

# NORTH CAROLINA SPECTATOR

## AND WESTERN ADVERTISER.

VOLUME II.

RUTHERFORDTON, SATURDAY EVENING, MARCH 26, 1831.

NUMBER 6.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY EVENING BY  
ROSWELL ELMER, JR.

Terms of subscription. Two dollars and fifty cents, per annum, if paid in advance; or three dollars, if paid within the year:—but if delayed after the close of the year, twenty-five cents will be added.

No paper will be discontinued until particularly ordered and all arrearages paid, or at the discretion of the publisher.

Advertisements inserted on the usual terms.—All persons advertising will please note the number of times they wish to have them inserted, or they will be continued and taxed accordingly.

### POLITICAL.

CORRESPONDENCE, &c.  
(Continued from page 18.)

#### APPENDIX.

General Jackson to Mr. Monroe.  
Nashville, August 19, 1818.

Sir, Your letter of the 19th July, apprising me of the course to be pursued in relation to the Floridas, has been received. In a future communication, it is my intention to submit my views of all the questions springing from the subject, with the fulness and candor which the importance of the topic, and the part I have acted in it demand. At present I will confine myself to the consideration of a part of your letter, which has a particular bearing on myself, and which seems to have originated in a misconception of the import of the order under which I have commenced the Seminole campaign. In making this examination, I will make use of all the freedom which is courted by your letter, and which I deem necessary to afford you a clear view of the construction that was given to the order, and the motives under which I proceed to execute its intentions.

It is stated in the second paragraph of your letter, that I transcended the limits of my order, and that I acted on my own responsibility.

To these two points I mean at present to confine myself. But, before entering on a proof of their applicability to my acts in Florida, allow me fairly to state, that the assumption of responsibility will never be shrunk from when the public can thereby be promoted. I have passed through difficulties and exposures for the honor and benefit of my country; and whenever still, for this purpose, it shall become necessary to assume a further liability, no scruple will be urged or felt. But when it shall be required of me to do so, and the result be danger and injury to that country, the inducement will be lost, and my consent will be wanting.

This principle is held to be incontrovertible, that an order, generally, to perform a certain service, or effect a certain object, without any specification of the means to be adopted, or limits to govern the executive officer, leaves an entire discretion with the officer as to the choice and application of the means, but preserves the responsibility for his acts on the authority from which the order emanated. Under such an order all the acts of the inferior are acts of the superior; and in no way can the subordinate officer be impeached for his measures, except on the score of deficiency in judgment and skill. It is also a grammatical truth, that the limits of such an order cannot be transcended without an entire desertion of the objects it contemplated; for as long as the main legitimate design is kept in view, the policy of the measures adopted to accomplish it is alone to be considered. If these be adopted as the proper rules of construction, and we apply them to my order of Dec. 26, 1817, it will be at once seen, that, both in description and operative principle, they embrace that order exactly. The requisitions of the order are for the commanding General to assume the immediate command at Fort Scott, to concentrate all the contiguous and disposable force of the division on that quarter, to call on the executives of adjacent States for an auxiliary militia force, and concludes with this comprehensive command: "With this view you may be prepared to concentrate your forces, and adopt the necessary measures to terminate a conflict, which it has ever been the desire of the president, from motives of humanity, to avoid, but which is now made necessary by their settled hostility."

In no part of this document is there a reference to any previous order, either to myself or another officer, with a view to point to me the measures thought advisable, or the limits of my power in choosing and effecting them. It states that Gen'l Gaines has been ordered to Amelia island, and then proceeds to inform me "that subsequent orders have been given to General Gaines, (of which copies will be furnished you,) that you would be directed to take the command, and directing him to re-assume, should he deem the public interest to require it, the command of Fort Scott, until you should arrive there."

Lastly, it mentions that "he was instructed to penetrate the Seminole towns thro' the Floridas, provided the strength of his command at Amelia would justify his engaging in offensive operations. The principle determining the weight of references, in subsequent orders, to instructions previously given is well settled. Such references are usually made with one of these two intentions—either the order is given to a second officer, to effect a certain purpose which was intended to be effected by another officer, and the instructions of the first are referred to as the guide of the second; or the order contains and is designed for an extension of authority, and only refers to anterior communications to give a full view of what has been previously attempted and performed. In the first case it is always necessary to connect the different orders by a specific provision, that no doubt may exist as to the extent of the command; and thus the several requisitions and instructions are amalgamated, and the limits of the agent plainly and securely established. In the second, no such provision is necessary; for an entire discretion in the choice and use of means being previously vested, the reference if there be any, is only descriptive of the powers antecedently given, and the results of measures attempted under such specific limitation. But admitting, that, in my order of Dec. 26, 1817, there is such a reference as I contemplated in the first case, allow me to examine its character and amount. It is stated that "orders have been given to Gen. Gaines, (copies of which will be furnished you)," but without affirming that they are to be considered as binding on me, or in any way connected with the comprehensive command that I should terminate the Seminole conflict. On the contrary, so far are they from being designated as my guide and limits in entering Florida, that in stating their substance in the ensuing sentence, no allusion whatever is made either to means or limitation.

How, then, can it be said with propriety that I have transcended the limits of my orders, or acted on my own responsibility? My order was as comprehensive as it could be, and contained neither the minute original instructions, or a reference to others previously given, to guide and govern me. The fullest discretion was left with me in the selection and application of the means to effect the specific legitimate objects of the campaign; and for the exercise of a sound discretion on principles of policy am I alone responsible. But allow me to repeat, that responsibility is not feared by me, if the general good requires its assumption. I never shrunk from it, and never will; but against its imposition on me contrary to principle, and without the prospect of any politic result, I must contend with all the feelings of a soldier and a citizen. Being advised that you are at your country seat in Loudon, where I expect this will reach you, I enclose you a copy of the order to me of the 26th December, 1817, and copies of the orders of General Gaines therein referred to; from a perusal of which you will perceive that the order to me has no reference to those prohibitory orders to Gen. Gaines that you have referred to.

It will afford me pleasure to aid the government in procuring any testimony that may be necessary to prove the hostility of the officers of Spain to the United States. I had supposed that evidence furnished had established that fact—that the officers of Spain had identified themselves with our enemy, and that St. Mark's and Pensacola were under the complete controul of the Indians, although the Governor of Pens'a at least had force sufficient to have controlled the Indians, had he chosen to have used it in that way. For the purpose of procuring the necessary evidence of the hostile acts of the Governor of Pensacola, I despatched Capt. Young, topographical engineer, and as soon as obtained shall be furnished you. I trust, on a view of all my communications, (copies of which have been forwarded by Captain Gadsden,) you will find that they do not bear the construction you have given them. They were written under bad health, great fatigue, and in haste. My bad health continues: I labor under great bodily debility.

Accept assurances of my sincere regard and esteem; and am, respectfully, your most obedient servant,

ANDREW JACKSON.  
JAMES MONROE, President U. S.

#### C.

Mr. Monroe to Gen. Jackson.

Washington, October 20, 1818.

DEAR SIR: I received your letter of the 19th of August, while I was at home, on my farm in Albemarle; and there appearing to be no necessity for giving it an immediate answer, I delayed it until my return here.

I was sorry to find that you understood your instructions relative to operations in Florida differently from what we intended. I was satisfied, however, that you had good reason for your conduct, and have acted in all things on that principle. By supposing that you understood them as we did, I concluded that you proceeded on your own responsibility alone, in which, knowing the purity of your motives, I have done all that I could to justify the measure. I well know, also, the misconduct of the Spanish authorities in that quarter, not of recent date only.

Finding that you had a different view of your power, it only remains to do justice to you on that ground. Nothing can be further from my intention than to expose you to a responsibility, in any sense, which you did not contemplate.

The best course to be pursued seems to me to be for you to write a letter to the Department, in which you will state, that, having reason to think that a difference of opinion existed between you and the Executive, relative to the extent of your powers, you thought it due to yourself to state your view of them, and in which you acted. This will be answered, so as to explain ours, in a friendly manner by Mr. Calhoun, who has very just and liberal sentiments on the subject. This will be necessary in the case of a call for papers by Congress, as may be. Thus we shall all stand on the ground of honor, each doing justice to the other, which is the ground on which we wish to place each other.

I hope that your health is improved, and Mrs. Monroe unites in her best respects to Mrs. Jackson.

With great respect and sincere regard, I am dear Sir, yours

JAMES MONROE.

Major GEN. A. JACKSON, Nashville Tennessee.

#### G.

George McDuffie to Mr. Calhoun.

Washington, May 14, 1830.

DEAR SIR: In answer to the inquiries contained in your note of this morning, I submit the following statement. I very distinctly recollect to have heard Mr. Crawford (I think in the summer of 1818) in conversation with Eldred Simpkins, Esq. relative to the proceedings of Gen'l Jackson in the Seminole war, and to the course pursued by the cabinet, touching those proceedings. Mr. Crawford spoke without any kind of reserve as to the respective parts taken by the different members of the cabinet while the subject was under deliberation. He stated that you had been in favor of inquiry into the conduct of Gen. Jackson, and that he was the only member in the cabinet that concurred with you. He spoke in strong terms of disapprobation of the course pursued by Gen. Jackson, not only in his military proceedings, but in prematurely bringing the grounds of his defence before the country, and forestalling public opinion, thus anticipating the administration. On this point he remarked, that if the administration could not give direction to public opinion, but permitted a military officer, who had violated his orders, to anticipate them, they had no business to be at Washington, and had better return home. I also remember that the National Intelligencer, which was lying on the sofa where Mr. Crawford was sitting, contained an article explanatory of the grounds upon which the administration had proceeded in regard to Gen. Jackson's military movements. Mr. Crawford adverted to some part of the article, which laid down the principle of the law of nations, if I mistake not, which went to show that a neutral territory could only be invaded in fresh pursuit of an enemy, and added, "Mr. Adams denies all that." He represented Mr. Adams as going much further in justifying Gen. Jackson than even Mr. Monroe, stating that the latter was induced to pass over the conduct of Gen. Jackson without public censure, not from a belief that he had not violated his orders and exceeded his power, but from political considerations connected with our relations with Spain. Your obedient servant,

GEO. McDUFFIE.

#### J.

John C. Calhoun to James Monroe.

Washington, May 17th, 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 16th of Jan., 1818—I mean the one in which allusion is made to Mr. J. Rea—was seen, when received by any one except myself, and, if it was, by whom. I will thank you to inform me by the 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.

JAMES MONROE.

#### 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 Gen. J. 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 would require an answer; but without any notice or its contents. Mr. Crawford came in soon afterwards, and 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 judgement 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,  
JAMES MONROE.

Hon. J. C. CALHOUN.

#### L.

John C. Calhoun to Mr. Wirt.

Washington, May 28, 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 my 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 General Jackson to Mr. Monroe, such as is 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.

J. 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 proceeding 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 meeting, 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 call 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 J. Forsyth, Esq. dated April 30, 1830," having 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 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 enquiry 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 inferences of acquiescence which he supposed the general was 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 his silence, but for a positive hint of his approbation thro' "some confidential member of Congress, say Johnny Ray." Really 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.

#### O.

John Q. Adams to J. C. Calhoun.

Washington, Jan. 14, 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 Gen. Jackson in Florida, on the occasion of the Seminole war, and alluding to a letter from Gen. 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 sacredly 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.

#### MR. CARSON'S SPEECH.

On the amendment proposed by Mr. Stanberry to the general appropriation bill, to strike out \$9,000, as compensation to the Minister to Russia.

Mr. Carson rose and said: I am deeply sensible, Mr. Speaker, of the obligation I am under to the House for its kind indulgence and great liberality manifested by its course of action, by which I am permitted to proceed in this debate. The best return I can possibly make, is to trespass for as short a time as possible upon their patience, which appears already wearied.

\* Mr. Blair, of South Carolina, demanded the previous question, which precludes debate. Mr. Carson appealed to him to withdraw the motion for the purpose of enabling him to discuss the subject further. Mr. B. refused. The previous question was seconded; but the House did not sustain the previous question. (decided by yeas and nays:) this put the question from before the House for one day. The vote upon the previous question was then re-considered, and the House gave leave for the original motion to be withdrawn; which was done by the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Blair,) and Mr. Carson was enabled to proceed.