

should not throw stones. The gentlemen of the south have always manifested great sensibility and irritation, whenever their representation has been alluded to; particularly, if any political reasoner has been blunt and candid enough to speak of it as extravagant and overcharged; as being more numerous than on principles of justice and equality they were entitled to. But here is a congressman from the south, who boldly throws down the glove, and challenges the nation to redress the wrongs of his countrymen, or civil war will be the consequence. Two years ago the same gentleman was enlisted heart and soul, in an effort to change the constitution of the United States. He now declares the South to be represented in theory but not in fact. These bold and extravagant declarations, proceeding from a public official and stamped as it were with official authority, will be regarded as a sufficient justification for examining the correctness of Mr. McDuffie's assertion. And fellow citizens, what will be your feelings of indignation against this incendiary of the South, when you find that this man, who has thus thrown a fire brand into the sacred temple of our union, is a Representative of a State, which has at this very moment four representatives on the floor of Congress more than her white population would authorize? By the census of 1820, South Carolina had a slave population of 265,000 souls. The constitution of the United States contains a provision which this very state and her southern sisters insisted upon inserting in that instrument as an indispensable condition of their uniting in the federal compact, by which 66,666 slaves became and were politically equivalent to 40,000 free whites. And yet this man complains of not being represented! There are now, fellow citizens, on the floor of Congress, twenty-four representatives who are created and hold their seats entirely and exclusively in consequence of the live stock or black property held in these United States. Does it belong to these men, to charge us, who have conceded to them this extravagant privilege, with not allowing them their rights? After giving them a surplus weight in the councils of the nation equal to the whole of Pa. and greater than all the states north of the Ohio combined, is there any justice or decency in their complaints? Is it for them to threaten to tear down the constitution? And when fairly out voted, the 24 surplus representatives to the contrary notwithstanding, to threaten us with civil war?

What would this great Southern Patriot, this amender of the constitution, have us do, to accommodate his notions of actual representation? A representation of three-fifths of the slaves is merely "theoretical." He would of course have his negro property set on a level with white freemen, and allowed a full vote, man for man. If that should not be sufficient to enable him to out-vote the grain growing states, he will be reduced to the necessity of proposing another amendment to the constitution, by which the vote of the slaveholder in Congress shall count two, while that of a non-slaveholder counts only one!

But suppose the major part of the population of the South disapprove, as we trust in God they do, of the outrageous and treasonable language of Mr. McDuffie and the Colleton district; still the coolest and most moderate of them, with Mr. Crawford at their head, are publicly pledged to put down the tariff. They denounce it as unconstitutional; they proscribe it as unjust; they are resorting to every expedient to deter or drive us from a system of policy which we regard as vitally essential to our prosperity. Meetings are called in various parts of the country, resolutions are proposed and adopted with great unanimity, to withhold from us their trade, to lay prohibitory taxes on the mules, horses, hogs, and cattle of the west, and some of their flaming patriots are so charitable and courteous as to proclaim in their meetings, that "the hemp of Kentucky is better fitted to make cravats for Kentuckians, than covers for their cotton." Yet these are the men whom it is seriously proposed we should unite with heart and hand in making a President. These are the men who publicly proclaim that the election of General Jackson as President of the United States, would be the greatest blessing and benefaction they could desire or possess!

Yes, fellow-citizens, it becomes you to engrave deeply in your memories, that the sworn enemies of the Tariff and Internal Improvements, the Hamiltons, the McDuffies, Gilleses, of the South, are all leagued together in a general conspiracy to pull down the present administration, and to plant the standard of Jackson upon its ruins!

Such are the principles, and such the conduct of the leading politicians of the South. Let us leave them for a few moments, and take a glance at Tennessee. Let us enquire what are her feelings and wishes, and what have been her votes in relation to the tariff and internal improvements? Let us ask, what probability is afforded, what rational prospect is presented to us, if we unite with her in making a President, that these card-

inal interests of ours, will be fostered and protected?

We shewed you last January, by extracts from the Journals of Congress, that she had uniformly voted with the South against every tariff law that had for its object the encouragement of domestic manufactures; and that her votes against the woolens bill were unanimous. But one solitary vote of Gen. Jackson in favor of the tariff in 1824, is claimed by his friends as demonstration unanswerable, that he is, at least in principle, on our side of these mighty questions; and perhaps the desire of convincing Indiana, Ohio, and Kentucky, that Tennessee would go hand in hand with us in making a President, may have induced her to vote with us on the late tariff. Exactly the contrary; no such good news for us. Every vote from Tennessee in the House of Representatives was given against the late tariff. Whilst Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri, were unanimous for it, Tennessee was unanimous against it. Is not this, fellow citizens, a fresh demonstration of what we told you last January, that Tennessee, notwithstanding her geographical position, is in her feelings, her wishes, her habits, and her votes, in strict alliance with the South?

So far, then, as the prominent friends of one of the candidates for the Presidency have disclosed their feelings and views of policy, they are directly at war with your sense of your own interest. This single fact, fastened and riveted upon us by reiterated demonstration, is of itself sufficient to induce reasonable and prudent men to pause, and seriously enquire, whether they do not wantonly risk, their best interests by uniting with their open and avowed enemies in electing a chief magistrate?

Surely, fellow-citizens, it is unnecessary to inform you that mankind love their friends and hate their enemies. Of this prevailing trait in the human character, no man has afforded more convincing evidence than Gen. Jackson. Hence we entertain no doubt that if a large majority of the friends and supporters are anti-tariff and anti-improvement in their politics, such will be the character of his administration. What think you of the motives of the leading politicians of the South in supporting General Jackson? Personal attachment? men of sense in electing a president look beyond this consideration, which by the law of necessity is limited to a small circle of individuals. No; the Southern gentlemen care no more for Gen. Jackson personally, than they do for Mr. Adams.—They however regard the one as an instrument for promoting their personal aggrandizement or sectional policy, whilst from the other they have little to hope or expect on these heads. The men of the South act consistently with their views (erroneous we believe them) of their own interests. But what shall we say of the fool-hardiness of western men, who, with all the preceding facts staring them in the face, persist in supporting Gen. Jackson on the ground and expectation of his continuing the policy of the present administration. To call it giving up a certainty for an uncertainty, to say that it is throwing away the substance to grasp at the shadow, are but feeble and inadequate expressions of the stupidity and folly of such conduct.

In the preceding remarks, we have assumed the fact, or rather we have not disturbed the supposition, that Mr. Adams and Gen. Jackson were candidates for the Presidency, with equal pretensions on the score of merit, talents, and capacity, to administer the government. Whether this be a fact, or even a remote approximation to it, is for you fellow citizens, to judge; and we presume your minds, like ours, will be influenced by evidence.

When a man asks of his countrymen the high office of presiding over a nation of freemen, when he aspires to the loftiest station that man can occupy or men bestow, it is not only natural and proper, but it is the imperative duty of the constituents of this high office to examine with unsparring scrutiny his character and qualifications. The vessel of state, freighted with the destinies of millions of freemen, must not and cannot be committed to any other than a pilot of consummate skill, experience and integrity. To take a commander of such a vessel, on such a voyage upon trust, without a rigorous investigation of capacity and integrity, would indicate a degree of madness and folly for which we have no name.

Does the office of President of the United States call for talents of the highest order, for extensive political and diplomatic acquirements, for long experience in public affairs, for habits of industry, for coolness, patience, and equanimity, for a disciplined temper, for devoted patriotism, for unblemished morals? Which of the candidates answer this description? A brief history of their respective lives will enable us to judge.

Mr. Adams has been in the public service of his country for a period of thirty-five years. Selected at the early age of 27 by the Father of his country, who was pre-eminently distinguished for his judgment of men, he was appointed ambassador to Holland, and had the good

fortune to realize the high expectations, and to enjoy the entire confidence of Gen. Washington, who, in 1796, appointed him Minister to Lisbon. So strong was the interest which General Washington felt in retaining Mr. John Q. Adams in the service, that after his father, the elder Adams, had been elected to the Presidency, Gen. Washington addressed him a letter, expressing "a hope that no over delicacy on his part would operate to withhold from his son merited promotion," adding "that in his opinion he was the most valuable public man we then had abroad in the service of the country." He was afterwards appointed minister to Berlin. In 1802, he returned home, and in 1803, he was elected to the Senate of the United States, the duties of which station he discharged until the spring of 1808, when his constituents disapproving of the vote he had given in favor of the Embargo, he resigned his seat for the express purpose of giving them an opportunity to elect a successor who could represent their feelings without doing violence to his own sense of duty. In 1809 Mr. Madison appointed him minister to Russia, and in 1813 he was associated with Messrs. Gallatin and Bayard to negotiate a peace with Great Britain. He was afterwards appointed Minister to London, where he continued until 1817, when Mr. Monroe, with the approbation of Gen. Jackson, appointed him Secretary of State, the arduous duties of which office he discharged with unrivaled ability for eight years. For the last three years and a half, he has been our chief magistrate. In all these various employments, he has uniformly met and answered the high expectations of his country, and completely justified the confidence reposed in him five and thirty years ago by the Father of his Country. The first charge of official misconduct or neglect of duty is yet to be established against him. He is the avowed friend and patron of the American System. He has been tried and not found wanting.

Gen. Jackson is about the same age of Mr. Adams, and has been first and last pretty extensively engaged in public life. There is however this difference between them, that the employment in which Gen. Jackson has obtained any degree of reputation has been military and not civil. "He was, like Mr. Adams, bred to the profession of the law, a profession best calculated to improve the faculties, which civil employments require.—But the History of his public life in these employments, is told in a few lines on a single page of his Biography.—(See Eaton's life of Jackson) He filled successively for very short periods, the office of Member of the Tennessee State Convention, Representative and Senator in Congress, Judge of the Supreme Court in Tennessee, and Senator again in Congress. Here was ample opportunity for distinction, if he possessed the talent, taste, and application suited to civil eminence. But he resigned three of these stations, and passed through them all, acknowledging his unfitness in two instances, manifestly feeling it in all, and leaving no trace behind which stamps his qualifications above mediocrity."

But we beg pardon for seeming to hurry over the civil career of General Jackson.—We must retrace our steps. There was one vote given by the General while a representative in congress, which distinguishes him and ought to be remembered. General Washington was about retiring from the Presidency. He had composed and published his farewell address, a legacy rich in those principles and paternal counsels, on which depend the dearest interest of the country, indeed its very existence. The house of representatives, anxious to express their gratitude for his services, their veneration for his character, and respect for his administration, drew up an address, in which was the following clause: "may you long enjoy that liberty which is so dear to you, and to which your name will ever be dear; may your own virtues and a nation's prayers obtain the happiest sunshine for the decline of your days, and the choicest of future blessings. For our country's sake, for the sake of republican liberty, it is our earnest wish that your example may be the guide of your successors, and thus after being the ornament and safeguard to the present age, become the patrimony of our descendants." A motion to strike out this clause from the address was made and supported by Mr. Giles of Virginia, and Mr. Livingston of N. York, now of Louisiana, two devoted friends of General Jackson. The motion was lost by a large majority, eleven members only voted to strike it out. Among these we find inscribed the name of ANDREW JACKSON, who thus declared his disapprobation of the measures of Washington, and his wish that his example might not be followed by succeeding Presidents. Fellow-Citizens are you prepared to make this man successor of the immortal Washington.

[Concluded next week.]

In Richmond Va. flour on the 3d instant was quoted at \$5 80 a 6—corn at \$1 12 a 1 18, per bbl.

[COMMUNICATED.]
TO THE EDITORS.

GENTLEMEN—The presidential contest is drawing very nearly to a close, hence it is important that those who have been misguided, in relation to the candidates, be undeceived, that they may not conscientiously vote away their interests. I know from observation, that there are many, very many men in this section of our state, who have been misguided by designing partisans, in relation to the conduct of Gen. Jackson towards the unfortunate John Woods, who was executed at Fort Strother during the Seminole War. A spurious document is going the rounds purporting to be a "true statement of the case of John Woods."—It is but justice to say, that it is replete with falsehood from beginning to end. The object of its publishers was to represent Gen. Jackson in the character of a tyrant, by publishing to the world that Woods was a mere stripling of a boy, and that he was executed for a very trifling offence. It shall be my object to present the case of Woods in a correct point of view, and thereby show that Gen. Jackson should be exonerated from the false charge in the publication alluded to. My reliance for proof shall be upon official documents, and not upon the idle rumors of the druggies of a party.

I will here state the case of Woods correctly, and submit it to candor to say, whether injustice has not been done both to Gen. Jackson and the people. It was as follows:

Woods was a militia-man under the command of Gen. Jackson, at a time when our situation was precarious, and the army in a state of disorganization; and of course rigor on the part of the commanding officer was absolutely necessary to quell the mutinous movements of many of the soldiers. No other course than that pursued by Gen. Jackson, towards his army at that time, would have restored order and subordination. John Woods deserted, was arrested, brought back, tried by a court martial, and sentenced to be shot—for this first offence he was pardoned by Gen. Jackson. About four weeks after he was pardoned, he mutinied and committed sundry other disorderly acts, for which he was arrested, tried a second time, and again sentenced to death, and accordingly the sentence was carried into execution—as of right it should have been. In testimony of the above, I will subjoin the address of Gen. Jackson to the prisoner, just previous to the execution, and in presence of the whole army. "It may be found upon record in the War Department.

GENERAL ORDER.

JOHN WOODS:—You have been tried by a court martial, on the charges of disobedience of orders, disrespect to your commanding officer, and mutiny; and have been found guilty of all of them. The court which has found you guilty of these charges, has sentenced you to suffer death by shooting, and this sentence the Commanding General has thought proper, and even felt himself bound, to approve, and to order it to be executed.

The offences of which you have been found guilty, are such as cannot be permitted to pass unpunished in an army, but at the hazard of its ruin. This is the second time you have been guilty of offences, the punishment of which is death.

When you had been regularly mustered into the service of your country, and were marched to Head Quarters under the immediate command of brigadier General Roberts, you were one of those, who, in violation of your engagement—of all the principles of honor and of your Commanding General, rose in mutiny and deserted. You were arrested, & brought back; and notwithstanding the little claim you had to mercy, your General, unwilling to inflict the severity of the law, and influenced by the hope that you would atone, by your future good conduct, for your past errors, thought proper to grant you all a pardon. This ought to have produced a salutary impression on a mind not totally dead to every honorable sentiment, and not perversely and obstinately bent on spreading disorder and confusion in the army. It unfortunately produced no such impression on yours. But a few weeks after you had been brought back, you have been found guilty of offences not less criminal than those for which you had so recently been pardoned, and which, if the law had been rigidly enforced, would have subjected you to death. This evinces, but too manifestly, an incorrigible disposition of heart; a rebellious and obstinate temper of mind, which, as it cannot be rectified, ought not to be permitted to diffuse its influence amongst others.

An army cannot exist where order and subordination are wholly disregarded; it cannot exist with much credit to itself, or service to the country which employs it, but where they are observed with the most punctilious exactness.—This disobedience of orders and the contempt of officers speedily lead to a state of disorganization and ruin; and mutiny which includes the others, aims still more immediately at the dissolution of an army—of all these offences you have been twice guilty, and have once been pardoned. Your General must forget what he owes to the service he is engaged in, and to the country which employs him, if by pardoning you again, he should furnish an example to sanction measures which would bring ruin on the army he commands. This is an important crisis, in which, if we all act as becomes us, every thing is to be hoped for towards the accomplishment of the objects of our government, if otherwise, every thing is to be feared. How it becomes us to act, we all know, and what our punishment shall be, if we act otherwise, must be known also. The law which points out the one prescribes the

other. Between that law, and its offender, the commanding general ought not to be expected to interpose, and will not where there are no circumstances of alleviation. There appear to be none such in your case, and however as a man he may deplore your unhappy situation, he cannot, as an officer, without infringing his duty, arrest the sentence of the court martial.

ANDREW JACKSON Maj Gen.
Fort Strother 4th March, 1814

(Signed) JOEL PARRISH, Jr. Sec'y.

The reader must be satisfied that an attempt has been made to misguide the public in relation to Gen. Jackson's conduct towards the unfortunate Woods.

The following is given to show that the court which tried him was legally organized, and that Woods, as well as many other soldiers, was of opinion that the General dared not to have the sentence executed which had been pronounced upon him. Had the soldiers been confirmed in that belief, the army had as well been disbanded at once, which would have turned the savages loose upon the defenceless of all ages and sexes, bordering on our frontiers, who would have been compelled to suffer in proportion to the cruelty of savage warfare.

The execution of Woods completely eradicated that opinion, and was the means of restoring good order and strict subordination in the army, which was essentially necessary to its existence.

John Woods having been once pardoned for the crime of mutiny and desertion, was found guilty on the 11th March 1814, of the charges of disobedience of orders, disrespect of his commanding officer, and mutiny, by a court consisting of five officers, citizens of the same state and member of the same corps to which he belonged. These officers, as the record of the proceedings show, were

Capt. THOS. GRAY, President.
Capt. JOEL PARRISH,
Capt. NATHAN DAVIS, } Members of the
Lieut. WM. KING } Court.
Ensign MICHAEL HOLT,
WM. R. LEESS, Judge advocate.

It was proved by the testimony of his fellow soldiers, and by that of two officers that he had positively refused to obey an order from his adjutant in the most disrespectful and insubordinate language—that in resistance to an order to arrest him for his disobedience and disrespect, he had brought his gun to a shooting position and threatened to kill any man who attempted to take his gun or lay hands on him.

For this glaring fact see the testimony of Lieut. Burret, Ensign Holt, and private Westmoreland, in the proceedings of the court martial. It is known to every member, that in addition to the crimes of which Woods was convicted, his conduct and language in the presence of the court, were rude and abusive, and that such was his intemperate spirit, and so mutinous the temper of a large portion of the troops, that he and others openly declared, even if he should be found guilty, the General would not dare to execute the sentence. This spirit of defiance had taken encouragement and audacity from the lenity of General Jackson in former cases, and especially from his having pardoned Moore, who was convicted some time before, and was rescued from death at the instant it was to have been inflicted on him. It was unfortunate that this act of humanity was attributed to fear, and that the delusion of Woods and of others, should have provoked the severity of the law and absolutely interdicted a recommendation for mercy on the part of the court, or an interposition of authority on that of the General. The crime of the unhappy man was wantonly committed, foolishly aggravated and necessarily punished; for had he been pardoned, it is unquestionable that subordination would have been at once destroyed, and that the mutinous spirit which the General had been long contending with, would, from that moment, have prevailed.

The public are invited to read the above, and dispassionately weigh its contents, and I am satisfied that the great "buga-boo" in relation to the case of John Woods, will vanish as thin air.

CANDOR.

CAUTION TO THE PUBLIC.

THE public, and all mankind are hereby cautioned against taking an assignment or transfer, or for a mortgage given by me to Lewis C. Manson, on the west half of the south quarter, and east half of the North west quarter, of section No. 5, Town 5, Range two west, containing one hundred and forty six acres of land—and given to secure the payment of \$650—the said land having been sold to me by the said Lewis C. Manson, and having been grossly and fraudulently misrepresented to me, by him, at the time of purchase, so far from paying him or his assignee any part of the above mortgage money I shall commence suit against him to recover back the money I have already paid him the said Lewis C. Manson, and for damage for the fraud.

WILLIAM ENEY
21 October, 1838. 4—11F

Valuable Real Estate for Sale.

BY virtue of a decree of the Dearborn circuit Court will be sold under the direction of the subscriber, administrator of the estate of Jonathan Dayton, deceased, on the premises in the county of Dearborn, in the State of Indiana, on the 24th day of November next at eleven o'clock in the forenoon of that day, section number 16, and fractional sections number 14 & 15 in Township No. 4, range No. 1 west, containing about 1294 acres.

Terms and conditions of sale made known by application to George H. Dunn, attorney at law, at Lawrenceburg, or to the subscriber at Cincinnati.

O. M. SPENCER.
October 15, 1838. 41—18.

Blank Deeds, Mortgages, Summonses & Executions, for sale at this Office.