

## To the Citizens of Columbia County.

As a citizen of Columbia, feeling with you a community of interest in the public concerns of the county, it is a right, which I, in common with every other citizen possess, to repel any attempt which a stranger may make, to control our county affairs—then, in the legitimate exercise of this right, I solicit your attention, whilst I expose the officious intermeddling with our concerns, of a certain writer in the Columbia Centinel of the 21st July last, who signs himself Atticus. This anonymous interloper, living, as he does, in a distant county, has presumed to publish a piece in his chosen organ, and which has since been printed in handbills, and numbers of them distributed among us, the chief and manifest purpose of which was to injure your Representatives at the next election; to subvert the interest of their opponents, and especially to promote the views of Mr. Crawford. Surely, when you perceive that a stranger has been enlisted into the ranks of opposition, for the purpose of drilling you into a systematic warfare against every principle and policy, that does not tend to give them predominance in the councils of the state, the control of elections, and enable them to monopolize all honors and offices; surely, when you perceive this, honest patriotism and honorable pride will cause you to despise the duplicity, and to spurn the officious interference of a stranger with our business, which does not belong to him. Who is this Atticus, who takes it upon himself to lecture you concerning your own affairs, as though you were not competent to manage them without the light of his wisdom? If report be true, he formerly (under a different name) wrote in the Augusta Herald, in support of doctrines very different from those he advocates now. He is the same Atticus, who, preceding the Presidential election, when the people were weighing the merits of the different candidates, placed himself in the scale of William H. Crawford, and thereby made it lighter.—The same who, previous to the election of Governor, in attempting to write another into office, wrote himself out, and who bids fair to keep himself out by the same means.—The same, too, who, ever since he lost his election, has been abusing those who felt it their duty to elect a better man, Judge, and who has been spouting abuse against the General Government, and at last, descending from his high calling, has turned his particular attention to the affairs of the people of Columbia county.

To take a correct view of this subject, it is necessary to make a few preliminary remarks. At the last session of the Legislature, Mr. Pettit introduced two Bills, one to divide the county of Columbia into Electoral Districts, the other to compensate Petit Jurors; both of which were zealously supported by Burnside and Collins, and as zealously opposed by Mr. Crawford. The people living in the upper section of the county, at so inconvenient a distance from the Court House, very much desired an Electoral District in their quarter; this was known to Mr. Crawford, and he electioneered among them, by promising to advocate a Bill in the Legislature to give them that privilege, should he be elected; and, confiding in his promise, many voted for him. The Bill passed the House of Representatives, and was sent to the Senate. Mr. Crawford there opposed it, by offering a substitute, different in its important provisions from the Bill, and which failed.—After the substitute was rejected in the Senate, and the final vote was taken on the Bill as it passed the other House, Mr. Crawford, though sitting in his place, refused to vote at all; nor is his name to be found among the voters.—(Journal Senate, page 139.) Why act thus? Either he thought the Bill ought to pass, or he thought it ought not. If he thought the Bill ought to pass, it was criminal in him not to vote for it; if he thought it ought not to pass, both his duty and his oath required him to vote against it. Did Mr. Crawford act thus, because he knew the measure was popular among his constituents, and therefore he did not wish his name to be seen in the Journals against it; yet, being himself opposed to it, withheld from it the support of his vote? The Bill passed into a law without Mr. Crawford's vote, and has been generally acceptable to the people interested; none have complained against it; therefore, in opposing the Bill, Mr. Crawford opposed the known will of his constituents, in disregard of his promise to them, made previous to the election.

The people in the upper part of the county once before petitioned the Legislature for an Electoral District. Mr. Crawford then promised them to support it, and they confided in his promise. The petition was read in the Senate; submitted to a Committee, who reported a Bill, in accordance with the petition; the Bill was read, and was progressing on the full tide of success, when Mr. Crawford, forgetting or disregarding his promise, fixed a Resolution to withdraw the petition and Bill; and on his motion they were withdrawn. This may be seen in the Journal of the Senate of 1820, page 46. There are but few who read the Journals, and many are ignorant, to this day, of the cause of the failure of their petition; little suspecting that Mr. Crawford himself, so far from supporting it, as he promised, did, by his own voluntary act, completely defeat it. The proof of this does not rest on my word; the Journal itself holds the proof; and it is believed, were it necessary, other evidence of the fact could be adduced. When Mr. Crawford came home that year, he told his constituents a fair story, and many believed him without searching for themselves; and, perhaps, his delinquency had not been thus publicly brought to light, but for this recurrence of it. Mr. Crawford also opposed the Petit Jury Bill, as may be seen in the Journal of the Senate, pages 211, 245, 246, 252, 256. It is true, he voted for an amendment, which was offered in lieu of the first section; but this amendment proposed paying Jurors from the County funds, provided the Judges of the Interior Court

should be willing, and there should be any funds belonging to the county; whereas, the original Bill set apart a particular and certain sum, to be taken from the Treasury of the State; and every section was formed upon this principle; the amendment, therefore, was incompatible with every section of the Bill; and as it was to take place of the first section, but to alter no other, it follows, of course, that had it been adopted, and the Bill passed in that shape, the law could not have been carried into effect; for, as the first section, as it was amended, said the money should come from the County funds, and every other section said it should come from the Treasury of the State, it contradicted itself—it was a mere nullity. The Bill, as it was amended, had neither consistency nor reason; it contained within itself the principle of its own destruction. Could Mr. Crawford have entertained a rational expectation, that the Legislature would have sanctioned a measure so absurdly contradictory? If he did not hope so, then the amendment was got up as a stumbling block to the Bill; or, if he did hope the amendment would be accepted, it was hoping for that which would have defeated the measure altogether. Besides, the amendment did not secure a compensation to Jurors; whether or not they would receive any thing, was made to depend on contingencies, which might seldom or never happen, viz: upon the will and pleasure of the Judges of the Interior Court, and upon the circumstance of the counties having more money in their Treasuries than they needed for other purposes. If the compensation of Jurors had been made to depend on the will of the Judges, according to the amendment, then Jurors in some counties would be compensated, and in others they would not. Even in the same county, Jurors would or would not be compensated, as the opinion of the Judges might change, or as the Judicial office might be filled by other men as vacancies might happen, or at regular elections. This would have been converting Judges into Legislators, and destroying the hope of compensation from the money which is under the control of the Legislature, and which cohabitant, and offering the forlorn hope of pay, from the money under the control of the Judges, which is seldom enough for county purposes.—So that, if there happened to be no county funds to spare, Jurors, according to Mr. Crawford's amendment, were to receive no pay. Counties have need of all the money they receive for county purposes, building bridges, supporting the poor, &c; and frequently, the ordinary income of the County Treasury is not sufficient to defray the ordinary expenditures, and an extra tax has to be resorted to; so that, after all the necessary expenses are paid, there would be seldom or never any thing left to pay Jurors. There is another view of the subject, which is alone sufficient to convince any impartial mind, that Mr. Crawford, in advocating the amendment, intended to prevent Jurors from being compensated on any terms. He says, in his Circular, that there are forty-one poor counties that do not pay taxes enough to pay their own members to the Legislature, and of course have nothing to pay Jurors; there are sixty-five counties, and each county has one Senator; then the Senators from the forty-one poor counties form a majority of the Senate, and could defeat any measure. Mr. Crawford must have foreseen, that the Senators from the poor counties would have voted against his amendment, to pay Jurors from the County funds, as these poor counties had little or no funds from which to pay Jurors, and, consequently, the amendment was against the forty-one poor counties, and in favor of the twenty-four rich counties, which, he says, are able to pay Jurors. I appeal to the impartial judgment of my readers, and ask him, in the spirit of candor, if Mr. Crawford really thought there were forty-one counties in the State that could not pay Jurors, and only twenty-four able to do it, could he have expected or intended by his amendment to compensate Jurors, seeing that a majority of the Senate from the poor counties would defeat it, as it was against the interest of their counties; because, under its provisions, their Jurors could not be compensated, and none but the twenty-four rich counties could be benefited by it? In the above argument, I have taken Mr. Crawford and Atticus upon their own ground, as it was fair to do; but I shall hereafter shew, that the division they have made of the rich and poor counties is altogether fallacious. Taking this view of the subject, many believe the amendment was intended to destroy the Bill, and that Mr. Crawford was opposed to such a Bill in any practicable shape; especially as he, after the amendment was lost, voted against the Bill, without any effort in favor of compensating Jurors on any terms.

This conduct of Mr. Crawford, thus opposing the known will of his constituents, (and that, too, when, as in the instance of the Electoral District, he was under a direct promise to respect it,) was calculated to injure him in their estimation, and it was not long after his return home before he found his popularity in its wane. Then, for the purpose of turning the blame from himself upon others, he makes a violent attack upon the characters of our Representatives, and particularly upon Mr. Pettit; not forgetting to give a parting curse to Mr. Foster, his opponent for the Senate.—Although it would be an easy task to shew that Mr. Crawford's statements contradict each other; are contradicted by the Journals and other official records, and disprove the conclusions which he has drawn from them, I shall not further attempt it, as those he has assailed will make their own defence. I shall content myself with taking Atticus in hand. Yet, it will be impossible to consider the statements of Atticus, without taking those of Mr. Crawford into view, they being similar. It is proper, however, to premise, that Mr. Crawford's piece was written in the form of a Circular, beginning "Dear Sir," but addressed to no particular person, and numbers of them sent throughout the county, and placed in the hands of Mr. Crawford's partisans, and read to those

persons thought to be in favor of the reelection of those elected last year, and whose opinions and votes; it was hoped, might be changed; but carefully kept from the view of the persons assailed, and their warm friends, whom they despaired of moving. In consequence of this course, though it was long known that Mr. Crawford had made an attack upon the opposing candidates, the specific charges could not be ascertained; those persons holding these circulars when they were applied to for one of them or a copy, gave what seemed to be a preconcerted excuse, that they were "private correspondents." It was in vain the injured party complained of being thus assailed all over the county, under the cloak of private correspondence, and not permitted to see the charges made against them.

At length, after the circulars had been going the rounds some weeks, one of them fell into the hands of a person, who not choosing to be made instrumental in stabbing the characters of others in the dark, and not permit them to see the weapon that inflicted the wound, was requested that a copy might be taken, and the request was granted. About this time, Atticus published his piece in an Athens paper, which is so much like that of Mr. Crawford, indeed, being the mere echo of it, we cannot resist the belief, that he had before him one of the circulars; it was no doubt intended, the publication of Atticus should follow that of Mr. Crawford; and support it under the belief, that a learned Judge said the same thing which Mr. Crawford had said, the people would believe he must be right, and your Representatives wrong, and guilty of all they were charged with, and consequently ought not to be re-elected, but that Mr. Crawford was deserving all support. That this was the object, cannot be doubted, when it is recollected that Atticus makes a direct attack upon the Petit Jury bill, and those of our members supported it in the Legislature, upon the very same ground which Mr. Crawford had previously taken.—That two men should draw the same conclusions from the same facts, is not surprising; but that men living at a distance, should take the same time and subject, and draw up the same order of statements, not only erroneous, but contradicted by the very authority on which they rely; use the same arguments, not warranted by their statements, and draw the same conclusions, at variance, both with their statements and arguments; that men should do this, without having a common purpose, and some secret intelligence and concert of action with each other, either direct or by means of partisans, is not to be believed even by credulity itself; such complicated coincidences never happen but by design. The jackals of fiction catering for slander in the kennels of corruption, supply themselves with the secret circular, and other food of the kind, and deposit their acquisition, an acceptable contribution, upon the desk of Atticus, to be cooked up in his style, and sent back to Columbia for home consumption. Indeed, while copying the above, for the purpose of sending it to the press, I have been informed that Mr. Crawford has lately acknowledged in public, that he sent the documents to Atticus, on which his piece is founded; thus he stands self convicted of employing a stranger to write in the newspapers against particular individuals, for the purpose of controlling the election in a county, of which he is not an inhabitant. Why Mr. Crawford should have made this confession, I cannot comprehend, unless it was to appropriate to himself the eulogy of Atticus, who says he received the documents "through the agency of a very intelligent and vigilant public servant." It is true he is very vigilant in electioneering at the present time; but as for his intelligence, let his circular speak, either with regard to its statements or its style, the first contradicted by indubious facts, recorded in the archives of the state, and of long notoriety; the last, violating the plainest rules of grammar, almost in every line, and alike vulgar in phrase and abusive in epithet.

WARREN.

[To be continued.]