

Law Notice.

THE subscriber has removed to and opened a Law Office in the town of Macon, and will practice in the counties of Bibb, Monroe, Newton, Henry, Pike, Upson, Crawford, and Houston, of the Flint; Jasper, Jones, and Wilkinson of the Ocmulgee, and the Northern counties of the Southern circuit.

CHRISTOPHER B. STRONG.
January 11 15

Caution.

ALL persons are cautioned against trespassing, for any purpose, on lot No 127, in the 14th district formerly Fayette, now De Kalb county, as the law will be rigorously enforced against all who should thus offend.

WILSON BIRD.
Shoals of Ogeechee, Aug 16 61—46

NOTICE.

ALL persons are hereby warned not to purchase or negotiate a certain bond given by the subscriber to Martin Fitchard for value to a half of a certain lot of land No. 127, Houston, now Crawford county, as the consideration for which said bond was given has failed by the refusal of the said Fitchard to comply with the contract which was the basis of said bond.

RICHARD M. BEAVERS

Crawford Co. Sept. 5, 1875. \$1p

OFFICE. All persons indebted to the subscriber either by note or account are respectfully requested to make immediate payment, otherwise they may calculate to find their notes and accounts in officers hands for collection. During my absence my business will be punctually attended to.

CALEB TOMPKINS.

N. B. All persons having left watches with the subscriber during the time he lived in Clinton and Monticello that have not taken them away are respectfully requested to call on Mr. Wm. H. Crane of Monticello and myself in Clinton, within the next month, where the watches can be obtained by paying the repairs, otherwise they will be sold.

CALEB TOMPKINS

NOTICE.

THE subscribers living in Morgan county, 3 miles South of the High Shoals on the Appalachee, take this method of informing their friends and the public generally, that they have on hand a number of Patent Cotton Gins and Carding Machines which they will dispose of at the reduced prices of \$2 per saw for Cotton Gins and \$25 for Carding Machines. The subscribers will also furnish a rough gear of any description with the Gins, and old Gins carefully repaired.

N. B. The above Gins and Carding Machines will be warranted to be of the best kind.

ALEXANDER M. BROWN,

WILLIAM J. DAVIS.

August 2 2m—44

UNAWAY from the subscriber on the 25th of April last, two negroes, one about 35 years old, the other 17 old, both named CHARLES, the eldest one has been shot in his breast and the bullet is perceptible in his breast, and he is also shot through the right leg, he is about 5 feet 10 inches, and the other about 5 feet 5 inches high. Any person that will apprehend said negroes and secure them in any jail in this state, or deliver them to the subscriber in Morgan county, near the old boundary line, shall be reasonably rewarded.

JOHN HUSKEY

may 17 \$10 4—33

NOTICE.

WILL be sold to the highest bidder on the 23d of September next, at the courthouse in Decatur, De Kalb county, a quantity of TOWN LOT'S. Terms made known on the day of sale. For salubrity of air, purity of water and healthfulness of situation Decatur is unrivaled by any village in the country.

JOSEPH MORRIS, J. I. C.

WILLIAM CORRY, J. I. C.

REUBEN CONE, J. I. C.

September 7

ATTICUS No. V.

From the Athens Centinel.

TO THE PEOPLE OF GEORGIA.

"But I am fearful that I have lived to become a very old fashioned fellow. Perhaps an unconquerable attachment to the dearest rights of man may, in these refined enlightened days, be deemed a fault. If so, I am contented to be old fashioned; I say, the time has been when every pulse of my heart beat for American liberty, and when the enthusiasm I felt had a counterpart in the bosom of every true American. But suspicious have gone abroad, suspicious of my integrity. It has been publicly reported that my professions are not sincere. Three and twenty years ago, was I supposed to be a traitor to my country? Then, I was said to be a brand of sedition, because I supported the rights of America."

(Patrick Henry on the Fed. Con.)

There is nothing in public life, so universally abhorred as political inconsistency, and yet, in that regard there is nothing so unsteady as human opinion. Considered as the elasticity of politics, it is often pursued with the most bitter execration, but, unlike that virtue, in the circle where it is so much venerated, it can sin and live. There is however, this distinction to be made; whole communities may be inconsistent with impunity, but individuals at their peril. No man can employ the above language of Patrick Henry with more propriety than Governor Truitt. There can be no public career where it would be more apposite than his. In all the great questions that have agitated the Councils of America, he has invariably been found on the people's side, and therefore according to the axioms of our government, on the right side. Was he supposed to be a traitor, when so ably defending the rights of Georgia against the Yazoo speculators? Or have the people forgotten that service? "Three and twenty years ago," was he considered an enemy to the union when so warmly supporting Mr. Jefferson's administration, and contending the ground inch by inch, with the Federalists, who were striving with unexampled powers to obtain the mastery of this government. Was he rated as a mad-man when standing by and encouraging Mr. Madison in those soul-searching measures that shook the federal government to its deepest foundations, tried all its parts, disclosed all its weakness, and finally conducted it through a successful war against the combined forces of Northern Federalists and British veterans to its present proud and elevated character? If he had been a disorganizer, then was the auspicious moment to gratify that passion. If he had been a traitor, then he had a brother in every federalist, and the North would have received him with open arms. If he had been a mad-man, all New England was a bedlam and there they would have kindly ministered to his disease. Not then the republicans acknowledged that he had an "unconquerable attachment to the dearest rights of man," then, they gratefully owned "that every pulse of his heart beat for American liberty, and his enthusiasm had a counterpart in the bosom of every true American." It was only the Yazoo swindlers and traitorous federalists that called him a flame of discord, a "brand of sedition," and now that a recollection of close trying times, and his more trying services, is passing away, they are willing for purposes too well understood, to renew these charges. And the super-added infamy of treason. And it is possible that the same community, who so generously supported him, while his services were so important to them, and so dear to that very union he is now said to have assailed, will be so inconsistent as to

desert him, when with the same spirit of the war and the same zeal of republicanism, he has gallantly thrown himself between their liberties, and that deadly blow which seeks their destruction?

As the Governor of the State, I presume no one will deny, not even that ruffian who justified the English in manroving, in cold blood, his countrymen at Dartmouth prison, that it is the first duty of Gov. Truitt, to take care of the interest of his own state, manage the conflicting rights of the Union. And the best method of testing the correctness of official conduct, is to enquire what ought he to have done under the existing relations between his own and the general government? Take for example, our militia claims: should he have said, you know how much our country suffered in its early settlement, you know your constitution recognizes the principle of self preservation, you know in addition to this, you directed us to protect ourselves, you know the general government is under the solemn obligation to defray the expenses, and you further know our militia performed a faithful service; we do not demand compensation, though it is our right, but we humbly leave the matter to your most gracious sense of justice, if you "see cause," to pay us anything we will most thankfully receive it, if not, let your righteous pleasure be done, and we will be content. My God! Where is that pater-familias, hero-hearted, dastard that could have submitted to such language. Take another example and suppose for a moment, that the Governor of an independent state is seen approaching the President of the United States, with cap in hand and cringing to the earth, humbly beseeching him to recollect that some twenty three years ago, your Excellency's government purchased of Georgia all her western lands. For which, as you may be pleased to remember, she agreed to remove the Indians from without her present limits—your state is now in great need of her territory, our people are anxious to have it, they are unsettled in their present condition, permanent improvements cannot be made without it, and the state is deprived of that weight and influence in the Union which is justly due her. Will it most graciously please your Excellency to condescend to make arrangements to carry your own voluntary contract into execution, not however if it will put your government or your governments most christian and benevolent allies, the Indians, to any inconvenience? It is our bounden and cheerful duty to wait yours and their perfect pleasure; and whatever your excellency you may choose to make, on our lands, in the face of your unexampled agreement, and in violation of our greatest interests, surely we shall never be so wanting in the most profound and lowly sense of duty as to mutter a single complaint. Is this the kind of language Governor Truitt should have used? It must be this or that which he did use, for there are but the two ways to come at our rights—Now let any man choose between them, and the moment he chooses the course different from that of Governor Truitt, he shall have a right to censure and abuse him as much as he pleases, and when a majority of the State shall be found with minds of that humble cast, I affirm, that Truitt is unfit to be their Governor. In its proper place I shall offer one more example, at present I shall return to the Indian Agent, and first enquire what ought to have been done under the circumstances already shewn of his peculiar hostility to the interests of Georgia? Should Governor Truitt have remained quiet? Should he have said nothing? Ought he to have permitted this individual to go on in his own way, without a solitary step to check his infamous conduct? I presume there is not an honest man in the state who will venture to say yes, nay, I believe that Crowell's protectors themselves would hardly dare to approve such a course. Then what ought the Governor to have done?—I shall doubtless be answered that he ought to have complained to the general government of his criminal acts, and then have laid the same before his own Legislature. This is precisely what was done, and to which I shall hereafter more fully advert. After the murder of McIntosh, Crowell finding he had pushed affairs to a most frightful extremity, and had produced a crisis perhaps fatal to his own prospects, resolved upon the desperate experiment of placing the whole blame upon the shoulders of Governor Truitt. To this end then, notwithstanding the murderers themselves had repeatedly avowed that McIntosh's death was in consequence of a certain law of the nation, and have lately seriously certified the fact in Crowell's own vindication, yet this meek and modest "victim" of Governor Truitt's "persecution" lost no time in informing the President, that "all the disturbance in the nation," had originated in the desire of Governor Truitt to "survey" the Indian lands. Now I simply ask, does any one believe it? When was such a thing ever thought of, until it suddenly broke from the letter of the Secretary of War to the Governor? In what talk, in what transaction with the Indians have they ever asserted it? Will any one believe that they would avow one reason for the murder of McIntosh, and at the same time impute another secret motive for the act. The thing is preposterous. If McIntosh died by virtue of a law of his nation, surely none will be so simple as to believe that the force and effect of that law depended entirely upon Governor Truitt's operations. If he asked the survey of the lands, McIntosh was to die, if he omitted it, then McIntosh should live. I am willing to allow the Indians as much penetration as any one, but I do not believe that even General Gaines with all his boasted knowledge of Indian character will admit that they can see so far into futurity as to make laws upon such contingencies. Yet strange to tell, the President has believed it, and ordered a cessation of Governor Truitt's movements. He has taken the simple word of his own petty agent, steeped as he is in crime until it wants a name, in opposition to the statement of the Governor of Georgia, to the reason of the case, and the multiplied facts that are actually clamorous in its refutation. And yet the Governor must keep his temper—to be sure, according to John Crowell, he has been the author of a civil war among the Indians, he has been the cause of the murder of one of Georgia's best friends, and the Union's bravest warriors. He is purposely thwarted in his measures, founded on the most righteous demands that ever had an existence, and all this, to ruin his political prospects and deprive him of his office—and yet, he must say nothing, he must hold his mouth, for if he dares to speak it will be treason. If there is any man who has been more tortured in feeling, misrepresented in conduct, or outraged in character than Governor Truitt, and lives under it, he alone, by the force of contrast, can possibly appreciate the extent of his abuses.

Before I proceed to shew how the Governor's complaints against Crowell have been treated, it will be proper here to examine the other alleged ground for the murder of McIntosh. I think I have shewn that it was not in consequence of a mere request to

survey their lands, and one, which though granted, had not even been attempted to be executed. The other, to wit, that it was in pursuance of a law of the nation, will appear if possible, still more fallacious. In the first place I understand that this law is not upon record, is not even written, rests only upon uncertain tradition—the time when, and place where not made known. The Indians and their agent, when called on to show this law, or to tell when, and where it was made, design to make no other reply, than that "such is the law." But I will shew conclusively that neither the Indians nor Crowell believed there was any such law. Did not the Indians make a treaty in the year 1821, at the Indian Springs? Who was then killed for that treaty? If there was such a law how does it happen that as late as July last, at Broken Arrow, and in November following, at Polo Cat Springs, Walker, the Sub-agent tried to make the Indians pass a law precisely to the same effect, and succeeded—indeed, in obtaining one, which Crowell unequivocally informed the United States Commissioners, was of no effect, being partial, informal and irregular, was not binding upon the nation? If there was an existing law on the subject, does not every one see that Walker's law was totally unnecessary? But how comes it, if there was such a law, and known to Crowell, that as late as the fall of 1823, this very just and law-abiding gentleman could have prepared the Indians for a cession of lands to Georgia, as he most undoubtedly informed Col. Campbell at Milledgeville? How does it happen that in the face of such a law, he could write from the Indian Springs in February last, to the Secretary of War, "the treaty has not been made in conformity with the instructions of which I have been furnished, yet I think it can be at no distant day, to the entire satisfaction of the government." Does he apprise his government of such a law, and that it is the only difficulty in the way? Does he or the nation even breathe it to the Commissioners at the time of the treaty? Would the Commissioners know it and entrap the unfortunate McIntosh, be necessary to the number of one of the bravest Chiefs of Maitagee, and one of the best friends of the whites? But further, how does it happen, under the unrevoked authority of this law, the very murderers of McIntosh, and Hambley with the full power of saying yes, or nay at this very treaty, for which they have so wantonly destroyed that noble chief? No! the truth is, there was no such law, they wanted an excuse for their heinous crimes, and this is one of their miserable shifts, sometimes they allege one thing, and sometimes another, and yet the government and its officers have the audacity to believe that the community is so weak and unsuspecting they can force down any thing however absurd, upon their credulity—neither the nation, Crowell, Andrews, or Gaines believes it. If the latter does, he betrays a shortage of intellect, or pliancy of morals, rendering him an extremely unsafe depository of power, which is to be exercised under any of the ordinary rules of either common honesty or moderate judgment.

In relation to Crowell, I stated that the Governor had informed his Government, of his unjustifiable opposition to the interests of Georgia, and had communicated to the Legislature his active efforts to defeat the treaty. The President of the United States sent on a Special Agent to inquire into his conduct, of whom I shall speak hereafter. The Legislature, as admonished by duty, determined to examine into the causes which were likely to deprive the people of their land, and why this man Crowell should evince such hostility to their undoubted right. Was there any thing unreasonable in this? As the representatives of the people, chosen to watch over and protect their privileges and immunities, and informed that this individual had exerted himself to the utmost to prevent a treaty, and not yet satisfied, was attempting by means the most fraudulent and disgraceful to have it annulled, were they not bound by every principle of reason and duty to have this man removed from an office, affording so much power to injure their constituents? What was their proper course? The Legislature had as much right to inquire into the conduct of Crowell, as any individual; being a body composed of a number of members did not take from them the right of inquiry. As a body they knew, and every one must know they have the right to prefer charges, collect testimony and do whatever else is necessary to bring a United States officer to justice before the proper tribunal. To this and the Governor's communication in relation to Crowell, was referred to the committee on the state of the republic, not however without being violently opposed. And here commenced a system of opposition, and abuse of the Governor, connected with a support and protection of Crowell, exemplified in any country. And who were the protectors of this greatest enemy of Georgia, I boldly affirm them to be Clark and his political friends—Let any one look to the very first step taken, to bring Crowell before his government. Who opposed it? Let the people look at the years and nay, and they will there unequivocally find, that every man who voted to screen Crowell was the avowed personal and political friend of Clark—When the question came before the committee, every body who saw their conduct, would have believed that they had been employed as lawyers, and were acting in that capacity to defend this poor persecuted and honest Indian Agent. They made objections to every measure that was proposed, they threw every obstacle in the way of a fair investigation, they denied the right of the Legislature to have any thing to do with Crowell, approved his conduct, abused and censured the Governor, endeavored to brow-beat and embarrass innocent witnesses who were sworn on the occasion, in fine bathed and out of doors they were actively engaged, with the aid of Clark and Crowell, who were frequently seen closeted together, to defeat the views of the Legislature, and to wrest the proceedings from their scrutiny. And for all this conduct of theirs, they alleged the deceitful pretext that the Legislature had no jurisdiction over the case, they endeavored to confound the right of prosecuting Crowell with that of trying him—this last, the Legislature never claimed, they were not so ignorant of their privilege, and indeed Andrews and Clark well knew that they never contended for such a right, but they thought the people were fools enough to believe it, and they would leave nothing unattempted to protect Crowell, and thereby prostrate Truitt. The Legislature well knew that if Clark, either as Governor or as an individual, or both, could prefer charges against Mitchell to the President of the United States, and collect testimony by affidavit to support his charges, before the latter was called to a hearing, they could do the same in relation to Crowell. And pray where is the difference in the two cases? Did Clark, before he preferred his charges, either summon or go to Mitchell, and say here is a man whose affidavit I am about to take, you can have the liberty of cross examining him? Was there any such thing as "compulsory pro-

and "confronting witnesses," or any other plausible farago in Mitchell's case, until after it had got before the President, the proper tribunal for trying it? Does a prosecutor in a court of justice go to the accused and tell him, "I am now about to indict you for a crime, here is the charge, and here are the witnesses, you are at liberty to cross examine them before they go into court? Such is never done, and such would be perfect nonsense, for it would be trying the case twice; and once, of course without any possible effect. The Legislature could award no judgment, all they desired was to be supported in the charges they were about to prefer to the President.—It would have been vain and idle to have gone before him without preparation, and until they knew the nature and extent of the evidence it was perfectly useless to prefer their charges. Therefore, I maintain Crowell had nothing to do with their investigation. It was time enough for him, when informed by the President that he was accused, and that the accusation was sufficiently founded to put him upon trial, to have an opportunity of "confronting witnesses" and "obtaining compulsory process."—This was the precise course pursued by Clark against Mitchell, and surely no one will deny to the Legislature the same right. And as to publishing the testimony in newspapers, surely no one will imagine, that the President who alone determines the case, is like a petty jury, easily influenced by such a step. Does not every one see the reason of this opposition to Troop and protection of Crowell? If Crowell can be sustained, if the treaty can be defeated, if the Governor can be thwarted in all his measures, however intended for the public good, and calculated to subserve the people's interest, it will destroy his popularity and make way for the success of his artful competitor.

ATTICUS.

...on 'conflicting evidence' ...