# NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER,

AND

# WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

*Vol. III.* WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. *No. CCCCLVI.*

*Five Dolls. Per ann.* FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 23rd, 1803. *Paid in advance.*


## NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

The following interesting production has been occasioned by the impending election in Connecticut. It presents a bold sketch of federal, contrasted with republican principles and measures. By reminding the citizen of past danger, it is admirably calculated to awaken him to present vigilance. The sentiments, the facts, the reasoning, are truly American, and, for the most part, as well fitted to the meridian of Maryland as Connecticut. To the citizens of Maryland, about to enjoy the sacred right of suffrage, we strongly recommend them.

*From the American Mercury.*

### REPUBLICAN ADDRESS,

To the freemen of Connecticut.

*Fellow Citizens,*

The general committee of the republicans of Connecticut solicit your candid attention to the political dissensions which at present agitate this state, a subject highly interesting to every man of you who loves peace and liberty.

On this subject you have been addressed by a number of federalists, convened, at Hartford on the 31st of May last.

We would deem it a misapplication of time and a departure from the true dignity of serious discussion, to notice what is exceptionable in that address, for our object is not to prove that the address is deficient in candor and truth, but to prove that the mass of citizens, of all parties, have an inestimable common interest, in the protection of which it behoves them to unite; and to prove also, that federalism is a dereliction of that common interest, a base betraying of it into the hands of its enemies. We speak here of the federalism of leaders; for we know full well that the federalism of those who lead is one thing, and of those who follow is another, and a very different thing.

The federalists, in their address, observe, that the origin of the dissentions which disturb the tranquility of this state, is "so well known that it cannot be necessary at this time to examine or explain it." We think otherwise. We believe that the great body of citizens of both political parties, have the same interests, the same principles, and the same general views, with regard to the means of promoting their prosperity, & of protecting their liberty. We believe therefore, that so far as dissentions do prevail, they must be the offspring of misinformation, of mistake; and that, to put an end to those dissensions among that mass of citizens who have no private views, no particular interests hostile to the common-weal, nothing more is necessary than a true, a full understanding of the origin of those dissentions.

Are the real interests of that class of our fellow-citizens who are stiled federal, hostile to or different from the interests of republicans? Has nature, or has accident adapted one kind of happiness to one political sect, and a different kind of happiness to a different sect? An opinion like this is as absurd as dangerous; for however the arts of plausible ambition, of skilful wickedness, by exciting and misguiding the zeal of uninformed and unsuspecting integrity, may have been able to array citizen against citizen, neighbor against neighbor, and to plant distrust and hatred where confidence and friendship ought to grow, still it will remain an unchangeable truth, that republicans and federalists must be freemen or slaves, happy or wretched, together.

Far then from us be rancour and every passion, while we make to our fellow-citizens a candid exposition of our view of the origin of the dissensions that now exist in this state, of those essential principles of government, in which the theories of leading federalists differ from those of the republicans, and of the opposing systems of public measures advocated and pursued by the parties respectively. If in the course of this exposition we shall find ourselves under the necessity of animadverting with severity on the conduct and views of men opposed to us, let it not be said that we have violated the rule we have prescribed to ourselves, that we permit passion to make us unjust! No, we will endeavour to be strictly just, and as we will set down nought in malice, so we will extenuate nothing. We will speak to our fellow-citizens with the plainness which belongs to truth. In an honest and ardent pursuit of those inestimable objects, public peace and liberty, we will not pause to calculate the importance to ourselves individually of the love or the hatred of the enemies of public peace and liberty.

History teaches us these interesting facts, that from the remotest ages, a few men in every nation have had the address to make the multitude their property, that the only intelligible distinctions that have been known among men have been those of master and slave; that the dark annals of despotism have been interrupted and enlightened by some gleams of liberty, by some noble struggles of oppressed man to break his chains, and to assume that dignified station from which he had been long degraded; that the success of these struggles has ever been of short duration; that though man has been found invincible when struggling for his liberty, yet that he has never been found competent to its protection; but that ambition and cunning have always succeeded, sooner or later, in persuading the simple, unsuspecting sons of freedom to assist in riveting their chains anew; that those short periods of liberty have indeed exhibited illustrious samples of genius, of energy & of virtue, to which degraded and enslaved man can never attain; but that in the long, dark night of despotism, these, like the bright coruscations of a meteor, have only served to give a more forcible perception of the deep gloom that was spread over the world.

From these facts, which are controverted by none, men have deduced various theories, conformed to their various wishes.—The lovers of liberty, the true friends of man have, in every case, seen freedom subverted by circumstances peculiar to each respective experiment. They have seen nothing to discourage new experiments. They perceive in the progress that society has made and is still making in knowledge, in every intellectual improvement, a sure a certain presage of the future universal triumph of truth and of liberty. On the contrary, the enemies of liberty, men of uncontrolable ambition and cupidity, say, that the experience of past ages demonstrates that the mass of mankind in every nation are, and, from the very nature of man, must forever remain incompetent to protect and perpetuate their liberties when acquired; that their ignorance and their vices incapacitate them for self-government—that the ignorant multitude are destined forever to be governed by the discerning few, whatever may be the form of that government—and that therefore all that is to be sought, or hoped, from the institutions of society is, that they may be so contrived as to mitigate, and render as mild as possible, that vassalage to which, they say, God has, by an irreversable decree, destined the human race. False! Foolish! Impious theory! They seek to deprive their fellow men of their dearest rights, of all that gives value to life, of all that gives to man a valuable pre-eminence above the brutes, and justify themselves by the most cruel, the most degrading of calumnies; by asserting in short, that the Divinity has given to man no valuable pre-eminence above the brutes.

Happy would it have been for us if this monstrous theory had been confined to that country which gave it birth. In Europe, as the multitude have been compelled to perform the part of beasts of burden, there it seems almost innocent to speak of them as such. Here in America, one would have thought that discretion, if not a sense of justice, might have protected us from the insult. But inordinate ambition is the growth of all countries, and in all countries it justifies its depredations by similar pretexts.

No sooner was that war finished which severed these American states from the British Empire, than ambition marked them for her own, and commenced her secret machinations. We will pass in silence the few years that preceded the birth of our present federal constitution, because during that period the operations of faction were unorganized and desultory; but no sooner was a convention of states proposed in order to revise the federal compact than they became both systematic and active. You need not be told fellow citizens, that at this period, and for the avowed purpose of influencing the deliberations of the proposed convention, Mr. Adams, our late President, wrote three volumes on the subject of government, the whole scope and object of which writings was to prove that a government constituted precisely on the principles of that of Great Britain, and no other, is perfectly adapted to the happiness and protection of men in all countries, and in all stages of society—and that as far as those who were to form a government for us should deviate from the true principles of the British Government, so far would they deviate from wisdom and from nature.

The convention when assembled was found to consist of discordant materials, some ardent friends of the elective principle throughout the legislative and executive departments of the government, some open, some covert friends of the hereditary principle in the executive, and in one branch of the legislative departments. Here it was that Alexander Hamilton strenuously advocated an annihilation of the state governments, an executive and senate elected for life.—How easy! how very natural would be the transition from Hamilton's governor and senate, or to use European names, Kings and Nobles for life, to Adams's hereditary king and nobles! The constitution, when formed, was declared by the convention that formed it, to be "the result of a spirit of mutual concession." Probably no single member of the convention believed it to be free from defects. In one point all parties agreed, to wit, that a stronger bond of union than had hitherto bound the states together was absolutely necessary to their peace, to their safety, perhaps to their very existence. The republicans were in general well pleased with the constitution. They confided in the good sense of the people, and they believed that if what appeared to them imperfections should on experiment be found to be really such, they would in the manner provided by the instrument itself be corrected. Some indeed, not less honest, not less zealous for a union of the states, but more jealous than their brethren, thought they saw in the instrument unnecessary facilities to corruption and usurpation, and on that account ultimately opposed its adoption. This procured for them, and for the republican party, with which they in the subsequent struggles co-operated, and to which they in truth belonged, the name of anti-federalists.

It must be manifest to every reflecting mind, that men, who like Mr. Adams, believed the British to be the standard of good governments, must have regarded our federal constitution as it came from the hands of the convention with disapprobation and contempt. Annihilation of the state governments, and a combination of the states under one government must have been a necessary part of the plan of the monarchists, and accordingly, as has already been observed, the measure was brought forward in the convention by Mr. Hamilton. Notwithstanding this attempt was defeated, and although the constitution was destitute of almost every thing which the monarchists considered as valuable in substance, yet they unanimously subscribed it; because it was all that at that time could be obtained, because though deficient in substance, in form it was correct; and because they hoped that, as it had the form, by a skilful management of its powers, by an artful direction and management of private interests already within its reach, and of such as from time to time it would be possible under various pretexts to create, to give it the substance of their great model, the British Government.

The moment that the new government was organized, the monarchists, arrogating to themselves the name of federalists, commenced a systematic attack on every republican principle in the constitution, endeavoring to sap one after another, every bulwark erected for the protection of the independence of the state governments, and of the supremacy of the whole people. This attack called forth a correspondent vigilance and vigor on the part of the republicans in the defence of every thing which in a government they considered of value.—Thus a warfare of principles commenced, which has not yet subsided.

Here then, fellow citizens, you have a faithful exhibition of our view of the origin of the dissensions which disturb the tranquility not only of this state, but of the United States, and of those essential principles of government in which the theories of leading federalists differ from those of republicans. We will say something of the opposing systems of public measures advocated and pursued by the parties respectively.—Permit us, however, to pause here and make a remark which is suggested by what has already been said. Man is always backward to acknowledge himself in an error, he is too apt to consider it a dishonor to him to have been deceived, this induces him to persevere in his error until he meets with evidence altogether irresistible. Many an honest sincere republican has constantly given his voice for federalists, believing them to be as honestly and as sincerely republican as himself. Such men will not easily be persuaded that they have been betrayed by those in whom they have confided; that they have given their support to a system which is their abhorrence.

It will be difficult to convince such republicans, that their friends, the leading federalists with whom they are acquainted, can be advocates for the systems of Mr. Adams or Hamilton. We solicit those men who shall entertain doubts like these, to reflect that Mr. Adams's books were published for the express purpose that has already been stated, and were read by the leading men of both parties; his principles were, therefore, early and universally understood—that Hamilton's proposition for the destruction of the state governments, and for the election of a Chief Magistrate and Senators *for life*, was made in the face of the convention assembled from every part of the union. To suppose then that the opinions of these men are unknown to leading federalists would be mere idiocy. Both Mr. Adams and Hamilton are known by leading federalists to be monarchists in principle, and of course to be enemies to our federal constitution. Mr. Adams has, on account of his principles been raised to the Chief Magistracy, and Mr. Hamilton is, to this day, the favorite chief of his party. Would republicans, would those who detest kingly, or any other hereditary governments, exalt to the Chief Magistracy of a government like ours, an avowed royalist? Such conduct would be the wildest phrenzy. No—*the men, who in fact procured the election of Mr. Adams were royalists. The men who are now the political friends of Mr. Hamilton, are royalists.*

Though the royalists, or federalists, as they called themselves, commenced their operations with the commencement of the government, yet during the administration of Washington their march tho' steady, was cautious. That inflexible patriot, always esteemed by the republicans, was always hated by the federalists, because he was known to be in favor of the popular elective system. They knew his integrity to be uncorruptible, to him, therefore, it is not probable that their projects were explained, but his personal friendship for, and confidence in some of the party, whom either accident or design had placed near him, enabled them in some instances to circumvent him, to betray him into measures plausible indeed, but which in their tendencies were indisputably opposite to the whole tenor of his declarations, and to the principles he avowed. Such instances however were rare, for we do not accuse him of a mental approbation of anti-republican legislative measures, merely because he did not consider it expedient to oppose to them his constitutional veto.

The day when this Great Man retired from the government was for federalism a day of triumph. Having by their address, for we will make use of a mild epithet, procured for themselves a chief on whose co-operation they might rely, they seemed determined to redeem the time they had lost under his predecessor. Having obtained a direct majority in the legislature, having early seized on the judiciary, they were become complete masters of the field. All the powers of the government were in their hands, and they were all exerted to prostrate every obstacle to the establishment of their favorite system. Caution was at an end, henceforward their attacks on the constitution, our citadel of liberty, were open, incessant, alarming. To trace them in all their movements of hostility, would be to write a history of the measures of the government. Few indeed were the measures that did not directly or indirectly tend to advance this great plan of federalism; but whatever might be the mode in which they were to operate, one distinguishing principle pervades the whole, they are all, excepting their measures of terror, calculated to create and to extend an individual, a particular interest, separate and distinct from the general interest of the community, and to engraft that particular interest on their system in such manner as that it should be understood that they were to stand or fall together.

The limits of an address will admit of little more than to name the most prominent of the measures that were directed against the popular, the republican system, in short, against liberty. In the front rank appears the funding system, a measure manifestly unjust, in as much as the real creditor of the public was thereby compelled to contribute to pay the whole amount of the very debt which in reason and justice was still due to himself, to the gambling speculator, who, taking advantage of his necessities, had purchased the paper on which was recorded the evidence of that debt at one eighth part of the amount of the debt. The injustice of the act will never be forgotten. The soldier to whom we were indebted for our liberty, he who purchased it at the price of his health, and of his blood, he, it is true, has been deprived of the pittance that had been promised him, and the price of his blood has been paid to his proud oppressor; but the soldier is poor, and himself and his injuries are forgotten; but the effects of the measure on the politics of our country will long be remembered.

The debts of the United States at the time they were funded, were nearly as follows:—The whole debt due originally to foreigners, about twelve millions of dollars. The domestic debt due originally to our own citizens of various descriptions, forty millions of dollars, but worth at the market price not more than five; but let it be estimated at thirteen millions of dollars. The debts of the several states for which the creditors had no pretence of claim against the United States, and which, therefore, should not be included in the estimate of the debts, really due from the United States, but which were assumed by the United States on shallow and frivolous pretences, amounted to the very serious sum of eighteen millions of dollars. If we estimate the balances due to those states which had performed more than their proportion in our revolutionary labours, at five millions of dollars which cannot be far from the truth, it will be found that the whole debt of the United States at the time the law for funding it was enacted, in truth, and in justice, amounted to no more than thirty millions of dollars, at least no more than that sum was due to those who by that law were recognized as creditors. But the debt when funded amounted to eighty millions of dollars. By this single operation then a capital to the enormous amount of fifty millions of dollars was created out of nothing, and what was worse, if worse could be, than the injustice of the measure, the proprietors of this vast wealth understood that they owed it to federalism (for the measure was strenuously opposed by the republicans) and they were taught to believe that the existence of their wealth depended on the success of that system which had created it.

Thus the federal leaders in one day, and by a single manoeuvre, inlisted under their banners, not indeed an army of poor soldiers, dressed in uniform, with muskets in their hands, prepared blindly to perform the work of desolation and murder; but an army much more to be dreaded of rich and consequently of influential men, dispersed over the union, who owed all their wealth and all their influence to their chiefs, and stood pledged blindly to support them in all their attacks on the principles of liberty.

While these things were atchieving by the legislature on one quarter, on another the judiciary were making a bold and decisive assault. A suit had been commenced against one of the states, and the supreme court of the United States solemnly decided that an independent state was subject to be impleaded before them, and amenable to their orders, and liable of course to be punished for contempt, or to have execution awarded against them. This was a situation for sovereignty which was universally felt to be rather ludicrous. It was doubtless a noble stride towards the accomplishment of Mr. Hamilton's project of annihilating the state governments. Unfortunately for federalism these sovereignties did not choose to be put on a footing with a corporation for the support of a toll bridge; they were not yet sufficiently federal for that: they therefore united in a constitutional provision to check this inroad of the judiciary.

The struggles of the French nation to recover its long lost rights, excited the sympathy of the friends of liberty in this country; on the contrary they were objects of regret and terror to the federalist. The French revolution became overclouded; it was disgraced by violence and cruelty; it was stained with innocent blood. The republicans in America, who cherished the pure and just principles of liberty only, have been to this day accused of abetting all the horrible deeds of the men who in France disgraced the name of liberty, a most foul calumny, and known to be such by those who uttered it. Nay, liberty itself was stigmatized. The horrors of the French revolution were said to be the certain fruits of democracy, that is, of a government entirely under the control of the people.

To enable federalists to accomplish in