PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

Presidential Election.

THE following pieces, copied from the Richmond Enquirer, having been published at different periods of the year 1823, are now *imbodied* in the pamphlet form, and submitted to the calm consideration of the people.

To the Editors of the Enquirer of May 13th, 1823.

THE PRESIDENCY.

When the people of this Union were called upon to choose a chief magistrate under whom the new constitution was to go into operation, all eyes were instinctively turned to the man—"first in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen." At the end of the second constitutional term, WASHINGTON the great, voluntarily withdrew from power crowned with the blessings of America, and the admiration of the world.

He was succeeded by Mr. ADAMS. This *conscript father* had, in his youth, drunk deeply at the crystal fountains of Greece and Rome and familiarized his mind to the best models of antiquity. He had been the first, or among the very first, to sound the tocsin against British wrong and oppression, and directly contributed by his counsels and his pen to the disruption of the colonies from the paramount country. His elevation, therefore, to the executive chair, seemed but a just reward for the high talents and services he had given to the infant Republic. But before the end of one constitutional term evil counsels were found to prevail in the cabinet: and under the administration of the man

to whom we had been so greatly indebted for political independence we were well nigh losing our civil liberties for ever.

A change of administration was now loudly called for; and Mr. JEFFERSON assumed the helm amidst the lengthened plaudits of a nation of republicans.

The mind of this great man was very early imbued with *the spirit of the age*—which, in his turn, he has enlightened and advanced. At thirty four he gave us the immortal Declaration of Independence; and his intermediate services alone, at home and abroad, would have been sufficient to point him out to the gratitude of a virtuous and intelligent people. To him, therefore, it pre-eminently belonged to heal the wounds our free institutions had sustained, and to re-assure the suffering nations of the world of the great political truth, first demonstrated in America—*that* THE PEOPLE *are capable of self-government.*—At the end of his second term, he too, like *the father of his country,* gladly withdrew to the bosom of philosophical retirement.

MR. MADISON followed. This accomplished statesman had also long rendered himself a signal benefactor of the country that rewarded him with the highest distinction known among men—the chief magistracy of a free people. Our present happy form of national polity was mainly the work of his hands. It was he who nicely adjusted the parts, and first demonstrated the problem, that the sovereignty of individual states could be maintained under an efficient *general* or *federal* government—having the power of peace and war, and only terrible against internal or external aggression. Again: when in the crisis of '98—'99, the light of the revolution seemed almost extinct with our rulers, it was he who aroused the people by the masterly Report on the violations of the constitution, and thus powerfully aided in bringing back the government to *first principles,* in 1801. Finally, like Mr. Jefferson (when in the same department of state) he had often occasion to vindicate our country's rights against foreign insult and violence—an office, that both one and the other always performed with a spirit and an elo-

quence equally felt in Europe and America. These splendid diplomatic papers (which, under similar circumstances, have received a worthy addition from the pen of our present chief magistrate) constituted, of themselves strong claims to the gratitude of a Republic ever mindful of her interests and proud in the distinction of her sons.

Mr. Monroe derives his first claim to a nation's love from that great source of all the public virtues—the war of the revolution. His devotion to country and freedom was, in the mighty struggle, sealed with his blood; and we find his name in our subsequent history honourably connected with all the great measures which have consolidated our liberties and prosperity. But *this last of the revolutionary school*, is yet in the high trust to which he has been called by a unanimity almost peculiar to himself. I shall, therefore, leave the more particular enumeration of his probationary services to the period, when "descent from power, like death, shall have canonized his virtues."

From this rapid sketch it will be clearly perceived, that each of our presidents has been selected by the people, as much from the recollection of *past services*, as with a view to *the capacity of future usefulness;* and thus has the gratitude of the nation been rendered admirably harmonious with its own essential glory and interests.

But the eyes fixed by enlightened precedent (more powerful than laws written on tables) has again brought round to us, the question—Who shall next succeed in that line of illustrious worthies?—We are not—perhaps, fortunately for the country—without a concourse of candidates. Yet it would seem that all the *active* influence of Virginia, apparently, without much enquiry or reflection, has been engaged in the cause of William H. Crawford. Differing materially with that portion of my fellow-citizens, I shall examine with freedom, but without personal hostility, *his* pretensions to the high honour that is sought for him.

After the most diligent enquiry into Mr. Crawford's public history, the conviction has been forced upon me, that his acts

have been either *negative, doubtful* or *censurable.* If this conclusion be deemed harsh, and there is no doubt it will be so considered by his partisans, I beg that some one of them will take the trouble to show by *facts* wherein I have erred and to bring out the evidence of his *positive* merits. Both Mr. C. and the public may be benefitted by the discussion; for I am far from believing that I am, at present, in a minority on this subject.

The earliest record we have of Mr. C. represents him as offering homage to Mr. Adams in professions of *the most unlimited confidence* in his measures—at the very moment when the three last presidents, and the whole republican party, justly alarmed for the safety of our institutions, stood forth in open array against that administration. This fact was, at first, discredited by the friends of Mr. C. certainly with his connivance, if not at his suggestion. Further proof however was soon adduced, and *then* the charge was admitted and palliated:—Finally, it has been attempted to obliterate the recorded evidence, in the case, by the recollections of certain persons who testify that he was, about that time, a republican! Dr. Abbott represents him, in the following year *('99)* as "not simply a republican, opposed to the administration of Mr. Adams; but denominated by the supporters of that administration—a jacobin." This is not improbable. Extremes *(as in an unfinished circle)* are always found to approximate. He therefore who commenced his political career, *a flaming federalist.* might very well, in the lapse of a year, become *a violent jacobin.* Such a character has no polarity; but the people want a president who is, in politics, what it seems Mr. C. was *not* in '98 or '99—"simply a republican."

The next eight or nine years of his public life, appear to have been employed in all the turbulence of party contention aggravated by local and personal topics. Two of these wrangles terminated in duels, with the loss of a life. But having at length crushed his personal opponents, we find him, in 1807, a member of the U. States' Senate. From this period his history has been more under the observation of the Union. Let us see

what claims he has since established to a paramount place in the esteem and gratitude of his country.

In the Senate, Mr. Crawford voted to re-charter the old bank of the U. States (a measure which Virginia instructed *her* Senators to oppose) and took that occasion to intimate, that the individual states ought to be prohibited from incorporating banks—in order, I presume, to create an uncontrouled monied aristocracy in that mammoth institution. Mr. C. did not stop here. He attacked the instructions given to Messrs. Giles and Brent, and chose to display his filial piety to his *native* state, by attributing her opposition to the federal bank, not to *principle*, but *sordid interest*—Virginia, as he argued, holding a large portion of the stock in her own local institutions. As a *comment* on this statement [written from memory] will the Enquirer favour the public with an extract of the speech itself, together with Mr. Brent's indignant reply to the foul insinuation? We shall then, perhaps, more fully see the *point* of the anecdote lately given by a writer in the Enquirer (Pendleton) of the conversation between Mr. C. and (as is believed) a distinguished *Virginia* member of congress.

In the session of 1811—12, Mr. C. charged Mr. Madison with being guilty of *duplicity* in the message that recommended the second war of our independence; but when the declaration was sent up from the other house, Mr C. gave it no *active* support—although there was a strong party in the Senate (besides the federalists) who wished to substitute *letters of marque and reprisal.* This faction (in, and out of the Senate) consisted, principally, of Messrs. Gallatin, Giles, Smith, &c. &c. the particular friends of Mr. Crawford; and it is believed that he fully concurred with them in their preference of the paltry substitute: although he was finally compelled to vote for the war. It will, however, be remembered by those who served with him, at the time, that during the two war-sessions that he sat in the Senate (before his departure for France) he made neither speech nor proposition in *support* of that great measure;—on the contrary,

when the bill came up from the H. of R. for building a certain number of ships of war, Mr. C. spoke against the measure, and ridiculed the idea of engaging England on the ocean as the extreme of madness and folly. To the immortal glory of better counsels and the valor of our seamen, these predictions of a misgiving mind were early and completely falsified!

Mr. Crawford's mission to France is not marked by a single incident that can be treasured in the memory. He crossed the ocean and returned, and his correspondence during the interval was almost wholly limited to bills drawn for his pay.

As Secretary of War, I recollect but one measure or proposition of his, beyond the mere ordinary routine of the bureau—the recommendation of marriages between our white population and Indians on the frontiers, in lieu of the importation of foreigners!

Mr. Crawford has now been some seven years in the department of the Treasury. What scheme of finance has he devised in all that period? His annual Reports will scarcely be appealed to by his warmest partizans in answer to this question. These papers, though sometimes *explained* by one or more supplementary reports, have not always been intelligible; and when understood, have uniformly been ridiculed and decried, by every man in America at all acquainted with fiscal transactions. The Report of the last year is particularly remarkable for another character. After conjuring up an artificial deficit (of some millions and a quarter of dollars) for the year 1825, he very ingeniously recommends, under the pretence of *revenue*, a *permanent* increase of the Tariff to meet that *temporary* exigency—thereby expecting to conciliate the manufacturers, without alarming the other great interests of the community. This stratagem was well understood by more than one member of Congress, from Virginia, during the last session.

Under the head of Treasury operations, I shall not dwell particularly on the charge, made by the Governor of Georgia and others, of Mr. C's participation with the creek agent, Mitchell,

in the illicit introduction of slaves into the U. S., and his, Mr. C's, neglect to prosecute the said Mitchell on the report of the attorney general, as the Secretary of the Treasury was bound to do ;—nor on the unauthorized loans of nearly a million of dollars to different banks known to be insolvent or unsafe—whereby the Treasury has lost the money ;—nor on the *suppressed documents* making a part of the correspondence relative to those loans ;—nor on the employment of a U. S. Senator in an executive and lucrative service, against the spirit of the laws, and the independence of Congress: In these transactions Mr. Crawford has, doubtless, gained many partizans at the expense of the U. States ; but I shall conclude this *negative review*, by some other incontrovertible facts, highly illustrative of the character I have attempted to pourtray.

Some years ago the House of Representatives passed a resolution requiring the secretaries of the Treasury and War departments to report, severally, on the question of *internal improvements.* Mr. Calhoun promptly obeyed the call ; but Mr. Crawford knowing that the subject was one on which the public mind was much divided, and that he could not write on it without disclosing his own particular leaning, has not to this day obeyed the order of the people's representatives !

In the beginning of 1816, a plan was suddenly formed at Washington, on the part of the Burrites and Clintonians in Congress *(*from N. York*)* aided by other interested and factious members, to put down Mr. Monroe in the impending caucus. This scheme was greatly favoured by a caucus vote of the legislature of N. York—requesting the delegation of that state, at Washington, to support any candidate for the Presidency *not* a Virginian. The first difficulty was to find a person who would lend himself to the faction. Mr. Tompkins honestly refused his name, and Mr. Crawford had not been previously thought of for the presidency by a single individual in the Union. He was nevertheless, in the emergency, selected as the opponent of the *Virginian ;* and, as was foreseen, *state pride* brought over to

his support all, or the greater part, of the Georgians. A few weeks before the caucus, the plot was opened by Dr. Bibb who told the public (in a letter) that "Mr. Crawford did not consider himself among *those* from whom the selection ought to be made"—Mr. C. well knowing, that Mr. M. was the only republican candidate within the view of the people. This *modest* reply, therefore, rather intimated that there *ought* to be an opponent. Accordingly, on the following day, the Washington Gazette, the uniform organ of Mr. C. announced, that the editor was authorized to say, that, on application to Dr. Bibb, the latter declared there was nothing in his published letter to take Mr. C. out of the field of selection, and that, if nominated and elected, he would serve. No further public declaration was made by Mr. C. or any one in his name, either before or at the caucus; but the most vigorous exertions were continued in his behalf and under his eye; for he was present, at Washington, as secretary of war. At the nomination, no one appearing on the part of Mr. C. to withdraw his name, he received the whole support of the factious, amounting to fifty-four votes.—The pamphlet published by this minority is a most extraordinary document. Their support of Mr. C. is expressly stated to be—opposition to "the Virginia dynasty," and "the Virginia school of policy;" and the pamphlet abounds in the gravest charges against Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison, as well as against Mr. Monroe. On that occasion it seems that Mr. Crawford was willing to put himself at the head of that hostile feeling, and to deny his native state. It remains to be seen whether the people of Virginia will not, at the polls, in 1824, return the compliment by forgetting *him*.

I have thus endeavoured to trace Mr. Crawford through the gradations of his public life. If the offices which he has held be numerous, so have been his opportunities to record his virtues and services in the hearts of freemen. But we have seen nothing in his history to fire either our love or admiration. Shall he then be admitted to the Presidency *speciali gratia*—as drones

take learned degrees—merely because he has gone through the forms of personal attendance? This would be, indeed—to follow up the language borrowed from universities—to let him eat his way to the highest honour and at the nation's expense!

WYTHE.

FOR THE ENQUIRER.

MR. CRAWFORD.—No. I.

In the support that Mr. Crawford receives, there is an apparent mystery that well deserves the most serious attention of all candid men. It is known, that many of the states are directly opposed to many other states, in the views of policy which will influence them in the choice of a president; yet, it seems to be Mr. Crawford's singular good fortune, to be urged in each particular state on precisely the grounds the most popular therein. Thus, in the purely agricultural portions of the Union, the people are told, aside and apart, as it were, that he is for leaving labor, skill and capital to find their own employments—without legislative interference; while in the manufacturing districts, his partisans affirm in like manner, that they know him to be in favor of encreasing the tariff, with a view of fostering manufactures! Whence these contradictory impressions? I will not assert that both [or either] have been derived directly from Mr. Crawford; but, as his last annual report is the only public evidence we have of his views on the subject; and as that strongly favors the manufacturers, it behoves the agriculturists [if not their opponents, also] to discard all private assurances, and to demand a public declaration on this great question. Without such declaration one party or the other must be deceived, if Mr. C. be elected; for, in such a cause, if not with us, he is against us.

On the question of *internal improvements*, equal uncertainty, not to say, contradiction prevails respecting Mr. Crawford's

views. In N. York, N. Jersey, Ohio and Delaware, I understand, he is represented, by his confidential friends, as willing to sanction a system of roads and canals, to be executed under the direction of the general government; and we all know, that among us, the opposite opinion is orally propagated, with great industry, by his partisans. In 1818—19, Mr. C. had a direct opportunity of dispelling all doubt and contradiction under this head. The house of Representatives—

"*Resolved*, That the sec. of the treasury be *instructed* to prepare and report to this house at their next session, a plan for the application of such means as are within the power of Congress, to the purpose of opening and improving roads and making canals; together with a statement of the undertakings of that nature, which as objects of public improvement, may *require and deserve the aid of the government;* and also, a statement of the works of the nature above mentioned, which have been commenced; the progress which has been made in them; the means and prospect of their being completed; the public improvements carried on by the states or by companies or corporations which have been associated for such purposes, *to which it may be deemed expedient to subscribe or afford assistance;* the terms and conditions of such associations, and the state of their funds, and such information, as in the opinion of the Secretary shall be material in relation to the objects of this resolution."

A similar instruction was, at the same time, addressed to the secretary of war, and *complied with.* Mr. Crawford, however, chose to maintain, before the public, the mystery habitual to him, since he fixed his attention on the presidency; and accordingly, took no notice, whatever, of the positive command of the House of Representatives. In the mean time, strange as it may appear, this contempt of the house has been used as an argument in his favor both by friends and enemies of internal improvements—each side maintaining, that he merely concealed his opinions, the better to aid or defeat the scheme, should he be elected president!

Shall this Janus policy be allowed to succeed in a country, that, yet justly boasts of its political morality? Or is it safe for freemen in the choice of a chief magistrate, to rely on any thing short of public acts, or a public avowal of principles, on questions of this magnitude?

In the commercial districts, and other exposed parts of our extensive frontiers, maritime and inland, Mr. Crawford is said to be the staunch friend of fortifications, the army and the navy; whereas, in the few radical districts [in the interior] he is represented as the enemy of these establishments; and the votes in congress of his confidential friends, Messrs. Cobb, Gilmer, Cocke, Cannon, Williams, &c. are triumphantly cited, in proof of his radicalism. In this case, however, we have better evidence of his views, than the contradictory declarations of instructed friends—I allude to his sarcastic speech, in the senate, against Mr. Madison, on the bill for "fitting out all the frigates of the U. S." In opposing the bill, Mr. Crawford said:

"The president's message of the third instant, has been introduced by the chairman of the committee in support of this bill. Feeble must be the aid which this measure can derive from that source. This message in point of obscurity comes nearer my ideas of a Delphic oracle than any state paper that has come under my inspection. It is so cautiously expressed that every man puts what construction upon it he pleases. Is he for war? The message breathes nothing but destruction and bloodshed. Is he for peace? The message is merely milk and water and wholly pacific. Is he for the bill before you? The message calls for its passage. Is he a friend to a large standing army? Why then, the message means 20,000 regular troops. Is he a friend to the militia? The message does not call for regular troops—it means militia. Thus, sir, this message means any thing or nothing, at the will of the commentator. If this message is oracular in its meaning, it was no less miraculous in its promulgation. The newspapers to the east of this stated that such a message would be delivered, and stated its contents, nearly one week before it reached the two houses of Congress. To account for this phenomenon is neither within my power nor province."

The gentleman from Virginia has reiterated the old maxim—that, "to be prepared for war, is the best method of preserving peace," and has declared that, he should vote for this bill upon that principle. This maxim has the authority of great names. It may be true, to a particular extent. If these preparations are of such a nature as to make the nation invulnerable, it is

true." [Mr. Crawford, then, is opposed to all preparation, that may fall short of *absolute* security! Did he ever read of a nation, that had attained it? And must not all preparations have *a beginning?*] "But, Sir, when the preparations amount to the equipment of five frigates, and the nation, against whom these preparations are made, can launch a thousand vessels of war against us, who can seriously urge this maxim as a justification of the measure? And in another place he says:—

"But admitting there is danger of war with England, of what service will these few additional frigates be, against the thousand ships of war which that nation can put in commission? The honourable chairman of the committee says, they will answer the two-fold purpose of defending our harbours and of annoying the enemy. To this, it may be answered that, if they are kept in our ports for their defence, they cannot annoy the trade of the enemy. If they are sent out to prey upon the enemy, but few, if any of them will ever return to *defend our ports.*"

The reader will not fail to perceive in these extracts, the same spirit of sarcasm, that led Mr. Canning to contrast our "few fir-built frigates, with a bit of striped bunting at the mast head" with the *invincible* oaken castles of England. How unlucky, that Hull, Decatur, Bainbridge, Jones, Stewart, Biddle, Warrington, Blakely, &c. &c. should have rendered the predictions of those two *great* statesmen, of the two hemispheres, equally false and ridiculous!

Mr. Crawford, having, as we have seen, handled Mr. Madison very cavalierly; next, by way of showing his superiority over all of our greatest men, censures Mr. Jefferson, with as little ceremony. Some one had said, in the debate, that the navy had been reduced by Mr. J. Mr. Crawford replied, with vehemence:

"The Navy, which was created by a federal administration, was by that administration, reduced to what they called a peace establishment. In this situation it was found by the late [Mr. Jefferson's] administration; who, so far from running into the extreme, stopped short in the salutary work of reform. * * * * * * * The new administration [Mr. J's.] cautiously guarding against the charge of innovation, stopped short of their duty. They ought to have amputated this fungus of the body politic, and restored it to a sound and healthy state. This was not done, and the nation has consequently, spent about twelve millions upon it."

Let us not, again be told, that Mr. Crawford is the friend of the Navy;—and we may perceive, in this last extract, whence his friends in Congress, before named, derive their *amputating* sys-

tem in respect to all our means of national defence—navy, army, military academy and fortifications. Among politicians of that *size*, all these institutions are, in the language of their leader, but so many *fungi of the body politic, which ought to be amputated;* but, such were not the doctrines of those first rate statesmen, Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison and Mr. Monroe, in whose wake we delight to follow.

But this speech deserves to be considered, under other points of view. Among republicans, Mr. Crawford is gratuiously supposed to have been an early, warm, and steady advocate for an efficient redress, by war or restriction, of the wrongs received from G. Britain, between the years 1806 and 1812.—Yet, it is believed, that this was his "single speech" on the causes of the war; and on enquiry, I am confident it will be found, he did not, once rise in the senate in support of that last resort of a suffering and insulted people—although, coerced by the ardour of his constituents, he ultimately recorded his vote in favour of the war. Previous to this, he had, *with the federalists in a body*, voted against the embargo, the favourite substitute of Mr. Jefferson; but, *after* its repeal, he proclaimed its efficiency, and gave it a preference over actual hostilities. Through the whole of this trying period, it would appear, that he was governed by the principle—that submission was better than any substitute for war, and any substitute better than actual war.—The following quotations from the speech under review will justify this conclusion.

"Mr. Crawford said, before he entered on the discussion of the bill, he felt it his duty to declare, that in the observations, he had made upon the motion for postponement, he had not the most distant intention of intimating, that the gentleman from Virginia" [Mr. Giles] "wished to involve the nation in a war, that he [Mr. G.] did not believe to be necessary for the preservation of the honour or the interests of the country.

"Mr. C said, that he had, by his *own* reflections" [no doubt hurt that he had not been consulted by Mr Madison] "been led to conjecture, that this additional naval force was intended to protect our commerce, in time of peace, or to prepare the nation for a declaration of war, which we intended to issue, or expect to be issued against us, by one or both of the great belligerent nations. The observations of the gentleman from Virginia had confirmed him, that his conjectures were well founded." Mr. C. next spoke of the

expense of the proposed measure; the futility of a navy, even "if the U. S. were to expend one hundred millions of dollars, in vessels of war, and expend one fourth of that sum, annually" upon it;—then glancing at our foreign relations, he proceeded thus:—

Mr. Crawford said, he was not convinced but, that it was fortunate for the nation, that we did not [declare war, in March 1809] altho' he thought and felt differently, upon the repeal of the embargo. He was opposed to its repeal, but for war when it was repealed. What, sir, is our situation now, when compared with March, 1809? The embargo, although vilified and abandoned here, proved efficacious.—The arrangement of the 19th of April last was the offspring of the embargo. The abandonment of the embargo produced the disavowal of that arrangement The order of the 26th April, 1809, is still in force, and although it falls very short of the arrangement made at this place [by Erskine] yet it abandons the two most important and obnoxious principles of the orders of the 11th November 1807.—The transit duty is given up, and the blockade of commercial Europe is restrained to Holland, France, and the kingdom of Italy. By this modification our trade to all the rest of the world is unmolested by British orders in council. If the comparison between our present situation and that of March last can be fairly drawn, there can be no difficulty in deciding, that as we did not then declare war, we shall not do it, now."

Here it is worthy of remark, that Mr. Crawford, on the subject of national redress, was always *behind* or *before*, the president and the republican members of congress. When they proposed an embargo, he voted against it; but after they abandoned it, he became an advocate of the measure. He was opposed to the war in the beginning of 1810 and then, for the first time, informs us, that he was in favor of that resort, the preceding March! What he says of the golden commerce left to us, under the British order in council of the 26th April, 1809, is in exact accordance with the arguments of the federalists of that day, on the same subject. Yet in another part of the speech, Mr. Crawford contradicts himself and shows by the facts he cites, that we ought, at that moment, to have declared war, even if it had been solely to vindicate our commercial rights. He is enquiring whether a declaration will come from the other side of the Atlantic, and this is his language:—

"Has G. Britain any interest to subserve by war with the U. S.? Is the commerce of this country beneficial to her? She enjoys all of it which she

wishes. She gets, by purchase or capture all which she wants from us. For the first she pays a moderate price, and for the last she pays nothing. But what is of equal importance to her, we purchase her manufactures. In the enjoyment of all the benefits of our commerce, she restrains her adversary from all participation with her in those benefits."

The last extract I shall make from this celebrated speech contains his principal argument against a declaration of war on our part, and is as follows:

"But, waiving all the arguments against our declaring war which may be drawn from our past conduct; Mr. C. said, he would ask this honourable body, whether the present situation of the world does not most solemnly admonish this nation to stand aloof, from the dreadful convulsions with which Europe, for years past, had been agitated to its centre? Yes, sir, the character of the war, and the principles upon which it is conducted, admonish us, in the most solemn manner, to remain quiet until its stormy billows shall have subsided into a calm"

What does Mr. Crawford mean by waiting till the "stormy billows" had subsided? Were we, under illegal blockades, the capture of our commerce, the impressment of our seamen, the diplomatic insults of Jackson and the murder of Pierce in our waters—and after offering to England every opportunity of abandoning and atoning for these accumulated wrongs—were we still to groan under them, till England could finish the war in Europe and stand prepared to wield her undivided force against us? Americans! this was the *magnanimous* course recommended to us, by Mr. Crawford, in common with all the federal orators and writers of that day. Happily for the justice, the honour and the glory of the Republic, the advice was rejected. At length we struck the haughty aggressors, and the blow has resounded through the universe.

But, perhaps it will be said, that the state of Europe (so solemnly deprecated by Mr. C.) was, at the date of his speech, so far as it bore on our relations with England, more unfavorable to us, than in March, 1809, and in June, 1812—at the first of which periods he *pretends* he was in favour of war, and at the second, actually coerced to vote for the declaration. But, the very reverse was the fact. In March, 1809, it was known, in

the U. States, that a fifth coalition had been formed between England and Austria, which terminated in the battle of Wagram, in July, and the disgraceful English expedition against Walcheren, in September :—and in June, 1812, it was known, that another coalition had been formed between England and Russia :—whereas, in the beginning of 1810, when Mr. Crawford was so much opposed to a redress of our wrongs, either by preparation, or actual hostilities, the European war was confined, solely to the Peninsula, where England maintained her doubtful equality in the contest. On these points, then, Mr. Crawford stands convicted of a want of patriotism, or a want of judgment. Let his partisans determine the matter between them.

In my next number I shall attempt an analysis of Mr. C's other celebrated speech, on the Bank of the U. States.

ROANOKE.

For the Enquirer of August 15th, 1823.

MR. CRAWFORD—No. 2.

It is not a little remarkable—considering the greatness of Mr. Crawford's pretensions, in contrast with the paucity of his public acts, and his extraordinary care, of late, to remain *dark* on all national questions; that the only speeches of his, extant, which possess the least character, or which can serve to elucidate his real principles, appear to be almost wholly unknown to the great constituent body of the U. States. In Virginia, at least, it is a rare circumstance to meet with an individual, who has read either of those productions. How is this singular fact to be accounted for? The Enquirer was the only paper that circulated generally among us in 1810 and 1811, and I cannot find that the Enquirer ever republished the two speeches. Its editor, it is to be presumed, was, at that trying period, too much occupied in embodying public sentiment in *favour* of the war,

and *against* the renewal of the old U. S. Bank, to notice the *opposite* efforts of Mr. senator Crawford; although the latter, in the second speech, as we shall see, travelled out of the debate to animadvert on, what he calls "the scurrilous abuse," the "jargon" and "the rantings of our democratic editors, in these large states"—evidently alluding to (among others) the editor of the Enquirer.

Having despatched Mr. Crawford's speech against the navy and the war, which may be called, with justice—a speech, against Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison—I shall now review his *remaining* great effort in the national legislature: for, in 1807, he appears to have contented himself with giving a *silent* vote against the embargo, though opposed, on that great measure, to Mr. Jefferson and every republican in the two houses of congress.

It will be remembered, that the old Bank of the U. S. was wholly independent of the government; and that its capital was principally in the hands of our political opponents and of foreigners. The *present* institution, of the same name, though in its creation equally obnoxious to constitutional objections, is, on the other hand, highly national in its character. The president of the U. S. and the senate annually appoint one fifth of the whole number of directors; the nation holds a large portion of the capital, and the remainder is widely distributed among individual citizens. Not so, with the old bank—for the renewal of which, Mr. C., as a member of the committee to whom the subject had been referred, came forward in the beginning of 1811.

Mr. Crawford prefaced his analysis of the constitution, in reference to the question in debate, with this extraordinary declaration—in which a miserable *plagiarism* is lost in the shock, produced by the *sentiment*.

"It has become so extremely fashionable to eulogise this constitution, whether the object of the eulogist is the extension or contraction of the powers of the government, that, whenever its eulogium is pronounced I

feel an involuntary apprehension of mischief. [!]******* This analysis may excite unpleasant sensations; it may assail honest prejudices [&c.] ***. In the present case, if there be any, who, under the conviction, that the constitution is perfect, are disposed to give it a construction, that will render it wholly imbecile [i. e. *hostile* to the bank] the public welfare requires, that the veil should be rent, and that its imperfections should be disclosed to the public view."

The rule of construction maintained by Mr. Madison, Judge Roane, and others, is next cited and combatted:

"But, it is said, that the enumeration of certain powers excludes all other powers not enumerated This is true, so far as original substantive grants of power are concerned; but it is not true when applied to express grants of power, which are strictly incidental to some original and substantive grant of power."

Mr. C. having (to quote the words of Milton) *through this palpable obscure, found out his uncouth way*, lights, again on high federal ground:

"When we come to examine the 4th art., the absurdity of this rule of construction, and, also of the idea of perfection attributed to the constitution, will be equally manifest."

The orator, in search of authority to sanction his vote, enlarges, much, on the doctrine of *implication*. Having found, that, under the clause vesting the judicial power "in one supreme court, and such inferior courts" as might be established, congress had actually created a supreme court; and that under the powers "to regulate commerce" and "to collect imposts," light houses had been, actually erected and supported—although the constitution had not said in so many words—congress *shall* establish a supreme court, and *shall* erect and support light houses—Mr. C. imagines, that he has discovered a defect in the constitution, and in the practice under it, through which, he may let in the bank, and, also, I doubt not, re-enact the alien and sedition laws—measures, which once claimed his "most unlimited confidence." He forgets, that constitutionally, as

(1) When Scotchmen smile, "I feel an involuntary emotion to guard myself against mischief"—*Junius to Lord Mansfield.*

well as logically speaking, there can be no "*inferior* courts," without the co-existence of a *superior* or "*supreme* court;" and, that light houses are "necessary and proper"—in short, indispensable to commerce. The implication, then, in these cases is not founded on convenience or vague notions of utility, but is direct and unavoidable.

Mr. C., by the means stated, having obtained his "power," let us see how he adapts it to the bill under debate:

"The right to erect light houses is exercised, because the commerce of the nation, or the collection of duties, is greatly facilitated by that means; and, Sir, the right to create a bank is exercised, because the collection of your revenue and the safe keeping, and easy and speedy transmission of your public money is not simply facilitated, but because these important objects are more perfectly secured by the erection of a bank, than they can be, by any other means in the power of human imagination to devise. We say, therefore, in the words of the constitution, that a bank is necessary and proper to enable the government to carry into complete effect the right to lay and collect taxes, imposts, duties, and excises. We do not say, that the existence of the government absolutely depends upon the operations of a bank, but that a national bank enables the government to manage its fiscal concerns more advantageously, than it could by any other means."

The admission in the last clause of the last sentence, quoted, brings the argument back to the point—that a bank is *a mere facility* to the fiscal operations of the nation—*a great convenience* to the treasury department; but, as a mean, incidental to some expressly delegated power, under the constitution, *such* recommendations do not satisfy the construction, uniformly put on the words "necessary and proper," by the great republican statesmen and constitutional lawyers, whose opinions are authority among us. Mr. Crawford, however, also cites authority in favour of the bank. He tells us that—

"The secretary of the treasury [Mr. Gallatin,] has informed [the Senate] that he conceives it necessary to the legitimate exercise of the powers vested in the government. I know, sir, that the testimony of this officer will not be very highly estimated by several honorable members of this body. I am aware, that this opinion has subjected him, and the committee, also to the most invidious aspersions: but, sir, the situation of that officer, independent of his immense talents, enable him to form a more correct opinion

than any other man in the nation, of the degree of necessity, which exists, at the present time, for a national bank to enable the government to manage its fiscal operations."

It will be recollected, that this is the same Mr. Gallatin, who escaped from the treasury and the country soon after the commencement of the war, without having devised the fiscal ways and means of prosecuting that measure. I hear, that he has recently returned to the U. States; and as he was understood to have concurred with his friend, on the war question, also, it is presumed the ex-secretary of the treasury, *with his immense talents*, knows better *than any other man in the nation*, that, the present incumbent (next to myself) is the *necessary and proper* person to succeed to the presidency.

"If, however, it is still believed, that the law, by which this bank has been created was the result of a forced construction of the constitution, yet I must contend that, that construction is entitled to some weight in the discussion of the question. ********. This law passed in the best days of this republic. At that time, the idea of party, as now understood, was wholly unknown The parties, which then existed were, literally federal and anti-federal. Those who were friendly to the federal constitution, and those who were inimical to it, formed the only parties, then known, in this nation."

Now, in looking over the ayes and noes, in the H. of R. in 1791, on this bank question, I find the names of the following distinguished republicans, who voted against the bill in all its stages. Abram Baldwin, and James Jackson of Geo.: Thomas T. Tucker and Edanus Burke of S. C.; John Baptiste Ashe and Hugh Williamson, of N. C. and of Virginia—Wm. B. Giles, Andrew Moore, Josiah Parker and James Madison—the illustrious pensman of the constitution, who, with the minority of twenty conspicuous republicans are represented by Mr. Crawford, as constituting *a party inimical to the constitution!* It has been said, that Mr. C. passed from his political childhood—("men are but children, of a large-growth")—into the republican school of Abram Baldwin and James Jackson; but, it would appear, from the speech before us, that even *their* patronage and example were insufficient to disabuse him of the

principles he had previously taught, (at the age of 33,) in his Augusta address.

But this speech so thoroughly abounds in political heresies, that it is impossible duly to notice them, unless its whole contents were extracted. This, an essay writer cannot do. He is obliged, (in the language of Addison) to "practice the chemical method, and give the virtue of a full draught in a few drops." I shall, therefore, briefly notice some of the more prominent points, not yet touched, and leave it to the friends of the orator, if they deem it prudent, to republish the speech entire.

Mr. Crawford's views of sovereignty.

"The entire sovereignty of this nation is vested in the state-governments and in the federal government—except that part of it which is retained, by the people, which is solely the right of electing their public functionaries."

This is a pretty direct denial of another right of the people, set forth, in the declaration of independence—the right "to alter or abolish" the *government itself*, and to institute *new* government." The extract supposes the great mass of political sovereignty to be in the *servants* of the people, and only a small *residuum* or *complement* to be with the *masters*, the people themselves! Again, having, as he conceives, shown, that the local banks owe their existence to the "*usurped authority*" of the states, and that their notes are "bills of credit," Mr. Crawford fixes upon us this syllogism :—

"The right to create a corporation is a right, inherent in every sovereignty; the people of the United States cannot exercise this right. If, then, the states are restrained from creating a bank, with authority to emit bills of credit, it appears to be established, that the federal government does possess the *right!!*"

His hostility to state rights; right of instruction, &c.

"What kind of resistance can they [the states] make, that is constitutional? I know of but one kind; and that is by elections. The people and the states have a right to change the members of the national legislature, and in that way, and in that alone, can they effect a change of the measures of this government."

Virginia, according to this doctrine, was guilty of usurpa-

tion, in passing her celebrated resolutions, in '98, and no less criminal, in adopting the masterly report of Mr. Madison, the following year! These measures appear to be still more pointedly alluded to in the following extract; Mr. C. is deprecating the idea of depositing the U. States' money in state banks:

"Is it desirable to increase the influence of these great states, which is, already too great, at the expense of the U. States? Does not the history of these *great states* admonish us, in the most impressive terms, to beware of placing this government in a state of dependence upon them? Sir, the time has been, and will certainly arrive again, when some one of *these great states* will be found in a state of hostility to the general government." Again. "What are the circumstances under which we are called upon to reject this bill? The great influential states, induced, by motives of avarice and ambition, interpose the weight of their authority; attempt to put a veto upon your right to pass such laws as are necessary and proper for the general welfare, through the instrumentality of instructions, by depriving not only their senators and representatives of a sound and honest discretion, but also, by intimidating others, by the weight of their influence and authority." And in another place.—"Had these great states, who have undertaken, by their instructions to influence the decision of this question, by congress, contented themselves with this right to establish banks, I should not, upon this occasion, enter into an investigation of that right. But *these great states*, not content with the exercise of an usurped authority, are by usurpation, attempting to legislate for Congress. And, sir, what is the inducement, with *these great states* to put down the bank of the U. S.? Their avarice, combined with their love of domination. They have erected banks, in many of which they hold stock to a considerable amount, and they wish to compel the U. States to use their banks as places of deposit for their public money, by which they expect to increase their dividends And in the banks, in which they hold no stock, many of the individual members of their legislatures are stockholders, and, no doubt were influenced to give instructions by motives of sheer avarice. The love of power, no doubt, had some influence in producing these instructions. Every person who is not wholly ignorant of the history of this government knows something of the influence of *these great states* upon the councils of the nation."

These great states, so often referred to, with emphasis, by Mr. C., and which had instructed their senators, &c. were Virginia, (and it is believed) New York and Pennsylvania. All further comment would be superfluous!

His contempt of democratic papers, &c. &c.

"I have heard and seen, in the public prints [said Mr. Crawford] a great deal of unintelligible jargon, about the incidentality of a law, to the power

delegated and intended to be executed by it; and of its relation to the end, which is to be accomplished by its exercise, which I acknowledge I do not clearly and distinctly comprehend, and must, therefore be excused from answering" * * * * The Democratic papers in *these great states* [Virginia, &c. &c.] have, for more than twelve months past, teemed with the most scurrilous abuse, against every member of congress, who has dared to utter a syllable in favour of the renewal of the bank charter. * * * * Sir, I had, always thought, that a corporation was an artificial body, existing in contemplation of law; but, if we are to believe the rantings of our Democratic editors in these great states, and the denunciations of our public declaimers, it exists under the form of every foul and hateful beast and bird and creeping thing. It is a *Hydra*, it is a *Cerberus;* it is a *Gorgon*, it is a *Vulture;* it is a Viper. Yes, sir; in their imaginations, it not only assumes every hideous and frightful form, but it possesses every deleterious and destructive quality. Shall we, sir, suffer our imaginations to be alarmed and our judgments to be influenced, by such miserable stuff? Shall we tamely act under the lash of this tyranny of the press?"

Now, I put it to the present senior (formerly *sole*) Editor of the Enquirer—Whether Mr. Crawford has not, in the preceding extracts, caricatured and "vilified" many of the leading articles in the Enquirer of that period—some of them editorial, and others communicated by several of the first pens among us? I appeal to all Virginians to say, whether the speech is not an outrage on the states, and in direct hostility to the principles, consecrated in the Declaration of Independence and the Report of '99? In fine, can Mr. Crawford, with any decent respect to his own public acts and declarations—in 1798, 1807, 1810 and 1811—be, at this day considered a republican?

ROANOKE.

For the Enquirer of November 21st, 1823.

JOHN C. CALHOUN—No. 1.

We hate some persons because we do not know them, and we will not know them because we hate them.—LACON.

Now I do not mean to say that the feeling entertained for Mr. Calhoun in Virginia by his particular opponents—amounts to *hatred;* or that he is not *known* and admired by many of our distinguished citizens; but I will assert that very unjustifiable means have been resorted to among us to excite a distrust of his political views, and to depreciate his great talents and services. For these purposes an erratic statesman—sometimes distinguished by the effulgence, and sometimes by the "disastrous twilight" of his genius, very early led the way by denouncing him in a public address, as "the army candidate," and the partisans of Mr. Crawford lose no opportunity to scatter the suspicion, that his plans of administration would be too splendid for a republic! By these and similar misrepresentations it cannot be denied, that many honest and even intelligent citizens among us, have conceived a dislike to Mr. Calhoun almost wholly unknown to the other states—a dislike which perhaps, it would now be impossible for any power of evidence or eloquence to overcome. Leaving then his opponents in the quiet possession of their prejudices, I beg leave to address myself to the unbiassed mass of our population—with whom the admiration of genius combined with virtue and illustrated by splendid public services, is yet and I trust will ever remain, a distinguishing characteristic.

John C. Calhoun was born in January 1782, in Pendleton, South Carolina—of Pennsylvania parents; and found himself, in point of fortune, in that state of happy mediocrity which has ever proved itself the most favourable to moral and intellectual excellence. Being, by his worthy father, designed for the bar,

he was early initiated in classical literature under a "celebrated scholar," in whose school several other conspicuous public men were educated about the same period. In that school *politics* were frequently discussed—as every where else in those days of party heat (between '97 and 1802); and I confidently appeal to the contemporaries of J. C. C. whether he did not there invariably support republican principles and republican men against youth, age, and authority?—He was now transferred to Yale College, Connecticut. Here again he soon became distinguished for classical attainments and a certain manly eloquence, that has since been so often displayed in the service of his country. A professor of Yale, having, at the end of a lecture on government or political philosophy, declared that it was yet doubtful whether a limited monarchy might not be more conducive to the happiness of these states than a republic, the suggestion called forth all the zeal and ability of J. C. C. in opposition; and so struck was the professor with this and other exhibitions of youthful powers, on the part of the Carolinian, that he more than once predicted, he would rise to the highest eminence in the country. For the truth of these facts, I have heard a member of Congress cite with confidence the names of several of Mr. Calhoun's classmates now high in office.

Perhaps these references to the *politics* of schools and colleges may call down upon me the censures of the same morbid sensibility that was lately excited against an essayest in the Enquirer, for a similar allusion. I beg leave, therefore, to ustify the liberty I have taken.

We are told by Anacharsis, that "all who have reflected on the art of governing men, acknowledge, that it is on institutions for the education of youth that depends the fate of empires;" and he lays down the principle—*that education; political institutions and manners ought to be in strict harmony with each other.* The immortal Plutarch, who had been the preceptor of Trajan, thus writes to the pupil on his elevation to empire—"Should your future government prove

in any degree answerable to your former merit, I shall have reason to congratulate both your virtue and my own good fortune on this great event—But, if otherwise, you have exposed yourself to danger and me to obloquy. The faults of the scholar will be imputed to the master.—Seneca was reproached and his fame still suffers for the vices of Nero: the reputation of Quintilian is hurt by the ill conduct of his scholars; and even Socrates is accused of negligence in the education of Alcibiades." In our times, the slight indications of magnanimity displayed in the earlier government of the Russian Autocrat have been attributed to his preceptor, the philosopher La Harpe, and to our own Wythe has been yielded the honor of forming Mr. Jefferson's principles on the republican models of Greece and Rome. If then *praise* be due to a preceptor for imparting *right* principles in government; would it not be a reciprocal duty *to censure him for attempting to teach what is not in harmony with our institutions?* The proposition seems too clear for disputation.

From Yale, Mr. Calhoun entered himself a student of the law-school of Judge Reeves at Litchfield, Connecticut. During his residence here, an incident occurred that may be appealed to as another proof of his early and decided republicanism. Seleck Osborne (the first native poet living) was, at that time, the editor of a democratic paper published at Litchfield. Having rendered himself by his politics highly obnoxious to the federal rulers of *the land of steady habits*, he was prosecuted and imprisoned for a libel on the state government. The law-student J C. C. warmly interested himself in behalf of Osborne, and by his writings, speeches, and other exertions, was in no little danger of sharing the fate of the persecuted editor. This occurred about the fifth year of Mr. Jefferson's administration, who, soon after, gave Osborne a captaincy in the army.

After an absence of five or six years, J. C. C. now returned to his native state, and entered on the practice of the law with

the success usual to all his endeavours. But the national excitement against England daily increasing, with her increasing arrogance and injustice, he was readily prevailed upon to become a member of the state legislature. Indeed, he seems, from the first, to have studied the law more as a subordinate branch of the science of government, than with a view to a long professional practice. Having by his legislative services at Columbia, laid the foundation of a popularity throughout the state, as permanent as that in his own immediate neighborhood, we next find Mr. Calhoun on a theatre suited to his great talents and information—a member of the Congress that declared war against Great Britain.

Preceded by the fame he had already acquired, his appearance in the national legislature was hailed as the most important acquisition to the republican ranks. Mr. Speaker Clay, without regard to *seniority* in years or services, placed him at once, the *second* member of the committee (foreign relations, at the time emphatically the first in the house; and of which committee he soon became the chairman. In this leading position none but a statesman of the first order could have sustained himself. During a parliamentary contest of more than four years; and against a weight and style of opposition unknown to the Congress of the revolution, Mr. Calhoun by his reports and speeches; by his genius, eloquence, firmness and patriotism, made himself the Jefferson and the Lee of *the second war of our independence*, and like those primitive patriots triumphed in the glory of his country. That this is not an extravagant encomium, I appeal to the feelings of the period, and *to documents*. The Enquirer of the 24th December 1811 thus speaks—

"We present this day the speeches of Messrs. Randolph and Calhoun, the "counterfeit presentment" of two orators, but it is "Hyperion to a Satyr." The one amuses us by excursiveness; the other delights us by the condensation of his ideas. The one is an edition of Clinton "run mad;" the other resembles one of the old sages of the old Congress, with the graces of youth. Mr. Randolph has surpassed himself in his own line of

acting: the snarling and petulant critic, who raves and bites, at every thing around him; oblique in his positions; extravagant in his facts; floundering and blundering in his conclusions. Mr. Calhoun is clear and precise in his reasoning; marching up directly to the object of his attack, and felling down the errors of his opponent with the club of Hercules: not eloquent in his tropes and figures; but, like Fox, in the moral elevation of his sentiments; free from personality; yet full of those fine touches of indignation, which are the severest cut to a man of feeling. His speech, like a fine drawing, abounds in those lights and shades, which set off each other; the cause of his country is robed in light; while her opponents are wrapped in darkness. It were a contracted wish that Mr. Calhoun were a Virginian; though after the quota which she has furnished, with opposition talents, such a wish might be forgiven us. Yet we beg leave to participate, as Americans and friends of our country, in the honours of South Carolina. We hail this young Carolinian, as one of the master spirits, who stamp their name upon the age in which they live."

About the same time we find the following notice copied into the Enquirer.

"The Hon. John C. Calhoun (says the correspondent of the Hartford Mercury) a representative from South Carolina, the gentleman second named on the committee of Foreign relations, graduated at Yale College, in this state, in the year 1804. In his high character as a scholar, his decided republicanism, and the Herculean vigour of his understanding, American liberty cannot fail to find a most powerful support."

The speech so justly characterized and applauded by the Enquirer, and which called forth a general burst of admiration, was Mr. Calhoun's first essay in Congress,—at an age less than thirty. No one then thought him *too young* to take the lead in defence of our rights. *That* objection has been *twelve years reserved*—to the period, when the country is no longer labouring under the pressure of external and internal difficulties, and when, from the lapse of time, the obligations of public gratitude are supposed to be relaxed or forgotten. But to return to the *occasion* of the speech.

The committee of Foreign Relations had reported in favour of immediate preparation for war, with the avowed object of an early declaration of hostilities. Mr. Randolph, the leader of what was termed the British party in the house, opposed the measures recommended by the committee; took a wide view of

our foreign relations, and deprecated war as unjust to England and calamitous to ourselves. To Mr. Calhoun was assigned the duty of replying to Mr. Randolph, and from the masterly style in which the task was executed—not to speak, in this place, of subsequent victories obtained over the same individual, on the same great questions, we may perceive whence the feeling that dictated the denunciation of Mr. C. by the odious appellation of "the army candidate."

One remark more on the editorial article copied from the Enquirer. Virginia has already become an object of jealousy to her sister states, from the fact—that of the *nine* presidential terms since the adoption of the federal constitution, *eight* have been given to Virginians. If then we find Mr. Calhoun eminently worthy of that high office, ought we now to regret that he was not *born* among us? or rather should we not have the magnanimity, in the words of the Enquirer "to participate, as Americans and friends of our country, in the honors of South Carolina?"

Among the energetic measures proposed in the session of 1811, 12, for placing the nation in an attitude of defence, was a bill—to fit up, and put in commission, all the vessels of the navy, and *to build a certain number of frigates.* The latter provision received the ardent support of Mr. Calhoun, but was finally lost. On this occasion he had the honour to find himself in a minority with those sagacious republicans—Messrs. Bassett, Cheves, Dawson, Hawes, Lowndes, H. Nelson, Pleasants, Newton, Troup, &c. &c. Let it be here observed, that this vote was taken *before* the declaration of war, and of course, *before* the navy had fought itself into favour with politicians of less wisdom and foresight. The following session—after the capture of the Guerriere, Macedonian, &c. four ships of the line, and six additional frigates were ordered by a large majority in each house of Congress, but even then, *Mr. Crawford* was not entirely cured of that hostility which led him, on a former occasion, to rebuke Mr. Jefferson, *for not having am-*

putated the navy as a fungus on the body politic—for he voted to strike the ships of the line from the bill!

We next find Mr. Calhoun (6th March 1812) supporting an embargo for 90 days as *a measure preparatory to war.* Here again it was his lot to reply to Mr. Randolph. Mr. Calhoun said, in the course of his speech—

"We will not, I hope, wait the expiration of the embargo to take our stand against England—that stand which the best interests and the honour of this nation have so loudly demanded. In his zeal against the embargo, the gentleman from Virginia says, it was engendered between the committee of foreign relations and the executive. Engendered! The gentleman must be sensible of the impropriety of such language—applied to the executive, or a committee of this house. No, sir, it was not engendered, but adopted by both the executive and committee, from its manifest propriety as a prelude to war. There is no man in his reason and uninfluenced by party feelings, but must acknowledge that a declaration of war on our part, ought almost invariably to be preceded by an embargo. One might suppose from the language of the gentleman from Virginia, that he was much in the secrets of the government. He says the plan now is, to disband the army, and carry on a predatory war on the ocean. I can assure him if such be the *plan*, I am wholly ignorant of it; and that should it be proposed, it would not meet with my approbation. I am decisively of opinion that the best interests of the country will be consulted, by calling out the whole force of the community to protect its rights. Should this course fail, the next will be to submit to our enemy with as good a grace as possible. Let us not provoke, where we cannot resist. The mongrel state, half war, half peace, is more to be deprecated. The gentleman from Virginia has told us much of the signs of the times. I did hope, that the age of superstition was past. Sir, if we must examine the auspices; if we must inspect the entrails of the times, I would pronounce the omens good. It is from moral —not brute or physical omens, that we ought to judge: and what more favourable could we desire than that the nation is at last roused from its lethargy, and stands prepared to vindicate its interest and honor? On the contrary, a nation so sunk in avarice and so corrupted by faction, as to be insensible to the greatest injuries, and lost to its independence, would be a sight more portentous than comets, earthquakes, eclipses, or the whole catalogue of omens which we have heard the gentleman from Virginia enumerate. I assert and gentlemen *know* it—if we submit to the pretensions of England, now openly avowed, the independence of this nation is lost—we shall be, as to our commerce, at least *re-colonized.* This is the second struggle for our liberty; and if we do but justice to ourselves, it will be no less glorious and successful than the first. Let us but exert ourselves, and we

must meet with the prospering smile of Heaven. Sir, I assert it with confidence, a war just and necessary in its origin; wisely and vigorously carried on, and honourably terminated, would establish the union and prosperity of our country for centuries."

This speech may be regarded as a history, before the fact, of the mighty struggle in which we were about to embark. The youthful orator who "resembled one of the old sages of the old Congress" looked through the storm and gloom of war to the clear sunshine of glory which burst on his country at the conclusion. May the last letter of his prediction be equally accomplished!

In a previous reply to Mr. Randolph, Mr. Calhoun had said—

"The gentleman from Virginia has not failed to touch on the calamities of war; that fruitful source of declamation—by which, pity becomes the advocate of cowardice; but I know not what we have to do with the subject. If the gentleman desires to repress the gallant ardor of our countrymen by such topics, let me inform him, that true courage regards only the *cause;* and if confident, that that is just and necessary, despises the pain and danger of war. If he really wishes to promote the cause of humanity, let his eloquence be addressed to Lord Wellesley and Mr. Percival, and not to the American Congress. Tell *them,* that if they persist in such daring insult and injury to a neutral nation, that however inclined to peace, it will be bound in honour and interest to resist; and that our patience and benevolence, however great, will be exhausted; that the calamities of war will ensue, and that the British government in the opinion of wounded humanity will be answerable for all its devastations and misery. Let melting pity, a regard to the interests of humanity, stay the hand of injustice; and my life on it, the gentleman will not find it difficult to call off his country from the bloody scenes of war. We are next told of the dangers of war! I believe we are all willing to acknowledge its hazards and accidents; but I cannot think we have any extraordinary danger to contend with—at least, so much as to warrant an acquiescence in the injuries we have received. The balance of power has also been introduced as an argument for submission. England is said to be a barrier against the military despotism in France. There is, Sir, one great error in our legislation. We are ready enough to protect the interests of the European states; and it would seem, from this argument, to watch over those of a foreign nation, while we grossly neglect our own immediate concerns. This argument of the balance of power, is well calculated for the British parliament; but not at all for the American Congress to entertain. Tell the Britons that they

are combatting with a mighty power in Europe, and that, if they will persis to insult and injure the American people, we shall be compelled to throw our whole force into the scale of their adversary. Let the gentleman from Virginia pourtray the danger to them, and if they will desist from injury, I will answer for it, that we shall not disturb the balance of power. But it is preposterous to talk of the balance of power, while they, by their conduct, deride our simple, good-natured, pacific and forbearing policy. If however, in the contest, it should be found, that they underrate our strength, which I hope and believe events will demonstrate, and we can, in fact, influence the balance of power, then it will not be difficult for us to obtain such terms as our rights demand."

Let these speeches, conceived in the spirit of wounded patriotism, and as remarkable for wisdom as eloquence, be compared with Mr. Crawford's *maturer* effort in the Senate, some little time before. We shall then again behold the "counterfeit presentiment" of two orators—"Hyperion to a Satyr." The questions discussed by them were essentially the same—*injuries* received from England, and *preparation* for redress.

Mr. Crawford in 1810, thus exhorted the Senate to further orbearance and submission—

"But waving all the arguments against our declaring war which may be drawn from our past conduct; he would ask this honorable body, whether the present situation of the world does not most solemnly admonish this nation to stand aloof from the dreadful convulsions with which Europe, for years past, had been agitated to its centre? Yes, Sir, the character of the war, and the principles upon which it is conducted, admonish us, in the most solemn manner, to remain quiet until its stormy billows shall have subsided into a calm."

And such also was the language held by the principal federalists in 1812. Mr. Sheffey in opposing the war measures, almost quoted the words of Mr. Crawford—"It becomes us, Mr. Speaker (said Mr. S.) to remain in our present situation; to let the present state of the world pass away. Until the great waters subside: until the antient landmarks re-appear, and the flood shall have gone. Desert not, I pray you, this your ark of safety. Embark not, sir, on the tempestuous ocean whilst its billows are running mountain high. If you do, I fear

you will sink to the bottom."—Does not the reader perceive—that to rescue the nation from such sentiments, and to take it out of the degradation to which it had been sunk by the eleventh Congress—*a master spirit was wanting to stamp his name on the age?* The twelfth Congress met, and behold the man!

Throughout the memorable session of '11 '12, we find Mr. Calhoun actively employed in giving tone to the house, and in prosecuting measures of preparation and of war. The army bills were reported by the committee on foreign relations—many of them drawn with his own hand. Among others, I find, by the journal of the house, there was one for creating a *commissariat* (in lieu of the *contract* system) for subsisting militia, volunteers and regulars. This however, was not then adopted: (it has since been introduced on his recommendation as Secretary at War). Had a commissariat been established at the commencement of hostilities; and if the opinions of experienced officers can be relied upon—millions of money—and what was of greater importance, thousands of valuable lives, lost by the frauds and failures of contractors, would have been saved to the nation. But the conclusions of some minds, even in Congress, as we have seen illustrated, on the vote to increase the navy, will always be found to lag slowly behind the intelligence and experience of the age.

At length the important moment arrived when we were again to take a stand among the independent nations of the earth—by throwing off the shackles with which our antient enemy had sought to bind and crush us.

"Mr. Calhoun, from the committee of foreign relations, to whom was referred the message of the first instant, made a report—Stating at large, the causes of war with Great Britain;" and immediately after "on leave given, presented a bill declaring war between Great Britain and her dependencies, and the United States and their territories."

The REPORT drawn by Mr. Calhoun, is conceived in a spirit and expressed in an eloquence which unquestionably renders it, the *second* document in the annals of our independence; and

when the personal jealousies of the present day shall have given place to the generous effusions of patriotic feeling, the declaration of our wrongs and rights of 1812, accompanied by an appeal to ARMS, cannot fail to be placed with one consent *next* to the immortal ACT which first called us into national being. The illustrious Jefferson having attained an age beyond the usual lot of man, but *now* enjoys the felicity of beholding his first great work stamped with the universal approbation of his countrymen. Shall public gratitude be always equally slow in expressing itself? I ask not for John C. Calhoun the honours of Jefferson, full of years and full of glory; but I ask for him that support from the republicans of the union, that was accorded to his illustrious prototype in 1796 and 1800.—It is to be regretted that the report of 1812, has not been more frequently reprinted. I shall close this number with its concluding paragraph—

"Your committee believe, that the freeborn sons of America are worthy to enjoy the liberty which their fathers purchased, at the price of much blood and treasure; and seeing in the measures adopted by Great Britain, a course commenced and persisted in which might lead to a loss of national character and independence, feel no hesitation in advising *resistance by force*—in which the Americans of the present day will prove to the enemy and the world, that we have not only inherited that liberty which our fathers gave us; but also the will and power to maintain it. Relying on the patriotism of the nation; and confidently trusting that the Lord of Hosts will go with us to battle in a righteous cause, and crown our efforts with success—Your committee recommend an immediate appeal to ARMS."

THOMSON.

For the Enquirer of November 25, 1823.

JOHN C. CALHOUN—No. 2.

The only things in which we can be said to have any property, are our actions. These are the title deeds *of which we cannot be disinherited.* LACON.

In offering to my fellow-citizens a view of the political acts and sentiments of Mr. Calhoun, I have chosen to introduce, in the way of quotation, the living statesman speaking in his own person; and where, in a few instances, that was not practicable, it will be seen that my statements are supported by other direct proofs, or by references to persons able, and (many of them) willing enough to contradict me—if they may do so with impunity. There can be no deception practised on the public by this method. The opposite course presented all the advantages of ease and simplicity of execution. A writer, unincumbered with proofs and illustrations, has only to draw on his imagination. He may throw himself out in a torrent of words; deck his favourite with every shining attribute of the hero and the statesman; the orator and negociator;* and by the boldness, multiplicity and I may add, *rapidity of his assertions*—distance every attempt at refutation. This species of *jockeying*, so far as my observations extend, has been practised by the supporters of only one of the presidential candidates, and certainly by none with greater license than the author of the "Four Letters;"—although the Enquirer in recommending these productions to its readers, as "*the best which the presidential election has called forth*" has rather strangely (if the uninitiated may be permitted to judge) added—"*always excepting the Political Horse Race!*"

Leaving for the present the treasury-fed steed in the hands of "his grooms and riders," I return to the main proposition I have undertaken to establish —that Mr. Calhoun by his reports and speeches rendered himself in the second War of our Independence, what our Jefferson and Lee had been in the first.

---

* *Witness the author of the "Four Letters" who, in reference to Jackson, Calhoun, Clay and Adams, unblushingly demands, in favor of Mr. Crawford—"which of their places is it that he could not fill? And which of them could fill his place? Which of them can shew an evidence of talents that he is not instantly able and ready to match?"*—Risum teneatis amici?

My last number left him in the act of presenting to Congress the declaration of hostilities. Notwithstanding the large majority by which the measure was carried, it was soon discovered that many members who had voted in the affirmative, began to waver in their purposes, and to show a disposition rather to rely on the *old peace measures* for redress than the *ultima ratio* of injured nations. On a motion to repeal the non-importation act, Mr. Calhoun came forward to rally the House and distinctly proclaimed—that since the sword of war had been drawn, *there was no safety but in throwing away the scabbard.*—This speech which reviewed the policy of the whole restrictive system cannot be read by an American, even at this late period, without feelings of the liveliest interest—I shall make several extracts from it.

"*The restrictive system,* as a mode of *resistance* or as a means of obtaining *redress* (said Mr. C.) has never been a favorite one with me. I wish not to censure the motives which dictated it, or attribute weakness to those who first resorted to it for a restoration of our rights. Though I do not think the embargo (of 1807) was a wise measure, yet I am far from thinking it was a pusillanimous one. But, sir, I object to the restrictive system—because it does not suit the genius of the people, or that of your government, or the geographical character of our country. We are a people essentially active. I may say we are pre-eminently so. No passive system can suit such a people—in action, superior to all others; in patient endurance, inferior to many. Nor does it suit the genius of our government. Our government is founded on freedom, and hates coercion. To make the restrictive system effectual, requires the most arbitrary laws. England with the severest penal statutes has not been able to exclude prohibited articles; and Napoleon, with all his power and vigilance, was obliged to resort to the most barbarous laws to enforce his continental system. Burning has furnished him the most effectual remedy. Besides, there are other strong objections to the system. It renders government odious. The farmer enquires why he gets no more for his produce; and he is told it is owing to the embargo or to commercial restrictions. In this he sees only the hand of his own government—not the acts of violence and injustice which the system is intended to counteract. His censures fall on the government. To its measures he attributes the cause of his embarrassment, and in their removal expects relief. This is an unhappy state of the public mind; and even, I might say, in a government resting essentially on public opinion—a dangerous one. In war, it is different. The privation, it is true, may be equal or greater; but the public mind, under the strong impulses of that state of things, becomes steeled against sufferings. The difference is almost infinite between the passive and active state of the mind. Tie down a hero, and he feels the puncture of a pin;—throw him into battle and he is almost insensible to vital gashes. So in war. Impelled alternately by hope and fear; stimulated with revenge—depressed with shame, or elevated by victory—the people become invincible. No

privation can shake their fortitude—no calamity break their spirit. Even when equally successful—the contrast between the two systems is striking. War and restriction may leave the country equally exhausted; but the latter not only leaves you poor, but even, when successful—dispirited, divided, discontented—with diminished patriotism, and the morals of a considerable portion of your people corrupted. Not so in war. In that state the common danger unites all—strengthens the bonds of society and feeds the flame of patriotism. The national character mounts to energy. In exchange for the expenses and privations of war, you obtain military and naval skill, and a more perfect organization of such parts of your administration as are connected with the science of national defence.—Sir, are these advantages to be counted as trifles in the present state of the world? Can they be measured by a monied valuation?—But it may be asked, why not unite war and restriction; and thus call our whole energies into action? It is true, there is nothing impossible in such a union; but it is equally true, what is gained to the latter, is lost to the former; and sir, the reverse is also true—that what is lost to restriction is gained to the war. My objections to restrictions without war, equaly hold against them in conjunction with it. Sir, I would prefer a single victory over the enemy by sea or land, to all the good we shall ever derive from the continuation of the non-importation act. I know not that a victory would produce an equal pressure on the enemy; but I am certain of what is of greater consequence—it would be accompanied with more salutary effects on ourselves.

"The memory of Saratoga, Princeton, and Eutaw is immortal. It is there you will find the country's boast and pride; the inexhaustible source of great and heroic sentiments. But what will history say of restriction? What examples worthy of imitation will it furnish posterity? What pride—what pleasure, will our children find in the events of such times? Let me not be considered romantic. This nation ought to be taught to rely on its own courage, its fortitude, its skill and virtue for protection. These are the only safe guards in the hour of danger. Man was endued with these great qualities for his defence. There is nothing about him that indicates that he is to conquer by endurance. He is not encrusted in a shell, he is not taught to rely on his insensibility—his passive suffering for defence. No, sir; it is on the invincible mind—on a magnanimous nature that he ought to rely. Here is the superiority of our kind; it is these that render man the lord of the world. It is the destiny of his condition that nations rise above nations, as they are endued in a greater degree with these brilliant qualities.

"Sir (continued Mr. Calhoun) it is often repeated, that if the non-importation act be continued, we shall have a speedy peace. I believe it not. It will debilitate the springs of war. It is for this reason, in part, that I wish it repealed. It is the fountain of fallacious expectations. I have frequently heard, sir, with no small mortification—from some of those who have sup-

ported the war—that it is only by restriction that we can seriously affect our enemy. Why then have we declared war? Is it to be considered but an *appendage* to the non-importation act? If so, I disclaim it. It is an alarming idea to be in a state of war, and not to rely on our courage and energy, but on a measure of peace. If the non-importation act be our chief reliance, it will soon direct our councils. Let us strike away this false hope—let us call out the resources of the nation for its protection. England will soon find that seven millions of freemen, with every material of war in abundance, are not to be despised with impunity. I would be full of hope, if I saw our sole reliance on the vigor of the war; but if we are to paralize it; if we are to trust in the moment of danger, to the operation of a system of peace, I greatly fear. If such is to be our course, I see not that we have bettered our condition. We have had a peace like a war: in the name of Heaven, let us not have the only thing that is worse—a war like a peace."

Let us contrast this patriotic and statesman-like speech with the sentiments and conduct of Mr Crawford on the same great questions.

In 1803 Congress resolved—that under the injuries the U. States had sustained, there were left to us but three alternatives: "War, embargo or submission." We have seen (in the preceding number) Mr. Crawford's pathetic appeal to the fears of the senate, in 1810, against war; and it may be added that the then state of Europe, within itself, was more favorable to redress against England than in 1812—and further, that *our* relations with England were essentially the same at the two periods. If therefore, Mr Crawford had been consistent with himself, he would have opposed the war in 1812, as in 1810—or he would have supported that alternative on both occasions But he spoke against both *preparation* and *war*, in 1810; and in 1807, he recorded his vote *with* every federalist, and *against* every republican, in the Senate, in opposion to Mr. Jefferson's embargo. It would therefore, conclusively appear, that Mr. Crawford, down to a very late period, at least, was in favor of "submission"—the remaining alternative according to the solemn declaration of Congress!

But the National Intelligencer which makes and unmakes principles to suit the rising, not the setting sun of the political firmament—in a reply to Mr. Niles (Sept. 6th) defends this embargo vote of Mr. Crawford. It tells us, that although "the embargo was (in 1807) considered the *only* alternative to war," and that the Intelligencer then "proclaimed the measure as one which, in (its) opinion, could no longer in fact be delayed without *sacrificing the vital interests of the nation;*"—yet this same Intelligencer, being, in 1823, well content to abandon all pretensions to political foresight, in compliment to that of Mr Crawford, says;—"It (the embargo) was repealed from the conviction of its *inefficacy* by the very persons who enacted it": and further; the Intelligencer "now maintains, that those republicans (meaning Mr. Crawford) who had the *sagacity* to foresee this result, and firmness

enough to resist their inclination to go with the multitude were, at least, as good republicans as those who had no opinion of their own and obeyed implicitly the executive recommendation!" Let the reader mark the contempt here cast by this political *sun-flower* on the implicit *followers* of Mr. Jefferson: it shall be my business to despatch the compliment paid to the *rising* candidate.

As late as 1810, in the speech so often quoted or referred to, Mr. Crawford on the subject of the embargo expressly stated, that "*he was* (in 1809) *opposed to its repeal,*" and asserts, that "the embargo, vilified and abandoned, here *proved efficacious!*" He is convicted, therefore, by his admission, of a want of sagacity in 1807, in voting against the measure; and according to the new *phasis* of the Intelligencer, he wanted sagacity in opposing its repeal in 1809 —Recur now to the views of John C. Calhoun. We find them at once luminous, energetic and consistent. He preferred *war* to *restriction—embargo* only to *submission.*

The limits I find it necessary to observe, will not permit me to give even *extracts* from all the interesting speeches of Mr. Calhoun at this period. I shall pass to that on the Loan Bill, March, 1814.

This was the most gloomy moment in our history since the revolutionary war. The opposition, greatly strengthened in number and in talent, rallied all its forces against the loan. The debate had already been protracted more than two weeks. The causes and the conduct of the war, were brought under review;—vehemently censured and condemned. By the cowardice of a Hull, and the no less fatal imbecility of superannuated generals, the favorable moment had been lost for the conquest of Canada. The new men, destined to roll back upon the enemy defeat and dismay, were yet struggling for notice and command. Our naval heroes, it is true, had put lake and ocean in a blaze with their glory, and caused our mountains and vallies to ring with their fame. These however were but brilliant flashes, across the dark political sky. News had just arrived, that the Allies had entered France, in triumph; that the pacification of Europe would immediately follow, and that England would soon be ready to fall upon us with all her mighty means disengaged from a twenty year's war. This was precisely the time to which, Mr. Crawford and others, had wished to postpone the redress of our wrongs. In the old world "the stormy billows" of war were fast "subsiding into a calm." But now the patriot felt that that *calm* constituted the principal difficulty in our position.* A desperate faction seized

* Mr. Crawford was happily absent from America at this crisis By his *most solemn admonitions*, in part, *war* and even preparation had been defeated, in 1810. But for this, we should not, in 1814, have stood single-handed against England. He contributed as much as any man in our councils, to bring upon the country its increased difficulties; but others were left to breast the storm.

upon the *auspicious* moment to defeat the Loan Bill, and thereby to compel the government to accept any terms, that the enemy (grown doubly arrogant by success) might grant us as a boon. The war was thus essentially transferred to the House of Representatives; and if we had been beaten there, the cataract of Niagara had wanted the moral sublime conferred by our victories amidst its thunders, and the 8th of January the immortal association of Jackson's deeds and name. But there were *master spirits—invincible minds*, both in Congress and in the field to uphold the mighty cause of Freedom against every hazard, and to conquer at her command.

Among the foremost, in his place, John C. Calhoun stood the confessed champion of the war. In a speech of more than four hours, without losing an auditor, he traced British injustice through all its dates and ramifications; refuted the arguments of the opposition leaders; threw back upon them their taunts and aspersions, and ended by inspiring the majority with a renewed confidence in the justice, valor and resources of their country. I have room only for a few extracts from this great parliamentary effort.

"It is now (said Mr. C.) more than two weeks since the commencement of this debate, most of which time has been consumed by the opposition in attempting to prove the bad faith, poverty, folly and injustice of our government and country.—To defeat the passage of this Bill or to prevent its successful operation *out* of this House, are (with our opponents) the declared objects of their policy. It is true that all have not made the latter declaration; but not one has disavowed it.—Is the war unjust and inexpedient? This is the question I now propose to discuss. The earnestness and zeal with which our opponents endeavor to prove this point, seem to me not altogether consistent with sound principles, or due love of country. In their zeal they often presume that we are wrong, and our enemy right, and that on us rests the burthen to show that these charges are false, even before they have attempted to prove them to be true! How contrary this to the maxims of Roman wisdom! That wise and virtuous people so far from presuming their country to be in the wrong, held it a crime in a citizen to doubt the justice of the public cause. In a state of war how worthy this of our imitation. The maxim lay at the root of Roman greatness. Without it, a free state will ever lose much of its peculiar and native strength—the spontaneous and concurring zeal of its citizens."

On the subject of *impressment*—having dwelt on the amount and enormity of the evil, "the liberty of the citizens being paramount to all other considerations; Mr Calhoun concluded his remarks, on this cause of war, as follows—

"We are told that our seamen ask no protection, and that it is strange that those who are remote and least interested should discover so much anxiety for them. As to the first part of this argument, I deny its truth. The sailors have claimed our protection. They have importuned and invo-

ked their country for it.—We have had their applications laid before this House in the form of a document. They constituted a large volume. Considering the cold indifference with which we heard their prayers, I wonder that they did not cease to consider us as their guardians. But we who stand forth to discharge this sacred duty, are charged with being *backwoodsmen*, who never saw a ship till covened here in our legislative capacities. Admit the fact, and what then? such generous sympathy with those who stand connected with us only by the ties of citizenship, does honor to our country. I hope it is not strange. Nay it is usual. Our history abounds with instances of this sympathy of the whole with every part. When it ceases to be natural, we shall cease to be a nation.—It constitutes our real union. The rest is but form. The wonder is, in fact, on the other side. Since it cannot be denied that American citizens are held in foreign bondage, how strange, that those who boast to be their neighbors and relations, should be dead to all sympathy, or should want the manly spirit to make a generous effort for their relief! The venerable gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Pickering) and another gentleman high in the ranks of his party, formerly felt and spoke as we do now—like Americans. How unhappy the change! How unaccountable!—unless, indeed, by the poisonous effects of systematic opposition—a spirit that clings more strongly to party than to the cause of country."

After reviewing the progress of British maritime usurpations, from "the rule of 1756," to the last order in Council, Mr. Calhoun cotinued—

"This country alone was left to support the rights of neutrals. Perilous was the condition and arduous the task. We were not intimidated. We stood opposed to British usurpation, and by our spirit and efforts have done all in our power to save the last vestiges of neutral rights. Yes, our embargoes, non-intercourse, non-importation and finally, war—were all manly exertions to preserve the rights of this and other nations from the deadly grasp of British maritime policy.

"But, say our opponents, these efforts are lost, and our condition hopeless. If so, it only remains for us to assume the garb of our condition. We must submit, humbly submit, crave pardon and hug our chains. It is not wise to provoke, where we cannot resist. But first let us be well assured of the hopelessness of our state, before we sink into abject submission. On what do our opponents rest this despondent and slavish belief? On the recent events in Europe? I admit they are great and well calculated to impose on the imagination. Our enemy never presented a more imposing exterior. His fortune is at the flood. But I am admonished by universal experience that such prosperity is the most fickle of human conditions. From high flood the tide dates its ebb. From the meridian the sun commences his decline. Depend upon it there is more of sound philosophy

than fiction in the fickleness which poets attribute to Fortune. Prosperity has its weakness; adversity its strength. In many respects our enemy has lost by those very changes which seem so very much in his favor. He can now no more claim to be struggling for existence—no more to be fighting the battles of the world, in defence of the liberties of mankind. The magic cry of *French influence* is lost.—In this very Hall we are not strangers to that sound. Here, even here, the cry of French influence—that baseless fiction; that phantom of faction, now banished, often resounded. I rejoice that the spell is broken by which it was attempted to bend the generous spirit of this youthful nation. The minority can no longer act under cover; but must come out and defend their opposition on its intrinsic merits.

"The example (resistance of British usurpation) can scarcely fail to produce its effects (on other nations interested in the maintenance of maritime rights). But if unfortunately we should be left alone to maintain the contest; and if in consequence—which may God forbid!—necessity should compel us to yield for the present; yet our generous efforts will not have been lost. A mode of thinking and a tone of sentiment have gone abroad which must stimulate to future and successful struggles.—What could not be affected with eight millions of people will be done with twenty. The great cause will not be yielded—no, never never!—Sir, I hear the future audibly announced in the past;—in the splendid victories over the Guerriere, Java and Macedonian. We, and all nations, are, by those victories, taught a lesson never to be forgotten. Opinion is power.—*The charm of British naval invincibility is* GONE!"

So spoke the patriot in the hour of his country's greatest peril. Like Cato the younger, at the same age, "there was nothing of youthful sallies, or finical affectation in his oratory, all was rough, and sensible and strong. Nevertheless, amidst the short and solid turn of the sentences, there was a grace that engaged the ear.*" The parallel between the two men, might be pursued much farther. But it may be said, that this Cato never attained the *consulship*. It will be recollected, however, that he lived at the close of Roman liberty which, even his great talents and virtues could not sustain; and that he lost his election by *combination among his rivals, and his zeal against bribery.** American liberty has passed from "the gristle of youth to the bone of manhood." 'Tis in the power of the people: may they long guard it from decay!

I shall conclude my notice of this portion of Mr. Calhoun's public career by an anecdote that will be recollected by the members who served with him at the time.

---

* Plutarch's life of Cato the younger.

The leading part taken by Mr. Calhoun in the origination and prosecution of the war, brought him almost daily in collision with the principal members of the opposition; and although free from *personalities* himself, he nevertheless had to repel many sharp expressions in debate. On one of these occasions, Messrs. Smilie and Findley, "the fathers of the House," came to Mr. Calhoun and said in substance; "We see that ——— means to challenge you. We are opposed to *duelling* on principle; but in meeting him you will still be fighting the battles of your country." Mr. C. neither sought nor declined the invitation. The meeting was finally prevented by interposition from another quarter.

THOMSON.

For the Enquirer of November 28, 1823.

JOHN C. CALHOUN.—No. 3.

Rashness is the error of youth, timid caution of age. Manhood is the isthmus between the two extremes; the ripe and fertile season of action when alone, we can hope to find the head to contrive united with the hand to execute.—Lacon.

I am sensible of the injustice I do to Mr. Calhoun in omitting to notice any of his public acts; for though it be true, that he has been but twelve years in the councils of the Union, we nevertheless find his history crowded with incidents more than sufficient, in number and importance, to illustrate a long life devoted to the public service. In tracing *his* claims to public favour, it is the mass, variety, and richness of the materials which constitute at once the necessity and difficulty of selection. His celebrity does not rest on a single great act—standing out in bold relief from the general negativeness of the character;—it depends on a rapid succession of such acts, each of which challenges our admiration, and which, when taken together, form the portrait of an accomplished and brilliant statesman. There is not, in fact, a single branch of our foreign policy, or internal administration, that has not passed under the review of his pow-

erful mind, and on which his conclusions do not stand recorded for the inspection of his fellow-citizens. Some of his opinions, are indeed objected to among us; but in his *career* all is light. He has never *temporized*. He has kept no "prudent reserves with the public:" no dark corner in his breast for secret biasses with which to astound, at some unguarded moment, his deluded supporters. In short, whether we look into his countenance or his history, we behold alike the undoubted and undoubting traits of distinguished frankness and intelligence.

His speech on the New Army Bill in 1813, like many others of the war period, has been unavoidably omitted, and I can only *briefly* notice many of the great measures originated or supported by him, in the important interval between the treaty of peace, and his entrance into the cabinet December, 1817.

In the introduction to the second volume of the American Register, printed in 1817, the editor who holds a classical and powerful pen, has drawn the following character of Mr. Calhoun's legislative services:

"Several of the speeches delivered on the repeal of the *direct tax*, besides those of Mr. Clay and Mr. Hopkinson which I have given entire in my first volume, could be cited as ingenious and instructive performances. I would indicate particularly those of Mr. Calhoun, who shines on every occasion which calls for an appeal to general principles, and enlarged views of policy. His language in the debates on the additional military academies, on the general appropriation bill, on the encouragement of domestic manufactures, was that of a statesman "*looking before and after.*"

On the subject of the *direct tax* Mr. Calhoun spoke *against* the repeal and mainly contributed to defeat the measure at that time. It was however carried after he had left Congress, and hence a large increase of national debt incurred by loans in a time of profound peace, and under the financial administration of Mr. Crawford. It does not appear that the latter gentle-

man did any thing to oppose the repeal of this tax, though he was the secretary of the treasury at both periods when the question was agitated. His rival with a "species of self devotion" which has ever characterized his public life, preferred the *tax* to *loans*—his *duty*, to *popularity*.

The following is the history of his speech on the general appropriation bill alluded to above:—Under the act of 1809, the President was authorized to transfer money from one head of appropriation to a different head. By a reference to the Journals of the H. of R. 2d sess. 14th Congress it will be seen, that the *first* attempt to establish the existing system of *specific* appropriations, was made by Mr. Calhoun, on a motion to instruct the committee of ways and means to enquire into the expediency of repealing the act of 1809. Did Mr. Crawford, as Secretary of the Treasury, aid this great reform? He did not; and if enquiry be made among the members of that Committee it will be found that the Secretary exerted himself against the proposition and succeeded in crippling it in some of its material parts. I regret that I cannot, at this moment, lay my hands on this truly republican Speech of Mr. Calhoun which established the principle, of the last importance in a free country—*that not a dollar of the people's money shall be expended, without the specific authority of the people's immediate representatives*

Another great parliamentary effort was made by him about this time on the "treaty making power." The late Mr. Pinkney who followed in debate, said—"The strong power of genius from a higher region than that of argument, had thrown on (the question) all the light with which it is the prerogative of genius to invest and illustrate every thing." And still more directly—"The gentleman from S. Carolina (Mr. Calhoun) has exhausted the correct constitutional grounds of the question, and left him nothing but to recapitulate his arguments."

I have quoted these complimentary notices as well to justify the high anticipations of the Enquirer, expressed on Mr. Cal-

houn's first appearance in Congress, as because I have not, at this moment, the speeches by me to exhibit for themselves.

His support of the present bank of the United States, and of Internal Improvement, I had designed to reserve for the head of *popular objections*; but cannot resist the pleasure of noticing the speech on the latter occasion, in this place. As a whole, it is believed that our congressional debates do not furnish a finer specimen of statesman-like oratory. The noble sentiments breathed in the extracts which follow will amply compensate the trouble of perusal. Mr. Calhoun first adverts to the effect of the improvements in question, on productive industry and wealth, and then proceeds—

"But there are higher and more powerful considerations why Congress ought to take charge of this subject. If we were only to consider the pecuniary advantages of a good system of roads and canals, it might indeed admit of some doubt whether they ought not to be left wholly to individual exertions; but when we come to consider how intimately the strength and prosperity of the Republic are connected with this subject we find the most urgent reasons why we should apply our resources to them. In many respects, no country of equal population and wealth possesses equal materials of power with ours. The people, in muscular vigor, in hardy and enterprising habits, and in a lofty and gallant courage are surpassed by none. In one respect, and in my opinion in one only, we are materially weak. We occupy a surface prodigiously great in proportion to our numbers. The common strength is brought with difficulty to bear on the point that may be menaced by an enemy. It is our duty, then, as far as in the nature of things it can be effected, to counteract this weakness. Good roads and canals, judiciously laid out, are the proper remedy. In the recent war how much did we suffer for the want of them! Besides the tardiness and the consequent inefficiency of our military movements, to what an increased expense was the country put for the article of transportation alone! In the event of another war, the saving in

mail and the press, said he, are, the nerves of the body politic. By them, the slightest impression made on the most remote parts, is communicated to the whole system; and the more perfect the means of transportation, the more rapid and true the vibration. To aid us in this great work, to maintain the integrity of this Republic, we inhabit a country presenting the most admirable advantages. Belted round, as it is, by lakes and oceans, intersected in every direction by bays and rivers, the hand of industry and art is tempted to improvement. So situated, blessed with a form of government at once combining liberty and strength, we may reasonably raise our eyes to a most splendid future, if we only act in a manner worthy of our advantages. If, however, neglecting them, we permit a low, sordid, selfish, sectional spirit to take possession of this House, this happy scene will vanish. We shall divide, and as consequences will follow—misery and despotism.

"To legislate for our country, continued Mr. C., requires not only the most enlarged views, but a species of self devotion not exacted in any other. In a country so extensive, and so various in its interests, what is necessary for the common good, may apparently, be opposed to the interests of particular sections. This must be submitted to as the condition of our greatness. But were we a small Republic; were we confined to the ten miles' square, the selfish instincts of our nature might, in most cases, be relied on for the management of public affairs."

Mr. Calhoun (after an interregnum) succeeded Mr. Crawford, as Secretary at War. Here a new field was opened to his genius, industry and love of order and economy. The department in all its branches stood in its original "confusion—worse confounded" by the prodigious masses of unsettled war accounts which had been seven years accumulating. These were now destined to be broken up and despatched. The mere manuel part of the labor and also such decisions as rested on express provisions of law devolved of course, on the subordinate officers of the department. But in all doubtful cases of expenditure, and particularly in the settlement of state claims for militia ser-

vices rendered, a personal reference to the Secretary under the same provisions of law, became indispensable. In December 1817, when Mr. C. came into office the amount of these unsettled debts and credits was more than forty millions of dollars. This enormous mass has already been reduced to a mere modicum, and the amount found due to the United States received, or put into suit for collection. A similar instance of despatch in the settlement of war-accounts it is believed never occurred in the experience of any other government. In England it is said they usually remain unaudited for half a century. Great credit is certainly due to the accounting officers attached to the war department, for their share in these appalling labors; and I doubt not that they were from the first, equally ready and willing to perform their duties; but, it is as certainly true, that for the want of an efficient head little or nothing had been done before Mr. Calhoun's appointment.—For the truth of these facts I refer to the reports annually made to Congress, of what is termed, *public defaulters*—that is, of the progress made in the unrolling of these manuscripts—which, like those buried in Pompeii and Herculaneum, might have slept for centuries but for the new genius that presided over the work of disinterment.

Mr. Calhoun had scarcely entered on his new duties when Congress passed an act granting pensions to the survivors of the revolutionary army and navy, and referring the whole subject to the war department. It is believed that the number of applicants for the benefits of this act has been more than *sixty thousand.* Now it was manifest on reflection, that, under the very strict limitations imposed by Congress the survivors entitled to be placed on the Pension List could not equal a *third* of that number. This mustering host of claims, was therefore, to be examined in detail, as well to save the Treasury from imposition, as to be certain that not one individual whose early patriotism and existing penury entitled him to national assistance should be disappointed. Both these objects have been attained with as much certainty as ever attended the decisions of the highest judicial tribunals, and the number of revolution-

this particular would go far towards indemnifying us for the expenses of constructing the means of transportation.

"It is not however in this respect only, that roads and canals add to the strength of a country. Our power of raising revenue, in war particularly, depends mainly on them. In peace our revenue depends principally on the imports; in war this source, in a great measure, fails, and internal taxes to a great amount, become necessary. Unless the means of commercial intercourse are rendered much more perfect than they now are, we shall never be able in war to raise the necessary supplies. If taxes were collected in kind; if, for instance, the farmer and mechanic paid in their surplus produce, then the difficulty would not exist, as, in no country on earth, is there so great a surplus, in proportion to population, as ours. But such a system of taxes is impossible. They must be paid in money, and by the constitution, must be laid uniformly. What then is the effect? The taxes are laid in every part of this extensive country, uniformly; but the expenditure must, in its nature, be principally confined to the scene of military operations. This drains the circulating medium from one part, and accumulates it in another—perhaps a very distant one. The result is obvious. Unless it can return through the operations of trade, the parts from which the constant drain takes place, must ultimately be impoverished. Commercial intercourse is the true remedy to this weakness; and the means by which this is to be effected, are roads, canals, and the coasting trade. On these, combined with domestic manufactures, does the monied capacity of this country, in war, depend. Without them, not only will we be unable to raise the necessary supplies, but the currency of the country must necessarily fall into the greatest disorders—such as we lately experienced.

"But on this subject of national power, what, said Mr. Calhoun, can be more important than a perfect unity in every part, in feelings and interest? And what can tend more powerfully to produce it, than overcoming the effects of distance? No people enjoying freedom, ever occupied any thing like as great

an extent of country as this Republic. One hundred years ago, the most profound philosophers did not believe it to be even possible. They did not suppose it possible that a pure Republic could exist on as great a scale even as the island of Great Britain. What was then considered chimerical, we now have the felicity to enjoy; and what is most remarkable, such is the happy mould of our government; so well are the state and general powers blended, that much of our political happiness draws its origin from the extent of our republic. It has exempted us from most of the causes which distracted the small Republics of antiquity. Let it not, however, be forgotten; let it forever be kept in mind, that it exposes us to the greatest of all calamities, next to the loss of liberty, and even to *that* in its consequences—*disunion*. We are great, and rapidly, I was about to say—fearfully, growing. This is our pride and danger—our weakness and strength. Little, said Mr. C. does he deserve to be entrusted with the liberties of this people, who does not raise his mind to these truths. We are under the most imperious obligation to counteract every tendency to disunion. The strongest of all cements is, undoubtedly, the wisdom, justice, and above all the moderation of this house. Yet the great subject on which we are now deliberating, in this respect, deserves the most serious consideration. Whatever impedes the intercourse of the extremes with this, the centre, of the republic, weakens the union. The more enlarged the sphere of commercial circulation, the more extended that of social intercourse; the more strongly are we bound together; the more inseparable our destinies. Those who understand the human heart know how powerfully distance tends to break the smypathies of our nature. Nothing, not even the dissimilarity of language, tends more to estrange man from man. Let us then, said Mr. C. bind the Republic together with a perfect system of roads and canals. Let us conquer space: It is thus the most distant parts of the Republic will be brought within a few days travel of the centre; it is thus that a citizen of the West will read the news of Boston still moist from the press. The

the institution of a system of permanent fortification—by which our coasts will soon be rendered invulnerable to an enemy; the establishment of a cordon of military posts, stretching from the upper lakes, around our western frontier—as physical and moral shackles on Indian hostilities;* and, finally, for his duties as a cabinet counsellor, in which capacity he is well known to have given to the measures of the President, an honest and efficient support.

I here close the long, but rapid enumeration of Mr. Calhoun's great public services. In my next (and concluding) number, I shall notice such objections as I hear among us urged to his elevation to the chief magistracy of this Union.

THOMSON.

*It will be remembered, that the Mamdau village was deemed an essential link in this cordon Congress stopped the expedition at the Council Bluffs. The recent hostilities in that quarter are the result!

For the Enquirer of December 2, 1823.

JOHN C. CALHOUN—No. 4.

In politics as in religion, it so happens that we have less charity for those who believe the half of our creed, than for those who deny the whole of it.—LACON.

That this truth is strikingly exemplified in the conduct of Mr. Crawford's partisans in Virginia towards Mr. Calhoun, I shall now demonstrate under the head of *objections* to the latter of these candidates.

In reference to the bank of the United States and internal improvements, it is alleged of Mr. Calhoun, that "he mistakes the true theory of our constitution, and advocates the assumption of extensive powers by the federal government which were never conferred. That "*HE, ALSO, argued—taking into view the prohibition against the states issuing bills of credit, that there was a strong presumption this power was intended to be exclusively given to Congress.*"

These objections are taken from the Enquirer of the 3d Oct. 1823. The words in *italics* are quoted by the editors of

that paper, from Mr. Calhoun's speech on the bill for incorporating the bank of the U. S.—Now admitting for a moment, that the extract in *italics*, taken with the context, fairly represents the sense of the speaker, (and I shall presently shew most conclusively, that *it does not*) we here have "the very head and front of *his* offending" against state rights. How does Mr. Crawford stand on constitutional grounds?—this Mr. C. whom the Enquirer holds up as having *sinned less* than either of his rivals?

Mr. Crawford was, in the Senate, the chairman of the committee that reported the bill for rechartering the old bank of the U. S. in 1811. "He was the father of the measure." Mr. Calhoun, in the House of Representatives, occupied the same relation to the bill for incorporating the new bank in 1816. Here the parallel ceases, and the contrast begins.—Over the old bank the government exercised no control whatever: the stock of the institution was almost exclusively owned by federalists and foreigners, who, on great occasions, exercised a fearful influence over our political elections, and even directly over the fiscal operations, of the government itself. The new bank, on the contrary, was placed mainly under the control of the government, and the four-fifths of its stock not owned by the U. S. are principally in the hands of American citizens, without distinction of parties. Mr. Crawford considered the bank as a means *necessary and proper* to the right of raising revenue. He even takes the higher argument of *convenience*. "We do not (he avowed) say, that the existence of the government absolutely depends upon the operations of the bank; but that a national bank enables the government to manage its fiscal concerns more *advantageously* than it could by any other means." This is precisely the federal ground assumed in 1791, and combatted by the whole republican party then in the minority. This minority Mr. Crawford characterises as "inimical" to the federal constitution; and expressly says "the old bank law passed in the *best* days of this republic." From this it appears, the republican preference attributed to him by his partisans, for the

ary pensioners, under that act reduced to about sixteen thousand. And here I do not hazard contradiction from any candid mind, acquainted with the facts, when I assert, that Mr. Calhoun, in the performance of this herculean labor has, by his extraordinary habits of business and powers of discrimination saved to the United States at least a million of dollars annually, since 1818—a saving that will be continued, tho' on a declining scale, for the next fifteen or twenty years!

When Mr. Calhoun came to the direction of the war department, the average cost of the officers and men in the army, was about $451 per annum each. A reduction in the cost of supplies of every sort would, of itself, have reduced that average to about $377; but the present average (and it has been equally low for several years) is but $298. The difference therefore, amounting to about $440.000 per annum, on an army of 5500 men and officers, can be attributed only to the admirable system of supply and exact accountability that he has introduced in all the parts of the establishment. In proof of these assertions, I refer to the President's messages during the two last winters and their accompanying documents. From these it will appear, that not one dollar in a thousand is now lost either by ignorance, fraud or failure on the whole expenditure of the department. Let the real friends of enlightened economy, look to these great results.

These triumphs of genius and system, over ignorance and waste could never have been effected without a thorough interior reform of the war department, within itself, and the new modelling of the staff of the army. The truth is, the war department had never been put on the footing of that of the treasury (for example) which owed its admirable organization to the analytical mind of Hamilton—the first incumbent. This was now the first duty to be performed. Mr C. saw at once that his department was not a labor-saving machine;—that the genius of invention and of construction had never been employed upon it. Left by the President responsible only for *results* in the execution of his particular duties, Mr. C. found a motive in giving to

his department the highest beneficial action. His fame became immediately interested in it. Accordingly, he commenced the reform by breaking up the general mass of business, and distributing it among several distinct bureaux. At the head of each of these, an officer of rank was placed, having a particular experience in that branch of duties. This head looked only to the chief of the department, who in turn, looked hourly to each of those heads—in order to assure himself, absolutely, that all acted on the general principles prescribed.

As incident to this great reform was the remodelling of the staff, and the introduction of a new branch (the *commissariat)* for the subsistence of the troops. These measurrs were effected by recommendations to Congress through the military committees of the two Houses ; and thus the chief of each branch of the new staff, became the head of one of the bureaux before mentioned. All the effects which result from a judicious division of labor and responsibility were soon found to succeed these simple but grand conceptions. Each chief of a bureau immediately felt that he had a direct interest in the able discharge of his duties, under the powerful stimulants of inspection and competition. The whole army, in all its branches of service and expenditure, was from the first, made to feel the hand of regeneration. Orders were now transmitted with direct certainty to the point of execution, and reports of the *service performed* received back in like manner. Every dollar of public money drawn from the Treasury could now be distinctly traced through a few hands to its destined object, and the vouchers for the expenditure returned in time to be checked and settled within the fiscal year.

This simple exposition will readily explain how Mr. Calhoun has found time and means for the despatch of the old accounts of the war before-mentioned;—the examination of claims for revolutionary pensions;—the thorough revivification of the military academy—the source of professional science; the establishment of a uniform and vigorous discipline throughout the army—supported by the most rigorous economy in expenditures; a survey of our maritime frontier by officers of the engineers;

first four years of Mr. Jefferson's administration, is but an after thought—a *lucky hit* for the political *leap year* that is at hand. The truth is, that most of his principles in government are like the calculations in an almanac—they are made for, and run out with the year.

The above is but a small part of the anti-republican speech which the Enquirer very justly admits to be "a blot on the escutcheon" of its favorite. The editors however never copy or quote the speech itself. Like able advocates at the bar, they seem to put in the plea of *guilty* to exclude all aggravating circumstances from the jury. In the following extracts from Mr. Calhoun's speech on the new bank we shall see whether the editors have shown equal skill in prosecution as in defence.

Mr. Calhoun said—"as to the state of the currency of the nation, that it was extremely depreciated and in degrees varying with the different sections of the country, all would assent. That this state of the currency was a stain on public and private credit, and injurious to the morals of the community, was so clear a proposition as to require no proof. There were, however, other considerations arising from the state of the currency not so generally felt; not so generally assented to. The present state of our circulating medium was, he said, opposed to the principles of the federal constitution. The power was given to Congress, by that instrument, in express terms to regulate the currency of the U. S. In point of fact, that power though given to Congress, is not now in their hands. The power is exercised by banking institutions, no longer responsible for the correctness with which they manage it. Gold and silver have disappeared entirely; there is no money but paper money, and that is beyond the control of Congress. No one, continued Mr. Calhoun, who referred to the constitution, could doubt, that the money of the U. States was intended to be placed entirely under the control of Congress. The only object the framers of the constitution could have had in view in giving to Congress the power "to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin," must have been to give steadiness and

fixedness of value to the currency of the U. S. The state of things at the time of the adoption of the constitution, afforded an argument in support of this construction. There then existed a depreciated paper currency which could only be regulated and made uniform by giving a power for that purpose to the general government. The States could not do it. He argued, therefore, taking into view the prohibition against the states issuing bills of credit, that there was a strong presumption this power was intended to be given exclusively to Congress.* Mr. Calhoun said, he acknowledged there was no provision in the constitution by which the states were prohibited from creating the banks which now exercised the power (that is, the power of issuing mere bills of credit-notes not redeemable in specie, on demand) but banks were then but little known. There was but one, the bank of N. America with a capital of only $400,000; and the universal opinion was, that bank notes represented gold and silver, and that there could be no necessity to prohibit banking institutions under this impression; because, if their notes always represented gold and silver, they could not be multiplied beyond the demands of the country. Mr. Calhoun then drew the distinction between banks of deposite and banks of discount; the latter of which were then (in 1789) but little understood, and their abuse not conceived until demonstrated by recent experience. No man, he remarked, in the convention, much talent and much wisdom as it contained, could possibly have foreseen the course of these institutions; that they would have multiplied from one, to two hundred and sixty; from a capital of $400 000 to one of eighty millions; from being consistent with the provisions of the constitution, and the exclusive right of Congress to regulate the currency, that they should become directly opposed to both; that so far from their credit depending on their punctuality in redeeming their bills with specie, they might go on, ad infinitum, in violation of their contracts without a dollar in their vaults.—Restore, said Mr.

* This is the sentence quoted by the Enquirer of the 3d October last, as I have already noticed in the beginning of this article. Let the reader judge of its meaning in connexion with the context. I shall have occasion to recur to it again.

Calhoun, these institutions to their original use; cause them to give up their usurped power; cause them to return to their legitimate office of places of discount and deposite; let them be no longer paper machines; restore the state of things which existed anterior to 1813, which was consistent with the just policy and interests of the country—cause them to fulfil their broken faith."

To effect these objects, of the highest importance to the nation, Mr. Calhoun proposed perhaps the only remedy.

"A national bank, he said, paying specie itself, would soon have a tendency to make specie payments general, as well by its influence, as example. It will be the interest of the national bank to produce this state of things; because, otherwise, its operation will be greatly circumscribed, as it must pay out specie or national bank notes: for, he presumed, one of the first rules of such a bank would be, to take the notes of no bank which did not pay in gold and silver. A national bank of 35 millions with the aid of those banks which are at once ready to pay specie, would produce a powerful effect all over the Union. Further, a national bank would enable the government to resort to measures which would make it unprofitable to the (local) banks to continue the violation of their contracts, and advantageous to return to the observation of them. The leading measures of this character would be to strip the banks refusing to pay specie of all the profits arising from the business of the government;—to prohibit deposits with them, and to refuse to receive their notes in payment of dues to the government."

These predictions have all been absolutely fulfilled, with one signal exception—I allude to the loss of about $700,000, deposited by order of Mr. Crawford in certain non-paying banks of the west, in opposition to the above sound advice of Mr. Calhoun!

We have seen that the extract from Mr. Calhoun's speech, given in the Enquirer with the significant preface—"*He also*," is calculated to produce the erroneous impression that Mr. Cal-

houn thought the state banks were so many usurpations on the constitution of the U. S. "For the *He also*," the Enquirer might truly have said, such was the monstrous doctrine of Mr. Crawford alone. The following are his own words.—In support of the old banks Mr. Crawford said—"Had *these great states* (Virginia, New York, and Pennsylvania) who have undertaken, by their *instructions* to influence the decision of this question by Congress, contented themselves with this right to establish banks, I should not, upon this occasion, enter into an investigation of that right. But these great states, not content with the exercise of an *usurped authority*, are by *usurpation*, attempting to legislate for Congress. And, Sir, what is the inducement of these great states to put down the bank of the U. S.? *Their avarice combined with their love of domination!* They have erected banks in many of which they hold stock to a considerable amount, and they wish to compel the U. S. to use their banks as places of deposit for their public money, by which they expect to increase their dividends. And in the banks in which they have no stock, many of the individual members of their legislatures are stockholders, and, no doubt, were influenced to give instructions by motives of sheer avarice!"

Here we have a denial of *the whole of our creed*, with insult and outrage superadded to the heresy. But it has been said, in the Enquirer, that Mr. Crawford has whispered to some Virginian *regrets* that he ever held this language; but has he publicly and solemnly recanted it? If so, where is the evidence of the fact? Let it be borne in mind that he was, at the time of the offence, a Senator of one of the *small states*, and had not (nor did he till the caucus of 1816) lift his ambition to the chief magistracy of this nation. Nor will the defence which has also been set up—that the many reprehensible sentiments, contained in the speech *were uttered in the heat of debate*—avail him on this occasion. The speech, on the face of it, carries the irresistible conviction, that it was coolly and deliberately written out with his own hand for the press! Let the enemies of Mr. Calhoun shew that he has ever uttered a sentiment repugnant to liberty; or has ever outraged any,

even the smallest state or district in the union, in the manner of Mr. Crawford, and I, as one of the voters of Virginia, will instantly say—let him be abandoned to his fate.

On the subject of internal improvements, I have already quoted (in my third number) Mr. Calhoun's views very much at large, and did not find that he had more than touched on the constitutional question. His speech, it will be recollected, was made on the bill after the amendment requiring the consent of the states to the particular works which might be executed in them respectively, and hence he seems to have considered the question likened to the principle in the Cumberland Road Bill, in the time of Mr. Jefferson—and therefore settled. There can be no doubt, however, that he goes as far as Mr. Monroe on this subject—or, in other words, that he believes Congress to possess the right, under the constitution, to appropriate any surplus money that may be in the Treasury to the construction of roads and canals for great national purposes.

And what are Mr. Crawford's views in respect to national roads and canals? Mark: I object to all answers that may be uttered in whispers. These may be crossed, forgotten or contradicted, at pleasure. I demand—where is his *public* act, or expression, on this matter? No where.

The subject has been brought before the public since Mr. Crawford became a candidate for the presidency, and he has stood mute, except perhaps, to confidential friends of opposite views, from that moment to the present. Not even the express command of Congress has been able to extort from him, in the last five years, a syllable in reply. Contrast this act of contumacy with the prompt, and open conduct of Mr. Calhoun on this, as on every occasion; and let us ask ourselves, which of the two is the better republican? Mr. Calhoun, who replied to the order at the earliest practicable moment; or Mr. Crawford, who has silently declined obedience from the fear of injuring his popularity? Further —If Mr. Crawford publickly proclaimed, *before* he was a candidate for the presidency, that the establishment of the Bank of Virginia and the Farmers' Bank, for example, were acts of state "usurpation;" why may he not now secretly entertain the opinion,

for future purposes, that the construction of the state road from the James river to the Kanhawa, is equally an *usurpation*—because, the constitution of the United States has said "Congress shall have power to establish post roads"? This is no extravagance in argument. The suppositious case is but an apt illustration of that which stands recorded of Mr. Crawford.

In the face of these facts, perhaps the Enquirer may again assert of Mr. Calhoun—"why, if there be an ultra in favor of the federal powers, he is the man. His *acts* are proof enough without his speeches." I am aware that "the flighty *assertion* never is o'ertook, unless the *refutation* go with it;" that thousands who have read the former will not care to follow me through these numbers—in which I have endeavored to collect and condense every important act and speech of Mr. Calhoun's political life; but should any leisure eye fall on this passage, the conviction shall flash upon it, that Mr. Crawford stands, by his own "merit raised to that bad eminence" so unjustly accorded to another. In his speech on the bank of the United States he roundly asserted—

"The *entire* sovereignty of this nation is vested in the state governments, and in the federal government, except that part of it which is retained by the people, which is *solely* the right of electing their public functionaries."

"The right to create a corporation is a right inherit in every sovereignty; the people of the U. S. cannot exercise this right.—If then the states are restrained from creating a bank, with authority to emit bills of credit (and Mr. Crawford considered *all* bank notes such) it appears to be established, that the federal government does possess the right"

Permit me here simply to ask, whether a parallel to these monstrous doctrines can be found in the writings or speeches of the fathers of federalism; in the worst days of the reign of terror—under that administration to which Mr. Crawford pledged himself without exception or reserve? If not, with what propriety can the Enquirer say—that admitting Mr. Crawford wrote the Augusta Address, that it is an isolated act—contradicted by the whole tenor of his life? Look at the overwhelming proofs just given to the contrary—to his vote against the embargo—his speech in 1810, against preparation and war,—his *rebuke* of Mr. Jefferson, on the subject of the navy—his *ridicule* of Mr. Madison's first war message—his declaration to a federal

member of Congress within a year or two past, that party distinctions should be buried, and to the following, the peroration of his speech on the bank—in which he solemenly exhorts the republicans of the Senate to act on that principle—

"Does the pride of opinion (said Mr. C.) revolt at the idea of acquiescence in the system of your political opponents? Come! and with me sacrifice your pride and political resentments at the shrine of political good Let them be made a propitiatory sacrifice for the promotion of the public welfare; the savor of which will ascend to Heaven and be there recorded as a lasting and everlasting evidence of your devotion to the happiness of your country"

I had designed to conclude this notice of objections to Mr. Calhoun by an examination of the Tariff question, together with some late indications of Mr. Crawford on this subject "that palter with us in a double sense"; but find, that I must hasten to a conclusion. I will however but just remark that Mr. Calhoun's opinions on this subject are not of a recent origin, intended to catch the popular voice to the north and west, in the impending election. They were distinctly avowed as far back as in 1814, in his speech on the Loan Bill, and seem to constitute an essential feature in his system of national policy. They have since been often repeated and supported with "a species of self devotion" (to use an expression of his own) which I believe almost peculiar to himself. He belongs to a state more entirely agricultural than that of Virginia. South Carolina, justly proud of his great talents and services, has the magnanimity to excuse if not entirely to approve, this bias in her favorite son, and I know not why we should consider it a *positive* objection. Mr. Calhoun however, is not understood to be the advocate of any sudden revolution in the productive labor and business of the country, through the medium of a new Tariff. From his speeches, I understand him to be in favor of encouraging manufactures of the first necessity, to a certain extent, and by regular degrees; upon the same principles, that we support a navy, army and fortifications—to render our independence on Europe the more certain and absolute.

It has been beautifully said by a great whig of another country—that *every man favored by education or position, ought either to write something worthy of being read, or to do something*

worthy of being written. Mr. Calhoun we have seen, has nobly performed both these duties of his condition. What is the fact in respect to Mr. Crawford? his speeches it will be universally admitted, are highly obnoxious to republican censures; and nobody mentions his *reports* with commendation. When then we demand on what *acts* he founds his claims to the presidency? We are answered with columns of empty assertions—"mere words, words, words!"

The objection to the *age* of Mr. Calhoun is the last resort of his opponents. This like every other, urged against him, is best answered by the simple recapitulation of his deeds. Can either of the *older* candidates exhibit political services and capacities *equal* in either number or brilliancy; or prove an *equal* exemption from defect and error? On this comparison ought strictly to depend the choice of a free and intelligent people. The reply of the great Pitt to Walpole will be remembered by every reader. Greater age certainly carries with it, the naked presumption of greater wisdom; but, that age and wisdom are not always parallel or proportionate, is a melancholy truth daily seen in every group of five individuals, as among the five candidates for the Presidency. The average age of the members who formed the Constitution of the U. S. in genral convention was about forty-five. These sages, with, perhaps, but one individual—the president of their body—the father of his country—in view for the chief magistracy of the Republic, nevertheless deliberately admitted that a citizen might render himself worthy of this high office by the age of thirty-five; and fixed accordingly the point of eligibility. On the 4th March, 1825, Mr. Calhoun will be in his forty-fourth year—more than two presidential terms older than is required by the constitution; and twelve years have already elapsed, since he was hailed by the great political organ of Virginia, as "*resembling one of the old sages of the old Congress*, with all the graces of youth." The loss of the latter in the service of his country, but confirms the resemblance, and renders JOHN C. CALHOUN, at this day, the most worthy to succeed the last President of the revolutionary school.

THOMSON.