EASTON GAZETTE.

WHERE THE PRESS IS FREE—"Literature, well or ill-conducted, is the Great Engine by which all Popular States must ultimately be supported or overthrown:" Religion purifies the Heart and teaches us our Duty—Morality refines the Manners—Agriculture makes us rich—and Politics provides for the enjoyment of all.

VOL. X. EASTON, (MD.) SATURDAY EVENING, SEPTEMBER 1, 1827. NO. 34.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED
EVERY SATURDAY EVENING BY
ALEXANDER GRAHAM,

At Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum payable half yearly in advance.

Advertisements not exceeding a square inserted three times for One Dollar, and twenty-five cents for every subsequent insertion.

From the National Journal.

'VINDICATION OF GEN. JACKSON.'

The Kentucky Gazette of the 3d ult. contains a letter from Gen. Jackson addressed to 'William Owens,' and purporting to be a reply to that gentleman's inquiries, 'in regard to the case of Harris and the other five militia men who were executed at Mobile.' The friends of the General, and more particularly the committee of Safety at Nashville, are really to be commiserated, that they have not sufficient influence over the General to prevent his taking up the pen He has never yet written a line for the public that did not add tenfold labor to the truly Sysiphean task of defending him.

In his present production, the General has given no new facts, nor adduced a single exculpatory circumstance. The chief object of the letter seems to have been to show, *by argument*, that the letter first published by Binns, editor of the Democratic Press, purporting to be a letter from the unfortunate Harris,' was not written by Harris. The General tells us, that this letter 'is well ascertained to be a forgery.' *How* it has been so 'well ascertained,' he does not condescend to say; but we may take it for granted that he refers to the *assertions* to that effect of his friends Duff Green and J. C. Isaacs, both of whom have so pronounced it. That Harris *did write* a letter to General Jackson, while under sentence of death, the General himself admits; but in that letter, says the General, 'he acknowledged himself to be guilty of the *enormous* crimes charged against him, and stated his *willingness* to meet the just sentence of the Court.' The production of this letter would have been worth all the assertions and arguments that boldness and ingenuity could devise to prove the 'Binns letter' a *forgery*. Why is it not produced?

Harris, in his defence before the Court declares, that he is *unconscious* of having committed *any crime*. How came he afterwards to make a confession of *guilt*.—Did Gen. Jackson seek to have it extorted from him, that it might be used, as it is now used, in justification of the *execution?* If the testimony which has been published in the case is to be credited, Harris was really not guilty of 'the enormous crimes charged against him.' He must, then, have had some powerful motive, some strong inducement, for confessing guilt, and acknowledging the justice of his sentence. What was this inducement? Was a promise of pardon held out to him? If so, how infinitely more cruel must appear his execution. At all events, the production of the letter itself, making the alledged confession, would be the best possible proof that Harris did not write the supplicatory epistle "first published by Binns." If the letter, like that addressed by Mr. Buchanan to a certain Editor here on the 16th October last, has been 'mislaid,' at least we might have expected of the General to remember enough of its contents to be able to tell us, on what occasion, or for what purpose, it was written. For, if Harris really felt himself guilty, and had no other object in his confession, than the fulfilment of a religious duty, and of unburthening his conscience, we can hardly believe that he would have selected Gen. Jackson, who was '300 miles off,' as the depository of his penitential acknowledgements. He would have seized the occasion when the assembled army was drawn up to witness his execution; then and there he would have confessed his guilt, that no imputation might rest upon his judges or executioners.

If Harris' letter to the General was really a mere letter of confession, and can be produced, why did the General think it necessary to resort to argument to show that the 'Binns letter' was a forgery? If, on the other hand, he means to rest the qestion of *fact*, as to Harris's having written such a letter, upon the argument which he brings forward, it will be no difficult matter to show the weakness of that argument, and the possibility that Harris might have written it. The General's argument is, that at the date of the 'Binns letter,' the 15th January, Harris could not have heard of the victory of the 8th, of which the letter speaks, because General Winchester does not mention it in any of his letters previous to the 17th. Now, there never was a more palpable *nonsequitur*. Official intelligence, it is well known, always travels much more slowly than rumor. The regular mail between New Orleans and Mobile, at the period we speak of, was not perhaps, interchanged more than once a week. It is not probable that General Winchester would write to General Jackson of the victory, until he had received the official accounts. But Harris had a son in the battle: he would not have waited for the regular mail to convey the 'glorious news' to his father, particularly as the splendid and decisive character of the victory offered to that father, who was under sentence of death, so fair an occasion to plead for mercy from the victorious General.—The distance between the two points is only about two hundred and sixty miles, so that, travelling at the moderate rate of 37 miles a day, intelligence might easily have reached Mobile on the 15th; and, under the circumstances, it was neither 'impossible' nor 'strange,' that Harris, though 'closely confined in jail,' should bear the news sooner than General Winchester, though 'the commandant of that post.'

But enough of this 'Binns letter!' for whether real or forged, it does not at all affect the main question of Gen. Jackson's cruel, illegal, unnecessary execution of 'Harris and the other five militia men.' I should not have dwelt upon it a moment, had not General Jackson himself chosen to trust to argument to disprove its authenticity.

The General tells his correspondent, that,—The regiment to which these unfortunate men belonged, was received into "service by the orders of the General Government, was mustered for six month's "tour, and was paid accordingly." We pray the reader to mark the studied ambiguity of this language. The regiment "was *received into the service* by the orders of the General Government!" This was never doubted. But who that reads this equivocal phraseology, would not infer that it "was *mustered for a six month's* tour," also, 'by the orders of the General Government?' It is plain that General Jackson intended this inference to be drawn, though *he knew it to be untrue*. It is impossible he could have forgotten, while he was penning this letter, that the Governor of Tennessee, under whose authority he was acting, had received positive instruction from the President of the United States, through the Secretary of War, to consider his militia drafts as called out under the law of 1795, which limited their term of service to *three* months—that the Governor had communicated those instructions to him—and that he himself in his correspondence with the War Department, had admitted his knowledge of the fact, as well as that the militia themselves, under his command, all believed that they could not legally be held in service longer than three months. Where are 'the orders of the General Government,' by which these men were mustered for a six months' tour?' If any such orders were ever given, it must be in the power of General Jackson to produce them; for if they were not addressed directly to him, a copy of them must have been furnished to him by Governor Blount. *Without such orders*, if he had ever looked at the law, which it was his duty to do, he must have known, that neither he, nor the Governor under whose appointment he acted, had any right to muster the militia for more than a 'three months' tour'

But what is not a little extraordinary in this letter, the General seems to have thought it wholly unnecessary for him to look at all into the law, or the facts, in relation to this unfortunate draft of militia. Contrary to his usual wont—as witness the case of *Ambrister*—he seems to have considered himself as bound to pay the most respectful deference to the opinion of the court martial in this case. He says: "That *the finding of the court proves conclusively* that these men were *legally in service*—or, otherwise, that they must have been acquitted.' As coming from Gen. Jackson, this idea is truly wonderful. *He* a *Lawyer* by profession who had sat on the bench as a Judge, the commander-in-chief of the army, *himself* orders the arrest of the men; orders, and partly appoints a court to try them, composed of his subordinates, of officers who look up to him as the sole authority by which they act, and who, of course, regard his orders as their rule of action: he, I say, regards the finding of such a court, as conclusive proof, that the men whom he ordered to be tried, were legally tried, and legally condemned! Why, from the very fact that the commanding General ordered these men to be arrested and tried for desertion and mutiny, the court had a right to conclude that he had authority for so doing, and that they had nothing to do with the primary question of the length of time for which they were 'mustered into service.' If any other proof could have been adduced that the "men were legally in service.' General Jackson surely would not have relied upon 'the finding of the court.'

The General again repeats in this letter, though with an abatement, what he had before affirmed to his Baltimore correspondent, namely, that 'the proceedings and sentence of the court martial detailed for the trial, and all the circumstances connected with the subject, are, or ought to be, on record at Washington City.' Unless the General had 'well ascertained' that the proceedings here spoken of, 'are' not 'on record' in the proper department, why does he add the qualifying clause 'or ought to be.' And if they 'ought to be,' why 'are' they not 'on record?' The articles of war are clear and explicit on the subject. They make it the duty of every Judge Advocate of a general court martial to transmit 'the original proceedings and sentence of such court martial, to the Secretary of War.' It was the duty of the commanding General to see that his officers obeyed the articles of war. If they were not obeyed in this instance, General Jackson is himself responsible for the disobedience. If they were obeyed, then, of course, 'the original proceedings' must have been 'on record' in the War Department, and the General perhaps, will be able to explain why they 'are' not there now, and how it happened that these identical 'original proceedings' came to be in the hands of his adopted son, as his own certificate states they were, when the Nashville Committee published their first Bulletin in vindication of the General. There is still a mystery in the history of these 'original proceedings,' which we doubt whether any body can so well unravel as the General himself.

The sycophants who surround General Jackson, and who do not blush to calumniate the illustrious dead as well as the living in order to minister to the vanity of their idol have so often compared him to the father of his country, that even the General himself, absurd and preposterous as is the notion, seems at last to fancy himself 'a *second Washington*;' and attempts to justify his acts of cruelty by falsely ascribing to that great man the same thirst of blood! In the Postcript to his letter, he thus irreverently sacrifices the truth of history to the interested and unsupported assertions of his own partisans:

"P. S. It will be recollected, in the Revolutionary war, at a time of great trial, General Washington ordered deserters to be shot without trial. Capt. Reed, under this order, having arrested three, had one shot without trial, and his head brought to the General; but he, General Washington, reprimanded Reed for not shooting the whole three."

Now mark how History speaks of this affair, in the person of an eye and ear-witness to all that passed:

'The army was posted on the Hudson above West Point; it was just before we stormed Stoney Point. Col. Lee was sitting at a table writing. An officer came in and reported that more of the men had deserted across the line to the enemy. Col. Lee, (the celebrated commander of the Virginia Legion,) without an instant's hesitation, or withdrawing the pen from the paper, gave the orders 'to shoot every man that was detected deserting to the enemy, and send their heads to head quarters.' The order was given to Lieut. Reed, who was in command of the advance guard; the same Gen. Reed who commanded in the battle in which Sir Peter Parker was killed in the late war, and is now living on the Eastern Shore of this State.—The order was issued but a short time before three men were detected in the act of deserting, pursued, taken close to the enemy's line, and brought in. Reed, observed, that according to orders, he ought to execute all three of them, but that he would not do so. He would make an example of one of them. I think, on examination, it appeared that one of them was a German, one a Frenchman, and the other an American Reed inquired which of the three should die? It was unanimously agreed that it should be the American. In him the atrocity was the most aggravated, because it was his native country he was deserting—he was shot. His head was cut off and sent to head-quarters, agreeably to orders. But *no man could be more mortified or provoked than Gen. Washington was at the sight. So far from countenancing such a proceeding for one instant Col Lee was immediately arrested, and tried for his conduct, and it was with extreme difficuly, indeed, popular as that officer deservedly stood with the army that he was preserved from being broke for the offence.*'

This is the statement of Col. *William Dent Beall*, of Maryland, who was then a captain in Washington's army, and the immediate commander of Lieutenant Reed, to whom Lee's order was given. Those who know Col. Beall, know that his veracity never was questioned; that no man living more piously venerates truth and honor, and that he never would have given this minute detail of the case if he did not, as he says, 'remember it as well as if it had occurred within the last hour.'

But suppose it to be true, that Gen. 'Washington ordered deserters to be shot without trial?' How does that excuse General Jackson for ordering men to be shot who were not 'deserters?'—Harris and his five associates were free citizens, who had faithfully served their legal tour of duty, three months. They had then gone home, not 'over to the enemy"—were brought back by the strong arm of power, kept in irons for sixty days or more, and afterwards deliberately murdered, not 'without trial,' indeed, but in violation of justice, humanity and law. The man who was shot by Reed, was 'detected in the act of deserting, pursued, taken close to the enemy's line, and brought in.' Where, I ask, is the parallel? No. If General Jackson relies for his justification upon the supposed resemblance of his conduct to that of Washington, he must procure some new history of the Revolution to be written by one of his own biographers. An ingenious writer, having no other object than to flatter him, and unrestrained by the trammels of historical truth, might do much towards completing the picture of 'a second Washington;' but while our present histories maintain their ground, the first Washington must stand unapproached and unapproachable by this "counterfeit presentment."

There is one sentiment, however, in the General's letter, which excites our unqualified approbation. It is the sentiment of true honor, as well as of christian charity. But we marvel much that, while penning it, it did not occur to the General, that he was uttering the most severe invective against himself. Referring to Mr Buckner, he says—"As a public or private man, speaking of transactions which concern the reputation and character of others, every manly feeling should remind him, that he ought to be guided by established facts, "not by the hearsay of a party." Could there be a more pointed philippic against the "fireside" communications of the General to his friend Carter Beverley and others? Was he "guided by established facts," while he was thus secretly endeavouring to tarnish "the reputation and character" of Mr. Clay and his friends; or was he 'guided' by the "hearsay of a party,' and by a misrepresentation, too, even of that "*hearsay?*" If the General could only have turned his eyes inwardly at the moment, how great must have been his shock at the discovery that he was so keenly satirizing himself in his advice to Mr. Buckner. TRUTH

REMARKABLE CASE OF ENORMOUS OBESITY.

The following is an abstract of the history of a case of enormous obesity, which affords some curious and interesting physiological facts, and may serve to warn folks of the danger of excessive eating.

Krocker (of Berlin)—for that was the fellow's name, did not, like Bright, Ahrens, Clay, and other truly great personages, signalize himself much in his youth, but was content to eat and drink the same quantity of food as his neighbours About the age of thirty he began to give way to a disposition to devour immense masses of meat, and the more he ate, the more his appetite increased, until his time was consumed in little else than eating and sleeping.—His occupation was that of a butcher, and animal food was his favourite repast, contrary to the usual habits of such people.—Krocker, however, would devour from eight to ten pounds of tripe at a meal, or from six to seven pounds of beef and sausages. He continued in this way to stuff himself, gradually becoming fatter, until it required *sixteen pounds* of beef daily to satisfy his hunger! For a bet he has frequently devoured the *boiled flesh of an entire calf* in a day, seasoned only with salt, in the presence of many persons; and on one occasion he declared himself ready to attack a second, but could get no body to bet against him. He could not trust himself in the sausage manufactory, as he would eat the minced meat by the pound, spreading it over bread with as little ceremony as the people spread treacle. By way of breakfast, or supper, he would clean from two to three dozen of the petitoes of pigs; and it appears, at last, to have puzzled his friends to know how to supply him. His usual drink was beer, of which he daily drank from two to three quarts. In this way he continued to feed himself, gradually increasing in bulk, his breathing becoming daily more difficult, and his power of locomotion daily diminishing, until he was at last obliged to confine himself to his large chair and his bed. Every now and then he was in great danger of suffocation; and it was on one of those occasions that Graefe, who has related the case in one of the recent numbers of his journal, was called to him.

He found the man stretched out upon a bed; complaining of a very difficult respiration, to such an extent, as to express his fear of being absolutely choaked. His lips were of a dull violet colour, his eyes appearing to start from his head, the conjunctival lining being of a bright red colour; the entire countenance was of a dark crimson; and the pulse was tremulous, irregular, and frequently intermittent. He complained also of great palpitation of the heart; although, from the immense projection of the abdomen, and the huge pendulous breasts, it was impossible to bring the hand upon the part of the chest covering it. He could only speak at intervals, and that with great difficulty. The abdomen protruded, so as to cover the upper half of the thighs; and on several parts of its immensely distended surface were round reddish spots, of about the fourth of an inch, in diameter, hard and painful to the touch somewhat resembling small lipoma or fatty tumours. Although the chamber in which he lay was kept very clean, and his linen frequently changed, the odour exhaled was exceedingly offensive, and resembled much the smell of a dissecting room, or a butcher's shop on the evening of a hot day.—Krocker was five feet four inches high; the circumference of his abdomen was five feet five inches; the circumference of his thigh two feet four inches; of the calf of his leg one foot seven inches; his breasts measured one foot eight inches in circumference at their bases, and were eight inches long, being almost as pendulous as those of the Hottentot women. His weight, at the time he was put under Graefe's care, was about 400 lbs. but immense as this weight may appear other instances are on record of those who have exceeded it. The fat man of Leewarden, who was exhibited before the medical faculty of Leyden, and taken about from place to place in Holland in a boat as a show, weighed 503; the woman whose history is given by Gunz, weighed 492 pounds Ahrens 450, and our countryman, Edward Bright, the fat man of Essex, as he was commonly called, weighed 616 pounds.

This patient, Krocker, was rescued from his immediate danger by copious and frequent bleeding, by large doses of calomel, and the substitution of fasting for his enormous stuffing. Purgative medicines were frequently given, a strictly vegetable diet and vegetable acids, were ordered; and, in about four weeks, he was reduced to about 316 pounds. In the space of four months, during the half of which time he took large doses of iodine, with occasional purgatives, the iodine being found very much to accelerate absorption, he was reduced to about 267 pounds, and enjoyed good health; was active, cheerful, and able to resume his former business. At the time the history of the case was concluded (August 10, 1826,) he was reduced to 209 pounds, his health being good, and his appetite moderate.—*Lancet.*

From the Middletown, (Con.) Gazette.

A ROLAND FOR AN OLIVER.

A few years since, a man living in an adjacent town, had occasion to transact some business at Canton, and as he was an excellent pedestrian, he determined to walk. He arrived at Farmington, about 11 o'clock, and called for a luncheon. The landlord set before him a mug of cider, & some bread and cheese. After despatching his frugal meal, he asked the price, & was told it was 25 cents. Our traveller was astonished at the exhorbitancy of the demand, and protested against the payment.

'Why,' said the landlord, 'if a man calls for a dinner, he pays a quarter of a dollar, and luncheon is the same.'

'Very good Mr Boniface,' said the pedestrian, 'I'll pay you your bill, but believe me, when I assure you that I will requite your kindness before many days.'

The traveller left Canton on the following morning, having his scheme of revenge well matured. He ate no breakfast, but drank bitters enough to create a most ravenous appetite; and by the time he reached Farmington, which was about one o'clock, he was prepared to swallow any thing edible. He desired the landlord who did not recognise him, to prepare dinner as speedily as possible. Boniface informed him that four of the selectmen were to dine with him that day, and he had accordingly served up a nice pig, but as they would be unable to eat the whole of him, if he would carve handsomely, he might make his dinner out of the porker. He, nothing loth, sat down, and in the space of 30 minutes, managed to strip every bone, and devour the whole pig. He then called in the landlord, and requested to know how much he had to pay.

'Twenty five cents, I 'spose,' replied the publican, with a most rueful elongation of visage; 'but I gave *four and six-pence* for the pig.'

ROCKVILLE, (Canada,) July 30.

The Tailor is worthy of his hire.—Last week, a Coat was made in this place by Mr. O. W. Stevens, and curiosity prompted one who was present to ascertain the number of stitches taken in making the garment, by counting.—They were as follows:—Basting, 890—Felling 3005—Stitching, 7582—Seaming, 2823—Rantering, 843—Sowing, 980—Surging 991—Tacking, 235—Back and Fore Stitch, 682—Padding, 2074—Staying, 383—Setting on Buttons, 99—Button Hole Stitch, 446—Total, 20,983. Making about 18 stitches for a farthing, exclusive to the time required for sponging, cutting, and other preparatory and finishing labours.

EXTRAORDINARY BIRTHS.

A lady, the wife of Mr. John Kelly, now residing in Wolf creek township, in this county, (Mercer Penn.) recently from Ireland, yesterday had *five* living children at one birth! They all died shortly after, as we are informed by the physician who attended her. Previous to her leaving Ireland, this same lady had *two* at once: and on her way hither, while in the state of New York, she had also *five* at one birth—making, in all *twelve* children, within about 18 months. All these births were premature. The lady and her husband are healthy, fresh, young looking people, and only two years married.—*Press.*

Breaking into Jail.—The breaking of jail is usually a breaking *out*, but we have before us an instance of breaking *in*. At York, Upper Canada, a person recently broke *into* jail; but, after laying his hands on $365 public cash, he took it into his head to vanish, and has not since been heard of.

It was lately announced in a Philadelphia paper that Th. J. Randolph executor of Mr. Jefferson, had been offered by a gentleman of Boston $100,000 for the manuscripts of his testator. We are authorised to contradict the statement, and moreover, to say that no offer whatever either from Boston or elsewhere, has been made for them.

Virginia Advocate.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11029-0558.jpg