

Western Carolinian.

It is even wise to abstain from laws, which, however wise and good in themselves, have the semblance of inequality, which find no response in the heart of the citizen, and which will be evaded with little remorse. The wisdom of legislation is especially seen in granting laws on conscience.

Dr. Channing.

SAJESBURY, ROWAN COUNTY, N. C., MONDAY, AUGUST 8, 1831.

[VOL. XII.....NO. 583.]

Printed and Published, once a Week, by J. M. BERRYMAN, at the Office of the *Western Carolinian*, in the Town of Salisbury, Rowan County, N. C.

EX-OFFICIAL CONTROVERSY.

From the *Washington Globe*.
Mr. Berrien to Mr. Blair.
WASHINGTON, 19th July, 1831.
SIR: In an article under the Editorial head, in your paper of this morning, which has relation to a controversy between the Editor of the *Telegraph* and yourself, I observe the following remarks:—

"At this point, we should have dropped the controversy, but we have understood, that it is reported to give countenance to the contradicted statement of the *Telegraph*, that Mr. Berrien has received a letter from Col. Johnson, which shews that we had no warrant for the denial, we made as to him. We take the liberty therefore of quoting from the letter of Col. Johnson, which we have, his express declaration, that the President did not make the exaction of the members of his cabinet, charged by the *Telegraph*. The Col. says—'He (General Jackson) never authorized me to require social intercourse, &c. &c. He always disclaimed it: I told the parties so.' These are the words of the Col. to the word, point, and letter. If this does not satisfy, we must refer the parties making the charge, to the witness called by them."

The reference thus made to me, renders it necessary, that I should submit the following observations to the public, and I have accordingly to ask that you will give them a place in your paper. I have not authorized the report of which you speak, and I would have told you so without hesitation, if you had intimated its existence to me. That such a course would have been more conformable to the views of Col. Johnson, I infer from the following considerations:

I have a letter from that gentleman, in which after stating his object, and motives, in seeking the interview, which with the approval of the President, he held with Messrs. Branch, Ingham and myself, he proceeds to remark that he has not himself seen the necessity, or propriety, of any allusion in newspapers, to this interview—and adds, that if any should consider it necessary, then the great object should be to state the conversation correctly, for which purpose, his views were made known in that letter, in order that any misunderstanding might be corrected. Acquiescing in the propriety of this suggestion, I immediately communicated to Col. Johnson, a statement of the conversation referred to, as it was very distinctly impressed upon my memory, and sufficient time has not yet elapsed, I believe to authorize me to expect an answer in the regular course of the mail. However this may be I have not received any. Independently therefore of my reluctance to appear before the public, in relation to any matters connected with the dissolution of the late cabinet, a reluctance which could only be yielded to my own strong conviction of the propriety of such a measure, I have thought that the understanding implied in the correspondence, to which I have referred, would be violated, by publishing a statement of what passed at the interview in question, until it could be accompanied by the remarks of Col. Johnson, on that which I had transmitted to him. A departure from this understanding, by that gentleman himself, would of course relieve me from its obligation. But from the tenor of your editorial article I infer, that the act of publishing the extract, from his letter, is not authorized by him.

I adhere therefore at present, to the determination, which I had formed: and assuming that your object as public journalist, is to present nothing to your readers which is not true, and not to withhold from them, that which is so. I take the liberty of suggesting, as well to the editor of the *Telegraph*, as to yourself, the propriety of abstaining from any partial and imperfect statements of the conversation, which occurred at the interview in question. The delusion produced by such statements, must be speedily corrected; but until that correction is made, their effect is to mislead the public mind, on a subject of awakening interest to the American people.

I am, very respectfully,
Sir, your obedt. servt.
JNO. MACPHERSON BERRIEN.
To FRANCIS P. BLAIR, Esq.,
Editor of the *Globe*.

Mr. Blair to Mr. Berrien.
WASHINGTON, JULY 19, 1831.
DEAR SIR: I have this moment received your letter, to which I will give immediate publicity.

I did not suppose that you had authorized the report, which imposed on me the necessity of giving an extract from Col. Johnson's letter. Under such an impression, I would not have hesitated to call on you to disavow it. The report, I knew, was false, and was merely circulated to keep in countenance the charge made against the President until it could work some prejudice against him in the public mind. I did not suppose that you were an accessory in this business, and, therefore, would not insult you by an application, which could only be founded on such an inference.

The course I have taken with regard to Col. Johnson's letter, grew out of circumstances which will justify me to him although he did not authorize me to publish his letter. My sole object was, at once, to clear the skirts of the President of a charge which you are well aware ought not to be attached to him; for you have, as I understand, explicitly declared, that he disclaimed to you, at the time when you were in communication with Col. Johnson, any design like that now imputed to him.

With regard to conversations between yourself and Col. Johnson, I shall certainly abstain, as I have hitherto abstained, from making any partial or imperfect statements.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
F. P. BLAIR.

Mr. Berrien to Mr. Blair.
WASHINGTON, 20th July, 1831.
SIR: Your note of yesterday, was received under circumstances which prevented my immediate attention to it. I reply to it now, to correct the misapprehension into which you have been led, and which, by the publicity which you have given to it, is calculated to mislead the public.

I extract from your note the following sentence:—
"My sole object was at once, to clear the skirts of the President from a charge which you are well aware ought not to be attached to him; for you have, as I understand, explicitly declared, that he disclaimed to you, at the time when you were in communication with Col. Johnson, any design like that now imputed to him."

I make the quotation for this purpose of saying to you, that you have been entirely misinformed—that the statement contained in this extract is not warranted by any declaration ever made by [me]; and still assuming it to be your wish to represent this matter truly to the public, I am under the necessity of asking you to give publicity to this note.

I am, very respectfully,
Sir, your obedt. servt.
JNO. MACPHERSON BERRIEN.
To FRANCIS P. BLAIR, Esq.,
Editor of the *Globe*.

Mr. Blair to Mr. Berrien.
WASHINGTON, JULY 20, 1831.
SIR: Your note of this morning will be given immediately to the press. In reference to the subject of which it treats, you do me but justice when you say that "I wish to represent this matter truly to the public." You will permit me, therefore, briefly to show the ground on which I felt myself authorized to say that "you were well ware," that the charge implicating the President, ought not to be attached to him, and that you had yourself explicitly declared that he disclaimed the purpose imputed to him.

As to the first branch of this statement, which you do not seem directly to controvert, I have to support me the positive written declaration of Col. Johnson, in which he says that the President always disclaimed such a requisition, and that he told you so. Besides this, I have before me, in the hand writing of the President, the identical paper, which he read to yourself, and Messrs. Branch and Ingham, and which presented the attitude that he thought it his duty to assume in relation to the circumstances which affected the harmony and character of his Cabinet. The course which he thought proper then to adopt, was predicated on information given him by several members of Congress, showing that a combination had been entered into in which yourself and the other gentlemen named were concerned, to disgrace Major Eaton and coerce his dismissal from the Cabinet. After a preliminary verbal explanation of the reasons inducing the interview, the President proceeded to say, that if it were true that you had taken the course of which he spoke, he felt himself called on to make the declaration which he read to you from his written memorandum, in which he says that it was, using his own words, "Not only unjust in itself, but highly disrespectful to me" [the President] "and

well calculated to destroy the harmony of my Cabinet. The grounds upon which this opinion is founded, are substantially true. I do not claim the right to interfere, in any manner, in the domestic relations or personal intercourse of any member of my Cabinet, nor have I in any manner attempted it, &c. &c.

In the conclusion of the same paper, after recapitulating the circumstances to which he wished to call your attention, he says, as the result of the matter, "Therefore, have I sought this interview, to assure you if there is any truth in the report that you have entered into the combination charged, in driving Maj. Eaton from my Cabinet, that I feel it an indignity and insult offered to myself, and of a character that will be considered of."

This is the ground on which this matter was placed, by the President in his interview with you in the beginning of the difficulties. And from it, and the absolute avowal of Col. Johnson, I considered my statement, that you were well aware that the President disclaimed all right to interfere and dictate the social intercourse of the family of any member of the cabinet, to be well warranted.

That I am also warranted in having said that you, yourself, had declared that the President disclaimed to you any disposition of the sort, will appear from the extract which I make from a letter of your own, now before me. After recapitulating a conversation of your own, held with Col. Johnson, [the tenor of which you inform me to be as adjusted between you and him,] and make this single remark in relation to the President:—

"In the interview to which I was invited by the President, some few days afterwards, I frankly expressed to him my views on this subject, and he disclaimed any disposition to press such a requisition."

In this you have allusion to the written declaration read to you by the President, which can bear no other interpretation than that which you have given it in this extract.

In both the points presented by me, in the extract quoted in your last note, I feel myself fully sustained by the documentary evidence, which I now lay before you; and I trust you will also consider it as fully vindicating the statement which I have made. Having thus justified myself, you will permit me to conclude my correspondence with you.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
F. P. BLAIR.

Mr. Berrien to Mr. Blair.
WASHINGTON, 20th July, 1831.
SIR: I have this moment received your note, in answer to mine of this date. I make no apology for continuing this correspondence, although you intimate a wish to conclude it, because it will be readily understood, that it is in your character as a public journalist, and not as an individual, that I address you. I exercise a right, therefore, which, as the Editor of a public journal, you can with no propriety withhold, when I claim the insertion of this note in the same paper which conveys your own communication to the public.

I repeat the quotation from your note of yesterday:—
"My sole object was at once to clear the skirts of the President of a charge, which you are well aware ought not to be attached to him; for you have, as I understand, declared that he disclaimed to you, at the time when you were in communication with Col. Johnson, any design like that now imputed to him."

The first remark which I have to make upon this quotation, with reference to your observation, that I do not seem to controvert the first branch of this statement, is the following:—

Your assertion that I was well aware, that the charge against the President, to which you referred, ought not to be attached to him, was made expressly to rest upon your understanding, that I had explicitly declared, that he [the President] disclaimed to me, any design. When, therefore, I told you, that such a statement was not warranted by any declaration ever made by me—and of course that your understanding was not correct, I gave you a very broad denial of my having any such knowledge—as that which you had imputed to me. In more distinct terms, however, [if that be possible,] I now renew that declaration. I have no such knowledge—Nay, more, Sir; I have no knowledge of the paper, "in the hand writing of the President," which you refer. No such paper was ever read to me, or shewn to me, or spoken of to me. If it had been, I should most certainly not now have had occasion to address myself to the public on this subject, through the columns of your paper.

Having thus disposed of the paper to which you refer, and shewn that this can furnish no ground for your understanding of what I was or was not aware of, since I never saw it, and its contents were never communicated to me, I advert next to your suggestion, that this understanding is warranted by Col. Johnson's positive avowal. Upon this subject, I have already told the public, through you, that I consider myself bound by the implied understanding resulting from my correspondence with that gentleman, not to publish any statement of the conversation which occurred between him, Messrs. Branch and Ingham and myself, until he shall have had a reasonable time to reply to my letter.

I told you, at the same time, that any departure from this understanding, which was authorized by that gentleman, would absolve me from its obligation. I still adhere to this view, and content myself, at present, with repeating in reference to that of which you suppose me to be well aware, that I have no such knowledge. The time must speedily arrive when this forbearance will be no longer necessary.

Your next reference is to a letter of mine to Maj. Eaton, which you say, is in your possession. As you have published an extract you are bound to give the correspondence—even before that is done, it is very easy to see that you entirely misunderstood the expression which you have quoted—that a disclaimer of an intention to press a requisition, is a wholly different thing, from a denial of ever having made it—and that in using this expression, I could not have had allusion to "a written declaration," which I had never seen or heard of.

You will perceive then, Sir, that you are wholly unsubstantiated in all the points of your statement, except by a declaration which you admit that you have used without authority, and which will be met if it becomes necessary. As a faithful journalist, you will of course, seize the occasion to correct your error; you can, no doubt do this, in relation to the paper on which you have placed so much reliance, by a direct appeal to the President, who will not, I think authorize the statement, that that paper was ever shewn to me. However this may be, I bear this testimony to the truth. Neither inviting controversy, nor seeking political effect, I find myself in a position, in which I must either speak or silently permit the public to be misled. I have a sufficient sense of what is due to them, not to intrude myself uncalled upon their notice—and the consciousness of what I owe to myself, will not permit me to shrink from the performance of my duty.

I am, very respectfully, Sir, your obedient servant.
JNO. MACPHERSON BERRIEN.
To FRANCIS P. BLAIR, Esq.,
Editor of the *Globe*.

Mr. Blair to Mr. Berrien.
WASHINGTON, JULY 21, 1831.
SIR: Your last letter was received late at night, when the *Globe* was made up for the press. To give it insertion with the correspondence which preceded it, rendered it necessary that I should defer the whole until this day, and substitute other matter previously set up, for my paper.

Without adverting to the special pleading of your letter, [in which, being no lawyer, I have no skill] I come at once to the point. You take issue again with me, by declaring "that no such paper as that quoted by me was ever read to [you] shewn to you or spoken of to you." And you further say, that the President will not, you think, authorize the statement that that paper was ever shewn to [you].

When the statement which I made, predicated upon Col. Johnson's letter, was impeached in your second note, I made the appeal to the President, which you seem to think I ought now to make. He immediately put into my hands the original memorandum which he wrote, and which he read to Messrs. Branch, Ingham and yourself; and I am now expressly authorized to state again, that in the interview referred to in my note and in your own letter, quoted therein, he held in his hand and read to you the paper from which I have given the extracts, which you say was never read, shewn or spoken of to you. And I am authorized further to say, that if you will call on the President, he will again exhibit and read to you this original document. It was prepared by him in contemplation that the interview might lead to an immediate dissolution of his Cabinet, and it was intended by him to record the basis he assumed in doing an act which involved his own character and the interests of the country. The paper thus prepared by the President, was communicated at the time to several of his friends, whom he consulted on the occasion. And the substance of the conversation which pre-

ceded and followed the communication, was also immediately reduced to writing, and connected with the document read to you, that nothing might be left to recollection, if circumstances at a remote period should make a reference to it necessary. With regard to a transaction so recorded, and vouched by the concurrent testimony of those consulted on the occasion, there can be no mistake. A man's memory may be treacherous when the man himself is honest. I am willing to believe this is your case. You have innocently forgotten the declaration made by the President, which stands authenticated, as I have told you, as well as the communication of the same purport made to you by Col. Johnson.

I am obliged to rely on this written record of a fact rather than on your memory especially when I find this positive proof confirming the statement of Col. Johnson, that the President disclaimed any right or desire to interfere with the private associations of yourself or your family and that you knew it.

I next quoted your own written admission, confirming the statement of Colonel Johnson and the written record of the President, in the following words—"In the interview to which I was invited by the President some few days afterwards, [after Col. Johnson's visit,] I frankly expressed to him my views on the subject, and he disclaimed any disposition to press such a requisition."

You say that "a disclaimer of an intention to press such a requisition, is a wholly different thing from a denial of ever having made it."

I thought not, in this; because no such requisition had been made. Col. Johnson says the President disclaimed to him any desire to control your domestic affairs, or private intercourse, and he told you so. The record of what the President said to you declares, that he claimed no right to interfere "in the domestic relations or personal intercourse of any member of his Cabinet; and, in allusion to the same conversation, you say, he disclaimed any disposition to press such a requisition." When no such requisition had been made by Col. Johnson; when he told you the President made none; and when you do not pretend he made any, either directly or indirectly, I could not but understand your declaration, that "he disclaimed any disposition to press such a requisition," as a declaration that he made no such requisition.

But I find, in the character you have always sustained before the public, other conclusive proof, that no such requisition was ever made of you and that you knew it. If the President had signified to you, directly or indirectly, that he required you to compel your family to associate with any one, contrary to their will and yours, you would not, as a man of honor have waited for an invitation to resign. You would have thrown your commission in the face of the President, and said to him, "Sir, I am no longer adviser or associate with a man who requires me to disgrace myself and family, though he be the President of the U. States!" In your public character I had a guarantee that you would not, for the sake of your honor, salary and emoluments, as Attorney General, sink your character as a man by tamely listening to such a requisition. No, sir; it is impossible to believe that you could have listened to such a requisition; dismissed your self-respect; forgotten your Southern honor; and humbly bowed in seeming reverence to the man who had insulted you, until politely invited to resign! It is impossible that you could bury such an insult, profess to be the friend of the President, make the speech that you did recently in Georgia and now that you are out of office, disclose a fact which would seal your own shame. No, sir; no such proposition was ever made to you; you had no cause to complain of the President; you eulogized him in public and private, and you would gladly have acted as Attorney General to the end of his administration, had you not been invited to resign.

But the circumstances under which the harmony of the late Cabinet was restored, repel the inference, which you will have it, in your last note, that the extract from your letter to Major Eaton, leaves open in the ambiguity of its expression. From the moment that you denied to the President any participation in the political combination to drive Major Eaton from the Cabinet, the usual courtesies were renewed among its members without any association between their respective families. Major Eaton would have been as reluctant to receive visitors, driven into his doors by the power of the President, as they could possibly have been to submit to such tyranny & degradation. His house was