

POLITICAL COMMUNICATIONS.
TO THE PUBLIC.

In the present election I know there are many worthy men who are hostile to my election from the best motives—such, for instance, as those who are in favor of the *Ad valorem* system of taxation, or, such as those who are in favor of my other system that I may be unable to; their objections are political not personal; with such men my private character and feelings are mere objects of anxiety; they have my best respects. There are other men who are governed in their attacks by personal feeling and private resentments; they are of private character only, and like the midnight assassin keep behind the curtain: Such men make more fuss and create more confusion in society than the balance of the community; they have no weight with the people in their true characters, therefore their names ought to be made known to the public and their motives exposed. With these reflections I informed the public of the author of those publications signed *Libertas*, and the motives that governed him. Since which time James Fowler, the reputed author, has given a printed denial to the statement I made: “let the gilded jade wince my weathers mavorung.” I shall not retract what I have said. The manuscript was known to be in his hand writing before it was committed to the press, and he tamely admits every assertion that I have made, as is incontrovertibly evident by a reference to the annexed note, which was politely presented to the Doctor on Saturday last by a gentleman of this place, to whom no answer is given, and he will not remove the injunction of secrecy:

“Doctor Fowler,

Sir, As you have denied that you are the author of *Libertas*, I presume that you can have no objection to permitting the Editors of the Indiana Intelligencer to state whether you are or are not the author of that publication. If you are not the author you are uninterested in the event of the Editors’ statement, and be so good as to give them a written permission, by the hand of the bearer, to say aye or no. The Editors being poor & desirous, do be so much of a gentleman, as to remove the injunction so far as relates to yourself and no further.

Yours &c.

B. FERGUSON.

July 20, 1822.”

Under these circumstances against him, with what face can he now appear in print and deny that he is the author. It is with the same face he states, that he has not been *efficious* in *electrionering* against me, when in fact and in truth, he has been the most *undervening*, *malicious*, *abusive*, *bully* body, save poor old Kinning, that has made his appearance either in private or public. But the shafts of his malice have no sting; they are considered with as little concern as the brayings of an ass, or the ravings of a madman.

I shall leave this subject for the present, to notice poor Mr. Kinning, that good old man, “a stranger” among you, who is connected in secret with characters who would disown that connexion in public.

By way of introduction to the following certificate, I will remark, that I soon found that Kinning was contentious, disagreeable, and abusive; I never was very fond of having such clients and wished to get rid of him.

“I do certify that two years ago, in the month of July, and before Ferguson and Hawk had attended to Wm. Kinning’s business against Crawford, I heard B. Ferguson tell Kinning that he did not wish to have any thing to do with him or his business, as he was a troublesome and contentious being, and that he believed him to be as big a rascal as Crawford, and would release the fee if Kinning would discharge him and Hawk from being his attorneys—that Kinning pressed the business on him, and made this remark, that he liked Ferguson the better for being plain with him—July 22, 1822.

SAM’L. WALKER.

Test.

DAVID SMALLWOOD.”

Mr. Hawk and myself were in co-partnership, we were authorized to

the best we could in the business, by Kinning, and after paying ourselves, which was the sum of \$100 as agreed upon, to give him the balance. We secured Kinning the land on which he resides, and retained some personal property we got of Crawford to secure our fee. Kinning agreed that the property should be sold to the highest bidder, on the day of the election, two years ago, in order to raise the amount; but, he, afterwards, on that day, forsook the sale; the property was then left in our possession. The horse, or rather a mare, spoken of, has since died with the boar. The following certificates will shew my conduct since that period.

“I do certify that nearly two years ago, I heard Benj. Ferguson offer Mr. Kinning to give up the property obtained from Crawford, by Ferguson and Hawk, if Kinning would give a mortgage on his land, or security for the payment of the fee which Kinning was indebted to them, and wait twelve months to pay it in; but Kinning refused the offer. July 22, 1822.

DAVID SMALLWOOD.

Test, *Daniel Huckleberry.*”

“I do certify that I have repeatedly heard B. Ferguson offer to settle with Mr. Kinning by leaving the whole transaction to men. In one instance, Kinning agreed to settle in that way, and at another time I heard him refuse. Kinning is known to be both abusive and contentious in the neighborhood.

July 22, 1822.

JACOB STRUTT.

Test, *David Smallwood.*”

“I do certify that in a conversation with Wm. Kinning he informed me that he and B. Ferguson had agreed to settle their business by leaving the whole transaction to men. At another time he informed me he had concluded that he would not settle in that way. Kinning is considered in the neighborhood, a contentious and abusive man.

July 22, 1822.

EDWARD NOLAND.

Test, *David Smallwood.*”

My case is before the people, judge ye of it.

B. FERGUSON.

MESSRS. EDITORS.

In your last paper Mr. Thompson has attempted to answer, what he calls the attack of three able bodied men; but it is a poor one indeed. He attempts to ridicule the call made on him for explanation, and particularly answers the charges made, and the queries asked by Plutarch, in the following words:—“You have in addition to all this, tried to make the people believe, at least, eight additional falsehoods, as truths to my preudge, and if you will give the public your true names, I will pledge myself to make it appear; if you do not, I will take it for granted you admit I can do so.” This is the whole of his answer to Plutarch!

Six of the charges against him, for his conduct during the last session of the General Assembly have the proof along with them; the Journals are referred to, and the pages pointed out; plain written testimony!—“he that runs may read!”—yet Mr. Thompson unblushingly pronounces them falsehoods! This caps the climax!—Under such circumstances it is unnecessary to say more. Mr. Thompson shrinks from investigation, and refuses to answer, by saying he must know the name of the author. Would knowing it change facts to falsehoods? Any person who will take the trouble to examine the Journals will be at once convinced, that every thing before stated, relative to Mr. Thompson’s votes last session, is absolutely true and it is utterly incomprehensible to me, to ascertain on what principle Mr. T. pledges himself to make truths falsehoods, by simply learning the real name of

PLUTARCH.

TO THE EDITORS:

Gentlemen.—As Mr. Thompson seems to complain so pitifully of the attack made upon him through your paper, by “three unknown scribblers,” as he terms them, I for one, feel very little disposition to follow up the blow. The people have now the whole merits of the case as respects Mr. T’s *ad valorem* system of taxation, and they are the judges whether the charge of

inconsistency is not, by his own evidence, brought home to him in a way that clearly proves that his present explanation is altogether an *after thought*. Let Mr. Thompson and his friends wince and screw as they may—let them tug and torture as they please expressions that convey but one plain and obvious meaning; yet with all their ingenuity *truth* must remain.—Mr. Thompson admits himself in favor of an ‘ad valorem’ system of taxation, but denies that he is in favor of taxing *improvements*! Strange perversion of common sense! He however admits that an ‘ad valorem’ tax would indirectly include a tax upon *window lights*; and are not window lights a part of the improvement of every dwelling, from the cabin to the castle?—And when Mr. Thompson made this last expression, did he not mean to be understood to admit that every item of improvement, nails and window lights, as well as orchards, houses, &c. &c. were, indirectly, subjects of taxation by his ‘ad valorem’ system? “In what noose shall I hold this modern Proteus, who so often changes his countenance?”

I have now done with this political weather-cock, barely remarking, that his bullying threat of *cowardice* is altogether as futile as his insinuations are contemptible. I neither fear the power of his arm, nor the vigor of his pen, be he *present* or *absent*.

JUNIUS.

To the Citizens of Clark and Floyd Counties:

I subjoin the following certificates to explain the reason of my stating that Messrs. Gibson and Johnson did convey to me the idea that Mr. Samuel Hay treated to two kegs of whisky by way of electioneering:

JOHN H. THOMPSON.

“I certify that on the 12th inst. I did tell Mr. Thompson that there was two kegs of whisky drank at James Johnson’s where Samuel Hay had a trial, in Wood township, and that I understood it was candidate’s whisky, and that I did think, from the conduct of Mr. Hay, and his remarking that he was electioneering, that it was Mr. Hay’s whisky, and that I told Mr. Thompson so, believing I was perfectly justified in so doing.

Z. JOHNSON.”

“I have every reason to believe from the conversation I had with Mr. Thompson, connected with Mr. Johnson’s statement, in his certificate, Mr. Thompson had good reason to believe, the whiskey spoken of, by Mr. Johnson was Mr. Hay’s, though Mr. Thompson did not get the direct statement from me, as to its being Mr. Hay’s whiskey.

W. M. GIBSON.”

Repent of your sins and tell the truth!

“I certify that John H. Thompson never did sell my first or last or any other cow, as a scribbler calling himself one of the people would falsely represent. Mr. Thompson has a judgment against me which I voluntarily confessed, in which case I charge Mr. Thompson with nothing wrong. It is true I am a *revolutionary* soldier and the friend of Mr. Thompson, and can but think contemptibly of any man who would make use of my name for so base a purpose, as to unjustly injure any man in the manner. *One of the People* has aimed to do Mr. Thompson.

WILLIAM GOBEN,

X
his mark.”

PLUTARCH has taken some notice of the answer of “Libertas” to his newspaper attack on Mr. Thompson, but he only denies facts which I will not say as he does “can be proven,” but which the following certificates will prove. Mr. Ferguson denies telling any man that he was sorry for having sold his negroes, or that he is unfavorable to the practice of slavery, or that he has ever said if he had his negroes again, he would keep them; and tells the people that the reason he advertised for people to come to his window for letters, was the sickness of his wife, and has got a certificate slipping about privately, trying to make out that Mr. Thompson has stated a falsehood. This, however, I am informed will be explained to the satisfaction of the

people, to be a contemptible management in him, if so, it will coil on his devoted head. For truth of Mr. Ferguson’s statement, public will read the following certifies:

“I certify that I heard Mr. Ferguson, on the 20th inst. in the presence of a number of the citizens of Martin, or any other person, that he had his negroes again, he would keep them, which I believe, was remembered by most present.

B. V. TELL.

“I certify, that some time in the month of June last, in a conversation with Benjamin Ferguson, about selling his negroes, he stated to me, I was sorry for having done so, and if he had them again he would keep them.

JAMES MARTIN,
July 22d, 1822.”

“I certify, that in the conversation above alluded to in James Martin’s certificate, Mr. Ferguson did just the practice of holding slaves, and so there was no candidate but would do the same thing.

AARON M. JOHNSON.

“I certify that while Benjamin Ferguson was Postmaster, I went to inquire for a letter; Mrs. Ferguson was in the room and was going to ascertain, when Mr. Ferguson stepped in from an adjoining room and asked me my business. I told him, he then told me to step out to the window and he would look, I did so, but seeing there was no person in the room but Mr. Ferguson and his wife, and it being the first time in my life that I had, altho’ a poor man, been thus treated I bore it in my mind this was not in mail hours and Mr. Ferguson was, apparently, well. I am willing to swear to at any time.

PEYTON VAUGHN.

The following will show the falsehood of a report. Mr. Ferguson’s friends have artfully got on foot, to the prejudice of Mr. Thompson;

“Having understood that some malicious person, in order to subserve electioneering purposes, has circulated a report that, I should have stood in and seen John H. Thompson play cards or some other game. I here pronounce the dastardly author, and his action as false as he is base and contemptible.

DAVIS FLOYD.”

Gentlemen I think you had better have let Mr. Thompson alone. I will conciliate these things as you have done them out against the will of the authors, and oblige yours, &c.

ONE OF THE PEOPLE

As the paper was going to press, I observed a base attempt to injure me on the subject of slavery. I only had time to have the following certificate inserted:

B. FERGUSON.

“I do certify that some time in the last, I was present at a conversation between James Martin and B. Ferguson, in which Martin asked Ferguson about selling his negroes, and Ferguson replied that, he sold them in order to purchase the land on which he now resides. Martin inquired of him, if he had the again what would he do with them. Ferguson replied that he would do as he had done with them, with this remark, that he was in favor of living in this state, and was hostile to slavery; that he felt justified in selling the negroes; he did not say he was sorry; his remarks were the reverse. I was also present on Saturday last, when Messrs. Thompson and Ferguson were speaking of the subject, and Mr. Ferguson’s remarks then and with Mr. Martin were the same; I could discover no variation.—July 23, 1822.

GEORGE MCDONALD.

Defaulter.—The Village Record published at Chester (Penn.) states, that John Smith, late Marshal of Pennsylvania, had received more than \$70,000 in militia fines, in the course of seven years; all of which, he had pocketed, besides being a defaulter in *Sacred* and other account and all his fees into the bargain.

Correspondents will be so good as to leave their communications early on Saturday morning, if possible.