable witnesses will aver, that he was ever heard, prior to the 22d December, 1817, to speak of Gen. Jackson in other terms than those of admiration.