

The *Augusta Courier* of the 28th ult. commenting on what it calls the *Jackson* editors in Georgia, says: "They are quarrelling among themselves, who shall support General Jackson, and are unwilling, some of them, to receive any aid from any other quarter. If the General's merits receive a passing tribute from any pen but their's—it springs from a *tainted* source—"they'll none of it"—the "offence is rank, it smells to Heaven." This in the language of the *Milledgeville Statesman* "is ominous of no good to the cause of Jackson."

Now, this, so far from being true, is a total departure from correctness. The *Jackson* presses in this State are quarrelling about neither men nor principles, nor have they at any time refused honest aid to promote their political purposes. The *Milledgeville Statesman* in his on no occasion objected to Jackson's receiving that just but unusual gift, a "passing tribute," from his avowed opponents, nor pronounced an act so equitable to be "ominous of no good to the cause of Jackson." We have only expressed our disgust at, and warned the citizens against, the faithless professions of such men in Georgia, as are indebted for the continuance of their influence to his mantle, while they are stabbing at his political existence.

That such is the position of the Crawford leaders cannot, in fairness be controverted; and it justifies fully our remark made on the 25th ult. that "the aspect of the Crawford party in Georgia is at present ominous of no good to the cause of Jackson." We wish to be succinctly understood as not applying the term *Crawford* to the *whole* of the *Troup* party, but as restricting it to that self created junto and its subalterns that, in conclave, apart from the public eye, have too often imposed their sinister designs on Georgia, to the injury of justice, her interest and reputation. Fairness demands this explication. By reference to the vote given, in Senate, during the last session of our Legislature, on the attempt to nominate Wm. H. Crawford, it will be found that several eminent *Troup* members disdained submission to the dictum of the Crawford aristocracy, and we all know that General Floyd, both a *Trouper* and representative in Congress, was and is opposed to that notorious nomination.

Having drawn this distinction, we ask, in what solitary instance have the Crawfordists shown a disposition to aid Jackson either as a warrior or candidate for the Presidency? Out of open hatred to Jackson, did they not as long ago as 1818, obtain a writ of *habeas corpus* for a man; if it be no a libel on humanity to apply that word to Obed Wright, who had been guilty of one of the most dastardly cold-blooded, wanton massacres of old men, woman and children, that have ever been perpetrated by a monster—and furnish him with means to escape to Cuba? Did they not arraign the motives of Jackson, for rolling back the tide of invasion from our frontiers and crushing the power of the savages on their own thresholds, calling him a dictator in disguise, and invoking the dagger of a Brutus? Did not William H. Crawford, then head and heart of the junto, urge, in the Cabinet at Washington City, the arrest and trial of Jackson for having secured the throats of our frontier inhabitants from the knife of the savages? And have not many of the Crawfordists since, systematically and constantly persevered in endeavors to defraud him of the merit of subjugating the Seminoles, by attributing in toasts, speeches, orations, and public documents, that conquest to an Indian Chief? Who has not heard Indian Billy M'Intosh, called the conqueror of the Red-sticks, thus attempting to deprive Jackson of hard earned honor, and to fasten a falsehood upon history? During the last Presidential canvass, did they not call Jackson every thing but a good man and patriot; and, in opposition to the wishes of their constituents, refuse to take him as the second choice of Georgia? Was it not the alternative of a nominal change in their politics, or certainty of political shipwreck, that, in 1826, compelled some of them to a hollow acquiescence in his nomination to the Presidency? And did not the two most active Crawfordists in that acquiescence refuse a re-election, last year, that the Chatham representation might last session stand uncommitted in relation to the subject of the Presidency; and has not one of the said members, Dr. Daniel who pretended so much zeal for Jackson's success, accepted an appointment from John Quincy Adams? Have not the Crawford junto and their subalterns with a perfect foreknowledge that Crawford could not be elected unless by aid from the Adams party, nominated that unfortunate, afflicted and prematurely old man?—

Have they not protested against the nomination of Jackson by the Senate at the last session of the Legislature, assigning the most frivolous and disingenuous motives for so doing? Has not Judge Clayton stated to the world, in vindication of his vote against that nomination, that he voted for Jackson in 1826, while the Journal of the Senate for that year (page 261) shows that he positively voted against the resolution which at that session passed both branches, recommending Jackson to the Presidency—voted against it, aye, and that without protest or explanation? Was not one of the editors of the *Courier* elected last year from Richmond, under the assurance that he was a Jacksonian; did he not as a representative profess to be such in the Legislative Hall; and is he now not devoting his funds, time, and, if he have any, talents, openly to the re-election of Mr. Adams?

Can such a party, without the grossest violation of decency, be called *Jacksonian*? or the presses of men that have followed such a party through all its sinuosities, be named *Jackson* presses, without the most departure from truth? Might not a wretch who had beaten Mr. Crawford, but afterwards taken refuge from a storm in the dwelling of Mr. C. and attempted to fire it intentionally, be, with as much propriety, styled Mr. C's personal friend? Most assuredly. Why then does the *Courier*, thoroughly acquainted with all the foregoing facts, apply the term *Jackson*, to the presses of Crawford; and brand the exposition of their duplicity, by their opponents, *quarrels* among the Jackson editors of Georgia. The reason is obvious, but it will not succeed.

In Georgia, Jackson is not "supported *reluctantly*, and in most instances against the dictates of an enlightened judgment," as the *Courier* asserts. At least nineteen twentieths of the people are from principles as well as policy, decidedly in his favor, and cannot be altered. In this State, his cause has nothing to fear, except from treachery. The fair and open friends of Mr. Adams here can do nothing against him; but the systematic craft and disciplined enmity of the organized Crawford junta, favored by the trimming versatility of its presses, will, if not overawed and kept in strings by the people, paralyze the intention of the State, sacrifice her interest, compromise her faith. We again repeat compromise her faith. We again repeat that the Crawford aristocracy bodes no good. In the feet of Georgian liberty, that cabal is a chieoe, which, if not timely extracted, must cripple her forever.