

RALEIGH REGISTER,

AND NORTH-CAROLINA GAZETTE.

"OURS ARE THE PLANS OF FAIR DELIGHTFUL PEACE, UNWARP'D BY PARTY RAGE, TO LIVE LIKE BROTHERS."

VOL. XXXI.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1831.

NO. 44.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY,
By Joseph Gates & Son,
Raleigh, North-Carolina.

TABULAR
Those who do not, either at the time of subscription, or subsequently, give notice of their wish to have the Paper discontinued at the expiration of their year, will be presumed as desiring its continuance until countermanded.

ADVERTISEMENTS.
Not exceeding sixteen lines, will be inserted three times for a dollar; and twenty five cents for each subsequent publication; those of greater length, in the same proportion. If the number of insertions be not marked on them, they will be continued until ordered out, and charged accordingly.

MR. CRAWFORD'S REJOINDER.

FROM THE GEORGIA JOURNAL.

To the Citizens of the United States.

The appearance of the address of the Vice President, of the United States renders it unnecessary to offer any apology for the following address: The Review of the correspondence signed A. B. originally published in the Georgia Journal, of the 21st of April last and several articles in the Globe and other newspapers have in my judgment sufficiently explained my conduct to all impartial and unprejudiced minds; and those of a different description, it is improbable that anything that I can urge will convince. Besides it is not very important to the people of the United States before whom there is no probability, I shall ever again be placed, to form any definite opinion of my motives or conduct in the transaction, developed in the correspondence, between the President & Vice President. I say it is not very important, to the citizens of the United States; but it is important to me individually, to have my conduct correctly understood; for no man however retired he may live, ought to be indifferent to public opinion. It also appears from the newspapers, that an explanation from me is expected, and desired. I therefore submit to the apparent necessity of appearing before the public.

I understand from letters received during the last session of Congress, that the Vice President, and his friends were endeavoring to make the impression that the difficulty between him and the President, had been produced by me from a desire on my part to ingratiate myself with the President. If this impression had been made by their joint efforts, the Vice President has dispelled, the illusion for by his publication, it is clearly established that the measures did not originate with me. In fact I assert without the fear of contradiction, that no intercourse, either verbal or written has taken place between the President and myself since a few days after the Presidential election in the House of Representatives in February 1825. During the call General Jackson then made upon me no reference whatever was made to what had passed, in relation to the Gen. or myself. I considered the call as evidence of a better state of feeling on his part than had been understood to have previously existed; and as I had never cherished any feelings of hostility towards him, I was perfectly willing that the past should be buried in oblivion. But the publication of the correspondence, has relieved me from the necessity, of saying any thing more upon this subject.

Two other charges have been made against me: 1st. That the confidential letter of Gen. Jackson, which I say was produced and read in the Cabinet, was not produced and read. And 2nd. that I have improperly, disclosed cabinet secrets.

Upon the 1st objection negative testimony is relied upon. Mr. Monroe, Mr. Adams and Mr. Wirt, do not recollect that it was produced and read; or rather Mr. Adams and Mr. Wirt, do not recollect it, for it is manifest that Mr. Monroe, has no recollection upon the subject, having relied wholly on Mr. Wirt. But Mr. Calhoun, has a distinct recollection that it was not produced, and read. Without relying upon that rule of legal evidence, which declares, that one affirmative witness outweighs many negative ones, there is I believe abundant evidence in the correspondence itself to support my statement. Here I beg leave to transcribe an article from the Globe of the 20th February, last, which has much force & cogency, and proves at least presumptively, that my statement concerning the confidential letter is correct.—The Globe says "After all the statements, and retractions, about the production of General Jackson's letter 'before the Cabinet in July 1818,' Mr. Monroe's letters published by Mr. Calhoun, go far to confirm Mr. Crawford's statement. In the conclusion of Monroe's letter to General Jackson dated December the 21st, 1818 (printed 1830 by a mistake in the pamphlet) Mr. Monroe thus speaks of the confidential letter; your letter of the 5th of January, was received whilst I was seriously indisposed; observing that it was from you I handed it to Mr. Calhoun

to read; after reading one or two lines myself. The order to take command in that quarter had before then been issued. He remarked after reading the letter that it was a confidential one relating to Florida which I must answer. I asked him, if he had forwarded to you the orders that had been given to General Gaines on that subject. He replied that he had.— Your letter to me with many others from friends was put aside in consequence of my indisposition; and the great pressure upon me at the time and never recurred to, until after my return from London on the receipt of yours by Mr. Hamblly and then on the suggestion of Mr. Calhoun.— Now when did Mr. Monroe, return from London, and when was the letter by Hamblly received? Mr. Calhoun has given us the evidence to show. In one of his notes he tells us that the 1st Cabinet 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 London. Mr. Monroe's letter to Gen. Jackson dated 19th July 1818, begins thus, "I received lately your letter of June 21st by Mr. Hamblly, at my farm in London, &c." Thus the time when the confidential letter was looked upon, on the suggestion of Mr. Calhoun, is identified within a few days. It was after Mr. Monroe's return from London, on the 14th and before the 19th of July 1818, the very period at which the Cabinet were deliberating about the Seminole War, and at the very time Mr. Crawford says it was produced before them. There is a remarkable coincidence, between the details of Mr. Crawford's statement and Mr. Monroe's account of this affair made in 1818 which proves the identity, of the incidents alluded to; Mr. Crawford says Mr. Calhoun, made some allusion to a letter the General had written to the President, who had forgotten that he had received such a letter, but said if he had received such an one he could find it, and went directly into his cabinet, and brought the letter out. Mr. Monroe in his letter of the 21st December 1818 says, your letter &c. was put aside &c. and never recurred to until after my return from London, &c. and then on the suggestion of Mr. Calhoun. Here is conclusive proof of two things, 1st. the confidential letter was produced on the suggestion of Mr. Calhoun, after Mr. Monroe's return from London, on the 14th and before the writing of his letter to Gen. Jackson the 19th of July 1818. 2d. Mr. Crawford was present when the suggestion was made and the letter produced. The Cabinet it seems were several days in deliberation. Mr. Wirt might not have been present when the letter was produced. At any rate the proof is conclusive that the letter was produced to Mr. Crawford, on Mr. Calhoun's suggestion. Mr. Calhoun's own account of that letter is incorrect.— He says, my recollection in relation to it accords with Mr. Monroe's statement.— I came into the room when he had apparently just received the letter. He was indisposed at the time. I think he opened the letter in my presence, and finding that it was from you, he gave to me the letter to read. I cast my eyes over it, and remarked that it related to the Seminole war, and would require his attention or something to that effect. I thought no more of it. Long after, I think it was at the commencement of the next session of Congress, I heard some allusion which brought the letter to my recollection. It was from a quarter which induced me to believe it came from Mr. Crawford. I called and mentioned it to Mr. Monroe and found that he had entirely forgotten the letter. After searching some time, he found it amongst some other papers, and read it as he told me for the first time.— Mr. Monroe's account of the matter written in December 1818 shortly after the meeting of Congress, proves that this story as to time is entirely fabulous.— That letter connected with that of the 19th July proves that the hunting up of the letter on the suggestion of Mr. Calhoun, and the reading for the 1st time took place directly after Mr. Monroe's return from London on the 14th July 1818 during the deliberations of the Cabinet. Upon this evidence may Mr. Crawford turn round and pity and taunt Mr. Calhoun for decay of his memory. He has notoriously published to the world a gross misrepresentation of this affair with the evidence of its incorrectness before him, in his own documents. If memory had failed him, he might have relied for correct information on the account given by Mr. Monroe, in 1818 which is certainly more likely to be correct, than any statement made by him now. He Mr. Monroe could not have forgotten the facts.— Thus vanishes one of Mr. Calhoun's clouds of dust, which he had raised, to blind the people in relation to his own conduct towards Gen. Jackson."

I shall not, however, turn upon Mr. Calhoun and reproach him with his decay of memory, for if he is to be believed, he never had any to decay. As I shall show before this review is closed. No, it is the want of veracity which must be reproached to Mr. Calhoun; and not the decay of his memory. In support of the argument of the Globe, founded on Mr. Monroe's letters of the 19th of July, and 21st of December, 1818, I shall produce a passage from Mr. Monroe's letter to me of the 8th August, 1830.—"I lay in my bed more than a week during which that letter (the confidential one) was removed, and every thing relating to that war having been previously arranged, it was forgotten and never read by me until after the meeting of the administration, and the decision as to the course to be pursued in reference to its management.— My impression is that I read it then, on a suggestion of Mr. Calhoun, that it required my attention. Had I read it when I received it, I should have considered it confidential, and never have shown it to any one, however great my confidence in them might be." It is somewhat difficult to ascertain what Mr. Monroe's meaning in the foregoing quotation is. He states that "every thing relating to that war, having been previously arranged, the letter was removed, and forgotten, and never read by me (Mr. Monroe) until after the meeting of the administration, and the decision as to the course to be pursued in reference to its management." It is manifest that the first part of the foregoing sentence relates to the arrangement of the letters and papers concerning the Seminole war. That had terminated before the meeting. If Mr. Monroe intended to state, that the letter was produced and read upon the suggestion of Mr. Calhoun that it required his attention, after the decision of the administration upon the course to be pursued towards Spain and towards Gen. Jackson; then it is manifest that he is mistaken.— It is impossible in the nature of things that Mr. Calhoun could have believed, or suggested that, that letter required the President's attention, after the decision of the administration upon the events of the campaign had been formed. It was impossible in the nature of things that the President's attention could be necessary to that letter after the decision had been made on the events of the campaign. I have before me a letter from a member of Congress from this State, in which he urges "that the confidential letter must have been before the Cabinet, as it was necessary to a correct decision of the questions growing out of the Seminole war, and that the President and Secretary of War, ought to have been apprized if it had been withheld." When Mr. Calhoun referred to the letter my impression was and is now, that he wished it produced to prove that General Jackson, instead of acting in conformity to the orders of the War department had determined to take the Spanish posts before he received orders to take charge of that war. It is probable that when he referred to that letter, he was not aware that it had been answered. It is easy to understand why Mr. Calhoun should call the President's attention to that letter before the President had decided upon the course to be pursued towards Spain and especially towards General Jackson—but after that decision had been made, it is impossible to conceive a motive for bringing it under consideration. Mr. Monroe is then evidently mistaken in stating that the letter was produced and read upon the suggestion of Mr. Calhoun, after the decision of the cabinet upon the events of the Seminole campaign. It is a little remarkable, however, that the confidential letter, is always produced upon the suggestion of Mr. Calhoun. Mr. Monroe in his letter to Gen. Jackson of the 21st December, 1818 and of the 8th of August 1830 to me says: it was produced on suggestion of Mr. Calhoun, and connects it with the proceedings of the Cabinet, in which I say I distinctly recollect it was produced and read upon the suggestion of Mr. Calhoun. I will now state more at large, the reasons of my distinct recollection of the circumstance. Mr. Monroe before he left Washington had particularly enjoined upon me not to leave Washington for Georgia until Gen. Jackson's dispatches should be received, and the Cabinet should decide upon the events of the Seminole campaign. During his absence in London, I had frequent conversations with Mr. Calhoun, who uniformly informed me, that Gen. Jackson had no other orders for the government of his conduct than those given to Gen. Gaines. Those orders I had seen his representations which at that time I had no reasons to doubt, made a strong impression upon my mind, and extremely unfavorable to Gen. Jackson. I entered the Cabinet therefore with decided impressions against the General which were removed only by the production and reading of the confidential letter, of which to the best of my recollection and belief, it was the first intimation I had ever received of that letter. I am confident Mr. Monroe is mistaken in his recollection of my coming into his room, after Mr. Calhoun, and reading the letter. It is worthy of remark too that in his letter of the 21st December, when it is more likely that his recollection was correct, than in the spring of 1830, he tells Gen. Jackson that the letter was given to Mr. Calhoun, but does not connect me with Mr. Calhoun and that letter, and I have a distinct recol-

lection of hearing him give the same account of it, several times, in none of which did he connect me in the affair of the letter. The Vice President seems to think he has disposed of Mr. Crowninshield's evidence, by the letter he has received from him—but by comparing the two letters, it will be seen that the latter to him does not contradict a single syllable of his previous letter to me. Mr. Calhoun in a note to Mr. Crowninshield's letter to him, says—"Nor could he have been present at any meeting of the Cabinet on the subject of the capture of St. Marks, or Pensacola in which I was."—George W. Erving, Esq. late minister to Spain and Denmark, writes in the month of February last, "That it is now ascertained that the official news of the capture of St. Marks, was received at Washington in the early part of May." He had particularly examined the records of the War department, and found that the dispatch giving an account of the capture of St. Marks, was recorded in the early part of May, and Mr. Calhoun in the note last referred to, says: that he, Mr. Crowninshield and the President left Washington on the 29th of May—and Mr. Crowninshield in his letter to Mr. Calhoun says, that he could not know any thing of a Cabinet meeting after the 23rd of May."

But the Vice President surely has no regard to accuracy when he asserts that Mr. Crowninshield could not have been present at any Cabinet meeting on the capture of St. Marks or Pensacola, at which I was. Could not a Cabinet council have been held between the early part of May and the 29th of that month?—Mr. Calhoun asserts, the negative—but every person that has understanding to content on will assert the affirmative.— This assertion of the Vice President in the city of Washington where the evidence existed, proves his reckless disregard of the truth on all occasions where he conceives it to be his interest, to violate it. In regard to this assertion of the Vice President, Mr. Erving observes, "There are stout assertions, since it is now ascertained that the official news of the capture of St. Marks, was received at Washington early in the month of May, nearly three weeks before either he or Mr. Crowninshield left that city; consequently it was very possible that this affair might have been the subject of a cabinet council when they were both present." In the same letter Mr. Erving says, "That Mr. Crowninshield asserted, the accuracy of every fact in his letter to you (me), and then related to me circumstances which passed in the Cabinet consultation to which it refers. The question before the Cabinet was whether we should take possession of the Floridas. He was opposed to the project, and spoke against it and he mentioned to me in general terms the argument which he made use of on that occasion. He well recollects that a certain private letter, was asked for, that Mr. Monroe had forgotten it, but wanted to look for it, in some cabinet or retired place, from which he brought a small box, or trunk, (red or blue I think he said) in this was found the letter. Mr. Crowninshield's recollection is minutely exact. He recollects as though he now could see the corner of the small box in which the letter was found, the very place in the room where he himself sat, during the discussion and all similar details." Mr. Calhoun must therefore resort to some other shift or device, to get rid of Mr. Crowninshield's evidence, more deceptive than his naked assertion, that Mr. Crowninshield could not have been present at any Cabinet meeting at which he was, on the Seminole campaign. The records of the War department show that this assertion is untrue.

The declarations before stated by Mr. Erving were made subsequent to the date of Mr. Crowninshield's letter to Mr. Calhoun. He is a man of undoubted veracity, and although my memory does not enable me to offer any explanation upon this subject, I have no doubt that his statement in his letter to me is substantially correct; because his memory is distinct, and he states facts clearly and unequivocally.— He is a man of unquestionable veracity, it is therefore a matter of perfect indifference whether the same facts are recollected by Mr. Monroe, Adams, Wirt or myself. They are besides facts that he could not have obtained any where else than in a Cabinet council. This circumstance is conclusive, and must prevail with all unprejudiced minds.

It may be proper here to state that I have no distinct recollection whether Mr. Crowninshield or Mr. Wirt, were present in the Cabinet council of July 1818, or were absent from it. Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Adams I know was present. If I had recollected that Mr. Crowninshield had been absent as I now suppose him to have been I certainly should not have applied to him for information. But the information given certainly applies to a Cabinet council at which he and Mr. Calhoun were present, and at which the confidential letter was produced. It is then demonstrated that the letter written by Mr. Crowninshield to the Vice President, does not impugn in the slightest degree, the facts stated in his letter to me. That letter does not give the date of the Cabinet council to which it refers: and that and

references disprove the assertion of the Vice President, that Mr. Crowninshield could not have been present at any Cabinet meeting, at which he was, upon the events of the Seminole campaign.

It remains for me to say a few words on the charge of disclosing Cabinet secrets. I have but little to add to what I have urged in my letter of the 2d October. The principles stated in that letter are believed to be orthodox. In this republic the President is appointed by the nation, and he appoints his Cabinet by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President and his Cabinet are therefore responsible to the republic for their acts. Those acts for which they are responsible ought therefore according to the principles of the government to be known. Otherwise the highest public functionaries known to the Constitution are irresponsible. To this responsibility inherent in our Constitution, there is but one exception sanctioned by reason. If the secrets of the Cabinet are disclosed while the Cabinet is in existence and charged with the management of the national concerns, the Cabinet might be rendered incapable of conducting those affairs successfully. This is the broad ground upon which the secrecy of Cabinet transactions can be placed. By some it is contended that in a government like ours, secrecy should not be extended beyond the accomplishment of the objects which have been the subject of Cabinet deliberations. That when the measures which have been the subject of those deliberations, have been effected, if they are beneficial to the republic, the people ought to know the extent of their obligations to their public functionaries; and if they are injurious to the community, that community ought to be placed in a situation to form a correct judgment upon the conduct of their public functionaries; I have acted upon the first principle; I have disclosed the proceedings of Mr. Monroe's Cabinet on the Seminole war only after it ceased to exist, and then only in self defence. A false account of those proceedings had been communicated not only to General Jackson but to the nation. It is a matter of general notoriety through the Union, that General Jackson believed I had been unfriendly to him in the Cabinet deliberations on the Seminole war. By whom was that impression produced? By Mr. Calhoun and his friends. I am perfectly willing that the President of the United States, should state, how and by whom that impression was made upon his mind. The only ostensible act having that object in view, which is within my own knowledge is the celebrated Nashville letter. That letter contained two falsehoods, one to my injury and one for Mr. Calhoun's benefit. No other human being on this torrid globe except Mr. Calhoun had an interest in fabricating those falsehoods: at least, the latter one. Until he wrote that the letter in question was written by some one else, not under his influence, or direction, or shall point out some other person having an equal interest with himself in that fabrication, he must pardon me at least for considering him to be the author of that letter.

I here terminate the review so far as my defence is concerned, and shall turn my attention more directly to the correspondence, and to the contradictions and commitments to which Mr. Calhoun has subjected himself in his several publications. Almost in the commencement of his first address he presents a letter from Mr. Wilson Lumpkin, containing one from General Daniel Newnan including the copy of a letter from me to Alfred Balch Esq. of Nashville in answer to one received from him. Mr. Lumpkin it will be observed is very flippant in the use of terms of reproach and vituperation; and General Newnan is not much behind him. Of these two men it is sufficient to say they are both apostates from the republican ranks. They will both probably, deny this. They are however both Clark men. This they cannot deny, and they both were Anti-Clark men until about 8 or 10 years ago; when they both about the same time made a political somerser. They are both unquestionably turn coats. Mr. Lumpkin is now the Clark candidate for Governor. That party in this State is a mongrel party, formed of the worst materials of the political parties which have heretofore prevailed in Georgia. General John Clark the leader of the party was believed to be a federalist—but finding in 1824, that he could not induce his party to support Mr. Adams, he declared for General Jackson. At the election in 1828, he only two electoral candidates for Mr. Adams, were Clarkites; one of them had been his confidential Secretary when he was Governor. This man (General Clark) had succeeded in a wonderful degree in combining all the ignorance in the State in his support. It may be laid down as an axiom that in the United States, if a man changes politics after he is 30 years old he changes from selfish and therefore dishonest motives. It is a notorious fact that both these men were more than 30 years of age when they changed their politics. It is not wonderful, then that there should be sympathy between them and Mr. Calhoun. The advantage of

birth of a feather will flock together, was never more fully verified than in this instance.— The Vice President is welcome to the copy of my letter which has been obtained from Mr. Balch without his knowledge, permission or consent. I have the letter of Mr. Balch now before me in which he says, "The copy was not furnished with my knowledge, privacy, or consent." If I had supposed the copy of the letter would have been acceptable to Mr. Calhoun, I would have sent him a copy and thereby possibly have saved his friend Newnan, from the shame and disgrace of purloining letters. I have never written or said any thing of Mr. Calhoun, that I would not have written or said to him, had the occasion made it proper. Mr. Lumpkin whom I have long known prides himself upon being a very shrewd observer of passing events. Independent of his strong desire to communicate facts, to his friend the Vice-President, he assumes the character of a prophet and ventures to predict what General Jackson will do. Unfortunately, the shrewd observer of passing events, and the prophet are equally at fault. He tells the Vice-President, "That from the day Pennsylvania took up General Jackson, every conspicuous friend of the Vice President supported General Jackson with constancy, zeal and uniformity and that General Jackson knows it." Leaving it therefore to be inferred, that every conspicuous friend of Mr. Calhoun in this matter, had been influenced so to act by the Vice-President. Now unfortunately for his friend Lumpkin, the Vice-President declares to the people of the United States that he was neutral between General Jackson and Mr. Adams. Wonderful!!! It is presumed that there was not another individual in the United States in this happy state of quiescence upon the presidential election. General Jackson and Mr. Adams were so unlike in their temper, manners, and principles that it is at least difficult to conceive, how any man who had the least knowledge of the two men could be neutral between them. But I believe Mr. Calhoun was not even neutral between these gentlemen. Does the nation recollect the letter of the 3d of July, 1824, by which Mr. Calhoun, Mr. Adams and John McLan their Postmaster General withdrew their names from the 4th of July Dinner at Washington because *Nathan Edwards* was excluded from that dinner? How happened this union.— That letter at least shows a friendly feeling between them; and the act was done to prop the tottering reputation of one of Mr. Adams's political supporters, whose son-in-law wielded the vote of Illinois; which vote secured Mr. Adams's election. If it had been withheld he would not have been elected, at least on the first ballot. Mr. Calhoun states that his opinion between the two candidates, towards whom he was in the happy state of neutrality was founded upon a principle which he is however careful not to disclose, but leaves to be inferred from his subsequent conduct.— What that principle is I am entirely at a loss to conjecture; nor has his subsequent conduct furnished any clue thereto as it does he mean that the principle he alludes to is that the candidate who receives the highest electoral vote must necessarily be elected by the House of Representatives? The Constitution has no such principle in it. If that had been the intention of the framers of the instrument they would have said that the candidate receiving the highest number of electoral votes should be President. It does mean that the Representative of a State are bound to give the same vote as the electors had done. That principle is not in the Constitution. The only limitation imposed upon the House of Representatives, is that they shall elect one of the three highest of the candidates.— This the House of Representatives did, and therefore violated no principle of the Constitution, however they may have infringed upon the principle of the Vice President, which to me is entirely occult. I believe he alone can tell what he means, if he means any thing; which is very questionable. Mr. Lumpkin after stating the conduct of the Vice President's friends—adds, "How then can it be possible that General Jackson can suspect the friendship, constancy or sincerity of you, or your friends. No he cannot. He will not be done. I have quite too much confidence in the General, to believe such idle tales." Poor Gentleman, he has been deceived in the course that Mr. Calhoun has pursued, and he is equally deceived in that which the General has pursued and will probably continue to pursue towards the Vice President. The keen observer of passing events and the prophet are alike mistaken both as to the President and Vice President, but possibly he may be more fortunate than I have been in discovering the important principle which the Vice President thinks ought to have governed the election of President, by the House of Representatives in February, 1825.

I proceed now to comment on Mr. Calhoun's notes, to my letter of the 2d October, 1830. It is, however due to myself, to state, that that letter was written without any expectation that it would be published. I am, however, glad, that it

published. I am, however, glad, that it