

THE
PRETENSIONS OF
THOMAS JEFFERSON
TO THE
PRESIDENCY
EXAMINED;
AND THE
CHARGES AGAINST
JOHN ADAMS
REFUTED.

ADDRESSED TO THE CITIZENS OF AMERICA IN GENERAL;

AND PARTICULARLY TO THE

ELECTORS

OF THE

PRESIDENT.

William Souginton Smith

UNITED STATES, October 1796.

A WRITER under the signature of Hampden, in the Richmond paper of the 1st instant, after asserting the exclusive right of Virginia to fill the office of President, calls the attention of the citizens of that state to the illustrious Thomas Jefferson, as the fittest character in the union to fill the President's chair, and proceeds to enumerate the various pretensions of that gentleman. They are,

1st. His merits as a *philosopher*.

2d. As a *republican*.

3d. As a friend to the civil and religious rights of mankind.

4th. As a citizen who was in favor of the present federal government, but wished for amendments.

5th. As an enthusiastic admirer of the French Revolution, without however surrendering the independency and self-government of America.

6th. As a citizen, who had a proper sense of the perfidious conduct of Britain towards us, which he would have counteracted by *peace* measures, and measures more advantageous than those which have taken place.

7th. As a citizen whose diplomatic talents, and *political sagacity* are not inferior to his republicanism and unalterable attachment to liberty.

8th. As possessing a *fortune* no less independent than his principles, and with a disposition, continually impelling his *fertile* genius to discoveries and improvements in the arts and sciences.

I SHALL not stop to consider the exclusive claim of Virginia to the presidency, but shall proceed to examine the pretensions of Thomas Jefferson, as the above detailed. We may justly presume that his panegyrist has brought forward every title which this candidate possesses to the public favor on this occasion, and we may therefore safely pronounce that those, and those alone, are the titles on which his pretensions rest. I shall examine,

● 1st. THE merit of T. Jefferson, as a *philosopher*.

WHETHER a *moral* or a *natural* philosopher, or both, is not stated by Hampden. The character of a good *moral* philoso-

pher is certainly a very respectable one, and if Mr. Jefferson's panegyrist can produce any evidence of his merits in that relation, I shall be happy to see them. If it can be shewn that he has disapproved of the *cruelties* which have stained the French revolution, that he has reprobated, instead of countenancing, the *impious doctrines* of Thomas Paine, that he has been an advocate for *peace, order* and submission to the laws, that he has never recommended in a public character, a profligate violation of public faith, in that case, his qualities as a good *moral* philosopher, would be valuable ingredients in the character of President of the United States.

WHETHER or ~~not~~ he has vindicated, the horrors and cruelties perpetrated in France, has been the advocate of *Thomas Paine* and the patron of his works, has fostered dissensions in the administration of the federal government, has connived at the opposition to the laws, has recommended measures destructive of the public credit and reputation, will hereafter appear by a review of his conduct, and by a reference to public facts and documents.

If Hampden only intended to exhibit him in the character of a great *natural philosopher*, I am at a loss to discern in what ~~respects~~ his merits as a natural philosopher, can recommend him to the presidency. It should seem that the active, anxious and responsible station of president would illy suit the calm, retired and exploring views of a *natural philosopher*, his merits might entitle him to the professorship of a college, but they would be as incompatible with the duties of the presidency as with the command of the Western army. As well might we have brought forward the eminent talents of Rittenhouse, had he been living, or the wonderful genius of Cox, the great bridge builder : indeed the merits of the famous *equestrian* Ricketts would have been at least as likely to recommend him to a station, which may occasionally require great military talents.

HAD Hampden justly appreciated the talents of this great natural philosopher, he would have continued him in his philosophical retirement, *employing his fertile genius in discoveries and improvements in the useful arts*, impaling butterflies and insects, and contriving turn-about chairs, *for the benefit of his fellow citizens and mankind in general*. While in the innocent enjoyment of such harmless occupations, no real friend to his peace and repose, and to the welfare of mankind, would draw this calm philosopher from such useful pursuits, to plunge him into the busy and dangerous vortex of an arduous station.

To be serious, let us examine the claim which his panegyrist sets up for him to the title of *philosopher*.

FOR the proof of his assertion, he refers us to the *Notes on Virginia*. As a moral philosopher, I do not recollect any part of that work, which justifies the assertion ; but as a *natural* philosopher, his claim is probably founded on his ingenious dissertation respecting the primary causes of difference between the whites and the blacks. It is worthy of insertion, and will furnish an accurate idea of his philosophical sagacity. This philosopher had once formed the extravagant project of *emancipating all the slaves of Virginia*, and the more extravagant one of afterwards *shipping them off* to some other country ; in page 147 of his *Notes on Virginia*, he says,—“ it will probably be asked, “ why not retain and incorporate the blacks in this state ? I “ answer, deep rooted prejudices entertained by the whites, “ ten thousand recollections by the blacks of the *injuries* they “ have sustained, new provocations, *the real distinctions which* “ *NATURE has made*, and many other circumstances, will divide “ us into parties and produce convulsions, which will never end “ but in the extermination of the *one or the other race*. To these “ objections, which are *political*, may be added others, which “ are *physical and moral*. The first difference which strikes us “ is that of colour ; whether the black of the negro resides in “ the reticular membrane between the skin and the scarf skin, “ or in the scarf skin itself, whether it proceeds from the colour “ of the blood, or the colour of the bile, or from that of some “ other secretion, *the difference is fixed in nature*, and is as *real* as “ if its seat and cause were better known to us. *And is this dif-* “ *ference of no importance ?* Is it not the foundation of a greater “ or a less share of beauty *in the two races ?* Are not the fine “ mixtures of red and white, the expressions of every passion by “ greater or less suffusion of colour in the one, preferable to that “ eternal monotony which reigns in the countenances, that im- “ moveable veil of black which covers all the emotions of *the* “ *other race ?* Add to these, flowing hair, a more elegant sym- “ metry of form, their own judgment in favor of the whites, “ declared by their preference of them as uniformly as is *the* “ *preference of the oran outang for the black women over those of* “ *his own species*. Besides those of colour, figure and hair, there “ are other *physical* distinctions *proving a difference of race* ; they “ have *less hair* on the face and body, they *secrete less by the kidneys* “ *and more by the glands of the skin, which gives them a very* “ *strong and disagreeable odour*. They are more tolerant of heat, “ and less so of cold, than the whites, perhaps *owing to a diffe-* “ *rence of structure in the pulmonary apparatus* ; they are more ar- “ dent *after their female* ; their griefs are transient ; in general “ their existence appears to participate more of *sensation* than “ reflection. They are *in reason* much *inferior to the whites*. It “ is not against experience to suppose that *different species of the*

“ *same genus, or varieties of the same species, may possess different*
 “ *qualifications. Will not a lover of natural history, then, one*
 “ *who views the gradations in all the races of animals, with the*
 “ *eye of philosophy, excuse an effort to keep those in the depart-*
 “ *ment of man as distinct as nature has formed them; this unfor-*
 “ *tunate difference of colour, and perhaps of faculty, is a power-*
 “ *ful obstacle to the emancipation of these people. Many of their*
 “ *advocates while they wish to vindicate the liberty of human*
 “ *nature are anxious also to preserve its dignity and beauty. Some*
 “ *of these, embarrassed by the question, what further is to be*
 “ *done with them, join themselves in opposition with those who*
 “ *are actuated by sordid avarice only. Among the Romans,*
 “ *emancipation required but one effort: the slave when made*
 “ *free might mix without staining the blood of his master, but with*
 “ *us, a second is necessary, unknown to history; when freed, he is*
 “ *to be removed beyond the reach of mixture.*”

A FEW comments on the foregoing very ridiculous and elaborate attempt to prove that the *negroes are an inferior race of animals*, will place in a just light the *philosophical* merits of the author: This passage has been selected, because it is among those which have been most admired by the author's friends.

First, we observe an affected anxiety to emancipate the negroes of Virginia, why? “in order to vindicate the *liberty* of the human race;” but this commendable zeal presently yields to a more interesting anxiety “to preserve the *beauty* of the human race.”

To extricate himself from the embarrassment into which he is thrown by the conflicting desires of “*vindicating the liberty of the human race,*” and “*preserving its beauty,*” he hits on the notable expedient of emancipating all the slaves of Virginia, and then instantly *shipping them off*, like a herd of *black cattle*, the Lord knows where. The desire of preserving the beauty of the human race predominates, however, in the mind of our philosopher; for notwithstanding the slaves are to enjoy a momentary freedom, they are suddenly after to be seized, bound, packed on board vessels, and against their consent exported to some less friendly regions, where they would be all murdered or reduced to a more wretched state of slavery.—Such are the noble and *enlarged* views of *philosophical* politicians! But some justification must be given for the latter part of this merciful project: It was necessary therefore to prove that the blacks, (whose emancipation was requisite to vindicate the liberty of the *human race,*) were not in fact of the *human race*, for this must be the author's meaning, if there be any meaning in his work; the idea of two or more human races, a black hu

man race, and a white human race, being too absurd even for him to have suggested ; it is true, his expressions are so vague and contradictory, that it is difficult to ascertain very precisely his meaning ; but taking the whole together, it results in this, that the blacks are a peculiar race of animals below *man* and above the *oran outang*, a kind of *tertium quid*, a higher kind of brute, hitherto undescribed. I am at a loss to annex any other result to the following expressions and observations, viz. “ The real distinctions which nature has made”—a difference in the *two races*”—comparing the preference which the blacks have for the whites “ to the preference of the *oran outang* for the *black women*”—secreting less by the kidneys, and more by the glands of the skin than the whites—difference of structure in the pulmonary apparatus—being in *reason* much inferior to the whites—different species of the same genus, or varieties of the same species—their existence participating more of *sensation* than reflection—gradations in the *different races* of animals,” &c.

THE confusion of ideas which pervaded the understanding of our author through the whole of this very ingenious and learned dissertation must be manifest. At one moment he is anxious to emancipate the blacks, to *vindicate the liberty of the human race*—at another, he discovers that the blacks are of a *different race* from the *human race*, and therefore when emancipated, must be instantly *removed* beyond the reach of mixture, lest he (or she) should *stain the blood* of his (or her) master; not recollecting what, from his situation and other circumstances, he ought to have recollected—that this *mixture* may take place while the negro remains in slavery : he must have seen all around him sufficient marks of this *staining of blood* to have been convinced that retaining them in slavery would not prevent it ; he must have been satisfied that the mixture would not be the *less degrading* from the *emancipated* state of the black. At another moment he discovers that the blacks are indeed a part of the human race, but then they are a *different species* of the same genus, or they and the whites constitute varieties of the same species. In one place he asserts with confidence “ that they are in *reason much inferior* to the whites ;” in another, he seems to doubt it ; “ this difference of colour, and *perhaps of faculty* ” to justify the *emancipation* of the blacks, they are made a *part of the human race* ; to justify their *transportation* they are *classed with the brutes*.

But the most extraordinary of all the self contradictions of this philosopher is found in a *Letter* written, while secretary of state, to a *Negro* named *Benjamin Banneker*, which letter, having a close relation to this subject, may very properly be here introduced.

We have seen from the above quotation, that our author was decidedly of opinion—1st, That there was a *fixed difference in nature* between the whites and blacks—2d, That this amounted to a distinction, constituting the blacks a *different race*—3d, That the blacks were *in reason much inferior* to the whites, their existence participating more of *sensation* than reflection—4th, That this *inferiority* was evidently not produced by their *condition*, but *by nature*.

THE negro Benjamin was the *reputed* author of an Almanac, which was either dedicated to, or sent, with some complimentary epistle, to his brother author, our philosopher, whose philosophy was of so pliant a quality, that, instantly forgetting all his learned discoveries on the skin and scarf skin and kidneys of the unsavory Africans, he sat down and wrote to brother Benjamin a fraternizing epistle, in which “he rejoiced to find that “NATURE had given to his *black brethren* talents equal to “those of *other colours*, and that the *appearance* of a want of “them, was owing *merely* to the *degraded condition* of their existence, both in Africa and America.” He then adds his *wishes* for the emancipation of the negroes in the United States, as fast as circumstances will admit. Here we find a *direct and flat contradiction* to all his assertions on this subject in his *Notes*; from which we must infer, either that that work was compiled with so much inaccuracy, and such want of information or reflection, that the most trivial circumstance was sufficient to induce him to contradict its contents *himself*; or that he was so influenced by a *ridiculous vanity*, so tickled by a silly compliment from an “*unsavory animal of an inferior race*,” as wilfully and publicly to contradict, without any shame or regard to public decency, his former assertions, still believing them to be well founded. His panegyrist may choose from the above alternatives, that which may be the least injurious to his friend. He will probably attempt to vindicate the philosopher by introducing his candor which led him to recant an error. The wonderful production of Brother Benjamin, he will say, had convinced him of the untruth of his former doctrine. But this apology will not do; because the *Notes on Virginia* prove, that our philosopher had seen the *reputed* works of *other blacks*, at least *equal* in merit to Brother Benjamin’s, and had suggested, that they were the production of some white person, falsely attributed to the negroes. He had fully considered and discussed this subject: this appears from the preceding quotation; but to leave no room for doubt on this point, a further quotation shall be inserted. Our author, in his great zeal to support his doctrine of the *inferiority of the race of the blacks*, proceeds thus to the proof: “They are *in reason much inferior* to the whites;

" as, I think, one could scarcely be found capable of tracing
 " and comprehending the investigations of Euclid ; in imagi-
 " nation, they are dull, tasteless and anomalous. Many have
 " been brought up to the handicraft arts ; some have been li-
 " berally educated ; and all (in America) have lived in coun-
 " tries where the arts and sciences are cultivated to a considera-
 " ble degree, and had before their eyes samples of the best
 " works from abroad. The *Indians*, with no advantages of
 " this kind, will often carve figures on their pipes, not desti-
 " tute of design and merit ; they will crayon out an animal, a
 " plant, or a country, so as to prove the existence of a germ
 " in their minds, which only wants cultivation. They aston-
 " ish you with strokes of the most sublime oratory, such as
 " prove their reason and sentiment strong, their imagination
 " glowing and elevated ; but *never* yet could I find that a
 " *black* had uttered a thought above the level of plain narra-
 " tion—never see even an elementary trait of painting and
 " sculpture. Love is the peculiar æstrum of the poet : their
 " love is ardent, but it kindles the *sense* only, not the imagin-
 " ation. Religion, indeed, has produced a *Phillis Wheatly*,
 " but it could not produce a poet. The compositions pub-
 " lished *under her name*, are below the dignity of criticism.
 " *Ignatius Sancho* has approached nearer to merit in his com-
 " position : Though we admit him to the first place among
 " those of his own colour, who have presented themselves to
 " the public judgment, yet, when we compare him with the
 " writers of the race among whom he lived, and particularly
 " with the epistolarly class, in which he has taken his own
 " stand, we are compelled to enroll him *at the bottom of the co-*
 " *lumn*. This criticism supposes the letters published under
 " his name, to be *genuine*, and to have received *amendment* from
 " no other hand, *points which would not be easy of investigation*,
 " (surprising the same reflections did not occur respecting Ben-
 " jamin, the almanac-maker !) 'The *improvement* of the blacks,
 " in *body and mind*, in the *first instance* of their *mixture* with the
 " *whites*, has been observed by every one, and *proves*, that their
 " *inferiority is not the effect merely of their condition of life*. A-
 " mong the Romans, their *slaves* were often their *rarest ar-*
 " *tists* ; they excelled too in science, inasmuch as to be usually
 " employed as tutors to their master's children. Epicætus,
 " Terence and Phœdrus were slaves ; *but they were of the race*
 " *of whites*. It is not their *condition*, then, but *NATURE*, which
 " *has produced the distinction*."

From the above it is evident, that he had well examined
 this subject, and that his direct and gross contradiction of all
 this doctrine, so soon after, sprung principally from a wish to

acquire a little popularity with the free negroes. What must we now think of a philosopher, who, in one publication, asserts it to be "*proved*, that the inferiority of the blacks is not "the effect merely of their *condition* of life, but a *distinction* of "race, produced by *nature*;" and in another "that it is owing *merely* to the degraded *condition* of their existence." Did he flatter himself that his letter to Banneker would escape publication, and only be handed round among the free negroes, who probably never had read his *Notes*, or if they had, would forgive the past injury, on account of the present recantation? Did he hope thus to escape detection, and thus artfully to obtain the character of a great and sagacious philosopher with the friends of negro slavery, while he would be rewarded with the plaudits of the abolition societies and free negroes?—What shall we think of a *secretary of state* thus fraternizing with negroes, writing them complimentary epistles, styling them *his black brethren*, congratulating them on the evidences of their *genius*, and assuring them of his good wishes for their speedy emancipation; what must the citizens of the *southern states*, particularly, whose slaves are guaranteed to them as *their property* by the constitution and laws of the United States, think of a *secretary of the United States*, (whose peculiar duty it was to watch over the interests of every part of the Union,) who, at the hazard of the primary interests of those states, promulgates his approbation of a speedy emancipation of their slaves?—What will they think of such a *candidate* for the office of president of the United States?—What will they say to the *Electors* of the *southern states* who shall be so *entirely regardless* of the *interests and future peace and tranquillity* of their country as to vote for such a person? But this subject, from its importance, requires a further consideration.

THOMAS JEFFERSON, secretary of state of the United States, in his letter to the negro Banneker, acknowledges himself converted from all his former opinions, respecting the inferiority of the black race, and declares himself convinced "that "*nature* has given to his *black brethren* talents *equal* to those of "*other colours*, and that the *appearance* of a want of them is "*owing merely* to the *degraded condition* of their existence both "*in Africa and America.*" He concludes his fraternizing epistle with these words, "I can add with truth, that nobody "*wishes more ardently* to see a good system commenced for "*raising the condition* both of their *body and mind* to *what it* "*ought to be*, as *fast* as the *imbecility* of their present existence "*and other circumstances* which cannot be neglected, will admit!" Notwithstanding the caution and *cunning* with which the latter sentence is worded, to admit of a double interpreta-

tion, if necessary, it cannot be denied that, taking the whole letter together, it meant to express to the negro, Benjamin, an ardent wish to see an early system of *emancipation* in the southern states ; he had just said, that nature had given to his *black brethren* talents *equal* to those of the whites, and that the *appearance* of a want of them was owing *merely* to their *degraded condition* ; he immediately adds *his ardent wish* for a good system for *raising the condition* both of their *body and mind* to *what it ought to be*, that is, in plain English, “ from the degraded condition of slavery to a state of freedom.” The qualification subjoined, viz. “ As fast as the *imbecility* of their “ present existence, and *other circumstances* which cannot be “ neglected, will admit,” was introduced as an artful salvo, not too far to commit himself ; behind these equivocal expressions he thought himself sheltered from an attack in the southern states ; he might, if pushed, construe them into an opinion, that for centuries to come, emancipation would be impolitic and dangerous, because *other circumstances* would not justify the measure. But this is certain, that had he viewed the measure of emancipation as a dangerous one, either he would have discountenanced it, or at least, on so delicate a subject, kept silent. Why such an answer to the negro’s letter ? Why not confine his answer merely to the almanac, and to the usual compliment on such an occasion ? Why make a *parade* of his *opinion*, by extolling the natural genius of the blacks, reminding them of their degraded condition and expressing a wish to see it changed ? Either he was a friend to emancipation, or he was not : if the former, then the qualification respecting *other circumstances* was absurd and unmeaning ; if the latter, then the encomiums on the talents of the blacks, and the ardent wish for their release from their degraded condition, were equally absurd. Again, he tells Banneker, and through him all the negroes in America, “ I am satisfied that your *natural talents* are *equal* to “ those of the whites, and that the *appearance* of a want of “ them in you is owing *merely* to the *degraded condition* of your existence ;” now what does he mean by adding, “ I wish to “ see you emancipated, as soon as the *imbecility* of your present existence will admit ?” If the appearance of their want of talents was owing *merely* to their *condition*, the sooner they emerged from that condition the better ; if their imbecility was produced solely by their condition, that imbecility would cease the moment they were emancipated ; what kind of reasoning is it, to charge their imbecility altogether to their condition, and yet to expect an amelioration of their reason antecedently to their change of condition ? It is no better than the blunder of the *Irishman*, who would not suffer his son to go into the water, until he could swim. According to our author’s mode

of reasoning, the negroes could never be emancipated, his ardent wish could never be gratified; the slavery of the negroes he says is the sole cause of their imbecility; but he immediately adds, they must remain in slavery 'till their minds are enlightened. How are they to acquire this necessary pre-requisite to emancipation, when, according to his doctrine, that pre-requisite can only be obtained *after* emancipation? Here is such a jumble of ideas, such a confounding of *cause* and *effect* in this letter, that the production of it by a man of common understanding can only be accounted for by ascribing it to a pitiful grasp at popularity from a class which he had despised, and to an ardent wish for the emancipation of the southern negroes, shrouded in the cautious and ambiguous language of one, who thought the times not yet ripe enough for a *full disclosure* of his dangerous views.—Another qualification in his letter refers to “*other circumstances, which cannot be neglected.*” What circumstances had he in view, to prevent the immediate emancipation of the blacks? Does he allude to the difficulties which would oppose his *transportation scheme*? Surely the negroes would not thank him for their liberty on such terms; but in his Notes on Virginia he is decidedly of opinion that the negroes of the United States, when freed, must be *removed* beyond the reach of mixture; rather a harsh treatment for his black brethren! Whence proceeds this right of transportation (without a crime or conviction) our philosopher has not informed us, and on what pretext of law or justice, free men, not even charged with any offence, are to be shipped off, like cattle, I am unable to discover: had he proposed shipping them off, while slaves, there would be more sense in the project; but first to emancipate and invest them with all the rights of free citizens, and then forthwith to treat them as slaves and cattle, is altogether unintelligible.

PERHAPS the project was, to make it a preliminary condition *sine qua non* with the Africans, that they should be free, subject to immediate transportation: but when free, it is doubtful how many of them would consider themselves bound by such a condition; indeed it is questionable whether many of them would accept their freedom on such terms. But waving these difficulties, how impolitic would it not be to banish from the country several hundred thousand of our *black brethren, to whom nature has given talents equal to our own*, and who, in spite of their monotonous † colour and offensive secretions (circumstances common to thousands of other colours) might become very useful citizens, and, according to the secretary's letter, rank with the whites in

† Who ever heard, before Mr. Jefferson's time, of the *monotony of colours*?

point of genius and merit, at the very instant of their emancipation.—If the secretary of State meant in his letter to allude to his shipping project by the words “ other circumstances,” it would have been but candid in him to have unfolded to his black brethren the whole extent of his views, that they might be fully apprised of the terms on which they had his ardent wishes for emancipation. Having omitted so essential a part of the plan, it is to be presumed, that he has abandoned it, and now wishes for their emancipation *as fast as other circumstances* will allow it to be accomplished; that is, as soon as he shall find it convenient to dispose of *his own*, and as soon as the measures which are now pursuing for that purpose in several of the states, even in some of the southern states, and the principles which have been transplanted from the French colonies into America, and *his countenance as President of the United States*, shall combine to make the measure appear practicable in the eyes of its promoters.

It appears almost incredible (and could not be credited had we not the facts before our eyes) that the same Thomas Jefferson, who not many years ago published to the world his opinion, “ that there were powerful obstacles to the emancipation “ of the blacks, because deep rooted prejudices entertained “ by the whites, ten thousand recollections by the blacks of “ the *injuries* they have sustained, new provocations, the real “ distinctions which nature has made, and many other circumstances, will divide us into parties and produce *convulsions* “ which will never end but in the *extermination of the one or the “ other race*,” should have recently declared *his ardent wish for such emancipation*, at the risk of all the horrid consequences which he had himself so strongly depicted.

If such a wonderful change has been wrought in his mind, to what are we to impute it? I can find no other clue to it than the delusive and visionary principles which he has imbibed on that subject by his residence in France. It is to be remarked that he published his notes on Virginia, after spending the greatest part of his life in Virginia, among Negroe holders and Negroes, and at a period when he must be presumed to be pretty well acquainted with Negroes, and aware of the consequences of their emancipation; he wrote his letter to Bancker, the Negro, *soon after his return from France*.

If his sentiments on this subject were not changed when he wrote to the Negro, then his letter to him is a piece of gross hypocrisy, calculated to filch a little popularity from a few free Negroes, and the friends of emancipation, at the expense of his own character and of the peace of his country.

WHETHER the Secretary complied with the promise made in that letter to Banneker "of sending his almanac to the great philosopher *Condorcet*," as a testimony of his black brother's extraordinary genius, we have never learnt.

MANY further similar illustrations might be made of the secretary's *philosophical* talents from his *notes on Virginia*; these may for the present suffice. At a future opportunity, we may find leisure to notice his very extraordinary *penal code*, and his whimsical system of *retaliation*, his *wise* attempt to refute the account of the *deluge*, (evidently stated by Moses to be a *miracle*) by a recurrence to philosophical and merely *natural* principles; and sundry other philosophical absurdities. His plagiarist *report on weights and measures* will be adverted to under another head.

AFTER these specimens of his talents, we may safely venture to withhold from Thomas Jefferson the title of philosopher.

BUT we should incur no danger in yielding to his claim in the fullest extent, because it must be obvious to men of the smallest experience in public life, that of all beings, a philosopher, makes the worst politician; that if any one circumstance more than another, could disqualify Mr. Jefferson for the Presidency, it would be the charge of his being a philosopher. Not believing him to possess any thing more than the *mask* of philosophy, my objection to his election would certainly not rest on that ground; but as there may be some, who, having read his works superficially, may have been deceived by that character, which is sometimes acquired, because no one has been at the trouble to scrutinize and strip it of its borrowed garb, to them I repeat that, admitting him to be a most learned philosopher, such a character alone creates his disqualification for the Presidency.

IN turning over the page of history, we find it teeming with evidences of the ignorance and mismanagement of philosophical politicians. The great *Locke* was employed to frame a constitution for Carolina; but it abounded so much with regulations, inapplicable to the state of things for which it was designed, so full of *theoretic whimsies*, that it was soon thrown aside. *Condorcet*, a particular friend of our American philosopher, was a great French philosopher; his constitution, proposed in 1793, contains more absurdities than were ever before piled up in any system of Government; it was so radically defective that its operation was never even attempted; † *Condorcet's* political

† Hear what *Boissy d'Anglas* says of the Constitution of *Condorcet*, a brother laborer in Philosophy and Politics of Thomas Jefferson: meditated amidst intrigue and ambition, conceived in the bosom of vice, that Constitution is nothing more than the *concentration of all the elements of disorder, and the organization of anarchy*. What indeed must we think of a Constitution, which organizes the partial insurrection of powers, independent of the constituted authority, and legalizes the reign of plunder and terror." Compare this, Americans, with the principles and practice of the Democratic Societies and the other supporters of Thomas Jefferson!!

follies, and the wretched termination of his career are well known; he had philosophy enough to know how to raise a storm, but not enough to avert its effects. The affairs of France have since been more ably conducted (except during the short aristocracy of Robespierre) by men who are good politicians, but fortunately for France, *not philosophers*.

RITTENHOUSE was a great philosopher, but the only proof we have had of *his political* talents was his suffering himself to be wheedled into the *Presidency* of the *Democratic Society* of Philadelphia, a society with which he was even ashamed to associate, tho' cajoled and flattered into the *loan* of his *name*. Many other instances might be adduced.

THE characteristic traits of a philosopher, when he turns politician, are, timidity, whimsicalness, a disposition to reason from certain principles, and not from the true nature of man; a proneness to predicate all his measures on certain abstract theories, formed in the recesses of his cabinet, and not on the existing state of things and circumstances; an inertness of mind, as applied to governmental policy, a wavering of disposition when great and sudden emergencies demand promptness of decision and energy of action. If the laws are opposed and insurrection raises its crest, the insurgents will always calculate on the weakness and indecision of the executive (if a philosopher) and they will be justified in their calculations, for he will hesitate till all is lost; he will be wandering in the labyrinths of philosophical speculations, moralizing on the sin of spilling human blood, and foolishly persuading himself that mankind can *always* be reclaimed and brought back to their duty by *wholesome advice*. His mind will be constantly attracted to his favorite pursuits; and his presidential duties, will, of course, be postponed to more pleasing avocations.

LET us suppose one of these exploring and profound philosophers elected President of the United States, and a foreign minister, on his first introduction into his cabinet, surprising him in the act of inspecting the *skin and the scarf skin* of a *black* and a *white pig*, in order to discover the causes of difference which nature has created in their colour, or with the same view anatomizing the kidneys and glands of a Negro to ascertain the *nature of his secretions*? Would not the minister's first observation be, that the philosopher would be much better employed in his retirement at home, and his second, that such a President would furnish excellent materials for him to make use of.

WHAT respect would the officers of government entertain for a president, whom they should find, on waiting on him for instructions, busily engaged in impaling a butterfly or contriving

with assiduous perseverance an † *easy chair* of new construction ? Would not an attention to these littlenesses make him the ridicule of the world ? The great *WASHINGTON* was, thank God, no philosopher ; had *he* been one, we should never have seen his great military exploits ; we should never have prospered under his wise administration. There is another characteristic trait in philosophers highly dangerous, namely, their extreme *openness to flattery* ; a flatterer will be always sure to gain a philosopher's affections ; a philosophical president will be consequently most influenced by *that nation which flatters most* ; which that is, need not be mentioned : if their agents do not fail in this national qualification, such a president will be their most devoted servant : he will also be perpetually surrounded by a swarm of domestic flatterers ; and as they are generally the basest of characters, the companions he will be attached to, and the measures they will promote, may without difficulty be predicted.

BUT, although I have thus denied to Mr. Jefferson the title of a *real philosopher*, I am ready to allow that he possesses the *inferior* characteristics, and the *externals* of philosophy. By one, ambitious of passing with the world for a philosopher, the first were easily acquired, the last as easily assumed. The inferior characteristics, as applied to the science of politics, are a want of steadiness, a constitutional indecision and versatility, visionary, wild and speculative systems, and various other defective features, which have been already portrayed—Indeed so unsettled is the mind of a *would be* philosopher, so capricious and versatile are the principles of these *philosophical mimics*, that they attempt to reconcile the most irreconcilable theories, and to justify the most inconsistent acts by the same standard. Thus you will find these *pretenders* to philosophy, at one moment, coolly justifying the most atrocious and *sanguinary cruelties*, provided they are *means* to a certain favorite *end* ; at another, cautiously dissuading from vigorous, tho' necessary measures, lest they might fatally issue in the shedding of human blood. *Condorcet* and *Brissot* were, like Jefferson, *reputed* philosophers ; they set up certain wild and mischievous theories of government ; of course, followed the emancipation of the negroes in the French West-Indies, and, of course, the massacre of the whites, and the desolation of the colonies : this was represented to them, by a deputation from the colonies, warning them of the fatal consequences of their principles. What was *Philosopher Condorcet's* reply ? Attend to it, Citizens of the southern States ! ! He answered with true philosophic calmness, “ *Perish all the colonists*, rather than that we should deviate one tittle from our principles.” This is the

† Who has not heard from the secretary the praises of his wonderful *Whirligig Chair*, which had the miraculous quality of allowing the person seated in it to turn his head, without moving his tail ? Who has not admired his fertile *genius* in the production of his *Epicurean side-board*, and other *Gim Krackery* ?

enlightened Condorcet, to whom his friend Jefferson, stimulated by a sympathetic philanthropy, sent Banneker's Almanac, as the highest proof of his admiration of the Negro's work. This is the *same Condorcet* who could, with calmness, see the colonies laid waste, and thousands of aged colonists and innocent women and children massacred, and yet was perpetually preaching up philanthropy and universal benevolence. *Brissot* was much such another character, and they both deservedly met the same fate.

As ignorant people are often imposed upon by an appearance of philosophy, those, who have ambitious designs, readily assume its *externals*: these consist in a ridiculous affectation of simplicity and humility, in a thousand frivolities, and little puerile tricks, which always render the performer contemptible in the eyes of discerning people, who soon discover that under the assumed cloak of humility, lurks the most *ambitious spirit*, the most overweening pride and hauteur, and that the *externals* of simplicity and humility afford but a flimsy veil to the *internal* evidences of aristocratic splendor, sensuality and epicureanism.

MR. JEFFERSON has been held up and characterized by his friends as "the quiet, modest retiring philosopher—as the plain, simple, unambitious republican." He shall not now, for the first time, be regarded as the intriguing incendiary—the aspiring turbulent competitor, unless facts shall warrant the suggestion: of these an enlightened public must judge.

WHAT, if a quiet, modest, unambitious philosopher, at a delicate crisis, withdrawing himself from a post of duty, from an alledged attachment to philosophical pursuits, and a strong antipathy to public honors, should immediately devote his hours of retirement to *mature his schemes of concealed ambition*, and at the appointed time, come forth the undisguised *candidate for the highest honors*, and for the most arduous station to which ambition can aspire?

WOULD not *this trait* alone sufficiently mark his character and his views?

To some few of his fellow citizens, this may perhaps be the *first time* his real character has been discovered; but let *them* recollect that there is always "*a first time*," when characters, studious of artful disguises are unveiled, when the vizard of stoicism is plucked from the brow of the epicurean, when the plain garb of quaker simplicity is stripped from the concealed voluptuary, when *Cæsar*, coyly refusing the proffered diadem, is found to be *Cæsar rejecting* the trappings, "but tenaciously grasping the substance of imperial domination."

THE pretensions of Thomas Jefferson to the Presidency, in the relation of a *philosopher*, having been canvassed, we shall next proceed to examine his pretensions as “a *republican*, and a friend to the civil and religious rights of his fellow-citizens.”

THE observations already made, respecting the assumption of the *externals* of *philosophy*, will apply with peculiar force to the assumption of the *externals* of *republicanism*. There are *impostors* in *patriotism* as well as in *philosophy*; and as the former are the most dangerous, so ought we the more carefully to be on our guard against them. It is now become so common a trick in France, in England, and in the United States, for every ambitious demagogue to put on the *garb* of *patriotism*, to vociferate in the *language* of *liberty*, that every prudent and intelligent citizen immediately suspects them of some mischievous design; and these suspicions have been warranted by fatal experience.—Who wore the externals of republicanism, who spoke the language of liberty more than *Marat* and *Robespierre*? Who was a greater friend to the civil and religious rights of his fellow-citizens than Cromwell? Who bellowed more for liberty than the insurgent and fugitive *Bradford*? In France, the actors in the late insurrection against the government, not content with the title of *patriots*, arrogantly stiled themselves the EXCLUSIVE PATRIOTS. In short, read but a few pages of ancient or modern history, inspect but a few columns of a newspaper, and you will find, that every aspiring, turbulent, and seditious demagogue, has always begun by assuming the externals of patriotism, and vociferating in the language of liberty, as a cloak and an aid to his nefarious projects.

WHENEVER I hear a man make a parade of his own republicanism, or his patriotism, or his overflowing zeal for his country's good, I instantly inquire, whether he is a candidate for office? When his puffers proclaim his republican virtues, and his love of country, I inquire into his *past conduct*: that is the true *test* of patriotism. Republicanism (that much abused word) is discovered by opinions, not by professions. Patriotism announces itself by DEEDS, not by words. When WASHINGTON was *unanimously* called to the Presidency, he required no *puffing*, no *Hampdens* to blazon his fame. His past conduct, his genuine merit, his long services, were recorded in every breast. He required no affected retirement, no pretended philosophy, no coyish rejection of public honors, no deep planned machinery to bring *him* forth to public notice. And whenever the *public eye* of America shall fix itself on a prominent object, it will have been attracted to it by well-known virtues, and well-tried abilities; not by the artificial parade of arrogant pretensions, or the deceptive puffings of interested intriguers.

HAMPDEN, in bringing forward Mr. Jefferson's *republicanism* as a title to public favor, could not have seriously intended this very common and universal qualification as a mark of any peculiar merit: It is to be presumed we are *all republicans*. I have mixed a great deal with the world; I have visited every part of the Union; I have heard the political sentiments of every description of people—and I can with truth, and most solemnly, aver, that I have never met with a citizen of the United States, who expressed a wish for any other form of government for the United States, than the *republican*.

YET I am aware that Hampden, in specifying this qualification, among others, meant less to point at the possession of it by Mr. Jefferson, than at the supposed want of it in his competitor, Mr. Adams.

It is well known, that one of the *tricks of party* employed by Mr. Jefferson and his adherents, has been to represent that worthy citizen, Mr. Adams, as a friend to monarchy and privileged orders. It is observed by our experienced *President*, in his late excellent address, “that one of the expedients of party, to acquire influence with particular districts, is, to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts.” So, one of the expedients of Mr. Jefferson's party, to acquire influence with the people, who are republicans, is, to misrepresent the opinions of their competitors and opponents, as being *anti-republican*.

WITH the vain hope of impressing this opinion, respecting Mr. Adams, on the public mind, various passages have been *garbled* from his work, entitled, “*A Defence of the American Constitutions* ;” a book expressly written for the purpose of *vindicating those constitutions* from the strictures of monsieur Turgot, a French theorist, who condemned the separation of the American legislatures into two branches. The object of Mr. Adams was, to shew the absolute necessity, in a republican government, of checks and balances; and that vesting all the legislative power in *a single body*, had, at all times, and in all republican governments, ended in the slavery of the people. To prove this, he refers to all the ancient and modern republics; and necessarily introduces the various checks and balances which had been devised in each, or for the want of which the people had lost their liberties.

THIS is called by Hampden, and other sycophants of Mr. Jefferson, “an elaborate book in favour of privileged orders, “and of a plan of government, compounded of a sufficient “mixture of monarchy.”

NOTHING is more false than this assertion. The book is in favour of distributing the legislative power in the United States, into two branches : and so much good sense and sound reasoning does it contain, that, for the honour of Mr. Adams, every constitution which has been made in the United States since his work has been so organized.—That of Pennsylvania, which had always been constructed on the plan of a single branch, was, in 1790, a few years after Mr. Adams's work appeared, changed, and organized with two branches;—a change effected almost unanimously in their convention, and allowed to be productive of the most essential advantages.

If this *party* have succeeded in some quarters of the Union, where the means of information have been limited, how have they effected their base purposes? By garbling detached sentences of Mr. Adams's book, and misrepresenting his opinions.

THERE is no publication in the world which may not be condemned by this unfair mode of proceeding. When an individual is prosecuted for publishing a *libel* even in England, although the charge is founded on certain passages, extracted from the work, the judge always charges the jury to *read the whole work*, and to ground their verdict on *the whole, taken together* ; the jury carry out the book and read the whole of it, before they undertake to condemn the author. Yet Hampden, probably himself a sprig of the law, and who, I'll venture to say, has never read the book he condemns, calls on the enlightened and liberal citizens of America to pass perpetual sentence of condemnation on Mr. Adams, (whom he allows to have been a *patriot of 1776*) on the strength of a few broken and detached sentences.

JUDGE WILSON, in the convention of Pennsylvania, when the federal constitution was under discussion, made the following reply to some of its opponents : “ Take *detached parts* of any system whatever, in the manner these gentlemen have hitherto taken this constitution, and you will make it absurd and inconsistent with itself. I do not confine this observation to human performances alone, it will apply to divine writings. An anecdote, which I have heard, exemplifies this observation : When Sternhold's and Hopkins' versions of the Psalms was usually sung in churches, a line was first read by the clerk, and then sung by the congregation. A sailor had stepped in, and heard the clerk read this line—

“ The Lord will come, and he will not——”

The sailor stared ; but when the clerk read the next line,

“ Keep silence, but speak out,——”

the sailor left the church, convinced the people were not in their senses.

“ This story, added Mr. Wilson, may convey an idea of the treatment of the plan before you ; although it contains sound sense, when connected, yet by the detached manner of considering it, it appears highly absurd.”

The passages, which have been selected from Mr. Adams's book by his enemies, are generally *narratives* concerning the forms of government of other countries, in which there existed a monarchy or privileged orders, and the defects of which he adduces as illustrations of his system in favor of a *balanced republican government*. When he speaks of the United States† he expressly rejoices at our happiness, “ *because OUR PEOPLE are sovereign, and because we have NO HEREDITARY titles, honors, offices, nor distinctions.*” It would have been singular indeed had he set out with writing a book *in defence of the American constitutions*, and then published a panegyric on a system, directly opposed to those constitutions : And yet this gross absurdity is alledged by his opponents.

BUT to place beyond a doubt the impression which this book, (so much reviled by our jacobins) has made on the disinterested, candid and enlightened, not only of our own, but of other nations, I will refer to the speech of *Boissy d'Anglas*, one of the purest republicans in France, in the convention, on discussing their present constitution. All France had just at that moment sworn eterna' hatred to monarchy and privileged orders ; any encomiums therefore on an author supposed to be friendly to monarchy and privileged orders, would not have been favorably received ; Mr. Adams's book had been translated into the French language, had been much read by that nation, and was well known : Boissy d'Anglas declared, in the convention, that “ the committee who had drawn up the constitution, were much indebted to the EXCELLENT WORK of that celebrated American patriot, JOHN ADAMS, for many of the LIGHTS they had acquired on the subject of true REPUBLICAN government.” Such was the opinion formed of Mr. Adams's book by those who had no *personal interest* in attempting to disparage the work or its author.

MR. ADAMS's work, which has furnished such a handle for the malignant criticisms of his adversaries, and of those who dread his just pretensions to the public gratitude, was

† See Defence of the American Constitutions, page 95.

written in the year 1786. Yet we heard little of his alleged monarchical principles till about the year 1791. This will be hereafter accounted for. It is very certain that Mr. *Jefferson* himself did not, in the year 1789, three years after the work was written, suspect Mr. Adams of fostering any such principles ; for we find in a letter ‡ from Mr. Jefferson, dated Paris, March 15, 1789, these expressions : “ I know “ there are some among us who would now establish a mo- “ narchy, but they are *inconsiderable* in number and *weight of* “ *character.*” No one will doubt that Mr. Jefferson had then seen Mr. Adams’s book ; the intimacy which had long subsisted between those characters, the curiosity of the former on literary and particularly on political subjects, his situation as the minister of the United States at a court, and among learned men, at that time particularly inquisitive on such subjects, where such a work would be necessarily an interesting and general topic of conversation, and the high character of the latter, then a minister at a neighbouring court, are all circumstances which must remove every doubt of the fact.

As little doubt can there be that at the time Mr. Jefferson wrote the letter referred to, he did not consider Mr. Adams as a person *inconsiderable in weight of character.* Thence it is clear that although Mr. Jefferson had read Mr. Adams’s book in 1789, he did not then infer from it that the author was a friend to monarchy, for had he drawn such a conclusion, he could not have said, with truth, that the friends of monarchy were *inconsiderable* in weight of character. What afterwards led to the discovery that Mr. Adams was a favorer of monarchy, is now to be unfolded.

In the summer of 1790, the President was afflicted with an alarming disorder which threatened his life. Already a successor was talked of ; various candidates presented themselves to the public mind, and among them the Vice-President stood most conspicuous. It instantly became the systematic policy of Mr. Jefferson and his adherents, to ruin in the public estimation a formidable rival, by charging the Vice-President with an attachment to monarchy and privileged orders.

About that time, Mr. Jefferson, being secretary of state, conferred a *sinecure* office in his department with a salary of two hundred and fifty dollars a year on Mr. Freneau, to induce him to remove to Philadelphia, and set up a newspaper at the seat of government, called the *National Gazette.* This paper

‡ This letter and some others, supposed to be written to Mr. Madison, on the subject of the new constitution of the United States, were published in Dunlap’s paper in 1792, to prove (what they did not) Mr. Jefferson’s approbation of that constitution.

forthwith teemed with the most illiberal abuse of Mr. Adams, and twice a week regularly rung the changes against his system of monarchy and privileged orders.

BUT, to give more *éclat* and character to the charge, the secretary of state himself, who only, two years before, had not discovered any thing injurious to the public weal in Mr. Adams's book, did not disdain to appear in print, and commence the attack.

THE first volume of Thomas Paine's "*Rights of Man*," made its appearance ; the opportunity was eagerly seized, to answer the double purpose of wounding a competitor, and of laying in an additional stock of popularity, by associating and circulating the name of Thomas Jefferson with a popular production of a once favorite writer, on a favorite subject.

FOR this purpose, the secretary of state wrote an epistle to a printer in Philadelphia, transmitting the work for republication, and containing the following passage: " I am extremely pleased to find it will be reprinted here, and that something is at length to be publicly said against the *political heresies* which have sprung up among us. I have no doubt our citizens will rally a second time round the *standard* of common sense."

THERE was not a man in the United States acquainted with the insinuations which had been propagated against Mr. Adams, who did not instantly apply the remark ; and the signal was so well understood by the partizans of the writer, that a general attack immediately commenced.

THE National Gazette of *Freneau*, faithful to its *duty*, and the newspapers of the *party* in the different states, resounded with invective and scurrility against the patriot, who was thus marked out as *the object of persecution*.

BUT it was quickly perceived that discerning and respectable men disapproved of the step which the secretary had taken. It was of consequence to endeavour to maintain their good opinion. Insincere protestations and excuses, as frivolous as awkward, were multiplied by the secretary to veil the real design. " The gentleman alluded to," he protested, " never once entered his mind ; it was never imagined that the printer would be so *incautious* as to publish the letter. No thing more had been in view, than to turn a handsome period, and avoid the *baldness* of a note, that did nothing but present the compliments of the writer ! "

THUS, a solemn invocation to the people of America, on a

most serious and important subject, dwindled at once into a brilliant conceit that tickled the imagination too much to be resisted. The imputation of *levity* was preferred to that of malice.

BUT when the people of America presented themselves to the disturbed fancy of the patriotic secretary, as a routed host, scattered and dispersed by that political forcerer, the Vice-President, how was it possible to resist the heroic, the chivalrous desire, of erecting for them some magic standard of orthodoxy, such as Tom Paine, and endeavouring to *rally* them round it, for their mutual protection and safety.

IN so glorious a cause, the considerations—that a citizen of the United States had written, in a foreign country, a book, containing strictures on the government of that country, which were regarded by it as *libellous and seditious*—that he had *dedicated* this book to the *Chief Magistrate* of the Union—that the *republication* of it, *under the auspices of the secretary of state*, would wear the appearance of its having been promoted, at least of its being *patronised by the government of this country*—were considerations too light and unimportant to occasion a moment's hesitation.

THOSE who, after an attentive review of circumstances, can be deceived by the artifices which have been employed to varnish over this very exceptionable proceeding, must understand little of human nature, and be little read in those arts, which, in all countries and at all times, have served to disguise the machinations of factious and intriguing men.

WE have seen, that these *supposed heresies*, at which Mr. Jefferson affected so much alarm, were the opinions disseminated throughout the able work of Mr. Adams,—a citizen, pre-eminent for his early, intrepid, faithful, persevering, and comprehensively useful services—a man, pure and unspotted in private life—a patriot, having a high and solid title to the esteem, the gratitude, and the confidence of his fellow-citizens—a title which the foul and pestilent calumnies, which have been circulated through the country, have never yet contaminated.

WE have seen the base arts which have been employed to distort his real sentiments, by selecting and disjointing detached passages. We shall now see whether a less unfair proceeding will not convict Mr. Jefferson himself of having fostered some *political heresies*.

IN the discussion of the charges alledged against Mr. Adams, I have inadvertently on the unfairness of gabbling sentences

and mangling expressions for the purpose of condemning an author's work ; and I have adverted to the practice in the courts of judicature in England, in prosecutions for a libel, where the jury never condemn, "*till they have read the whole work.*"

WILL the enlightened citizens of America condemn an old and faithful servant, whom even Hampden styles, "*a patriot of '76,*" before they have allowed him the means of defence, which are allowed in England to the meanest individual ?—Let them read his Defence of the American Constitutions, and I shall be content to abide by their verdict ;—but let them spurn, with just contempt, the venomous insinuations of party.

WOULD Mr. Jefferson be content to have *his* opinions examined by the rule which has been applied by his partizans to Mr. Adams ? Would he acquiesce without appeal, in a sentence of condemnation, which should be altogether grounded on mangled quotations, and partial extracts from his writings ?

THE charge against Mr. Adams by Hampden is, that he is an advocate for monarchy and privileged orders ; and this charge is said to be founded on certain expressions in his work.

I do not mean to retort with severity the charge, and accuse Mr. Jefferson of being at this time, an advocate for monarchy and privileged orders ; but I am warranted in asserting, that, without doing any violence to the context, I can produce from his writings particular passages, as much in favour of monarchy and privileged orders, as any passages in Mr. Adams's book.

For example—In speaking of the impolicy of increasing the population of the United States, by encouraging the introduction of foreigners, in page 93 of his Notes on Virginia, he observes, that foreigners will infuse into our government their spirit, &c. ; by waiting some years longer, our government will be more homogeneous, more peaceable, more durable. He then adds, " Suppose † twenty millions of REPUBLICAN Americans, thrown all of a sudden into *France*, what would be the *condition* of that kingdom ? If it would be MORE TURBULENT, LESS HAPPY, LESS STRONG, we may believe, that the addition of half a million of foreign-

† A very curious supposition, by the bye, inasmuch as there were not at that time, THREE millions of republican Americans in the world. Where, then, was he to find these twenty millions ?

“ers to our present numbers, would produce a similar effect
“here.”

Now, it is evident, from the above extract, that Mr. *Jefferso* believed that a *monarchical* government was the best suited to France, and that sending there twenty millions of *republican* Americans would render France *more turbulent, less happy, and less strong*. If he thought that *twenty* millions of *American republicans* (who are justly reckoned the best republicans on the globe) would *disorganise* France, and *diminish* her *happiness* and her *strength*, he must have been fully persuaded, that *thirty* millions of *French republicans* (who, with all their merits are certainly inferior to the Americans in the science of self-government) would produce those effects in a much greater degree.

An opinion, in favour of *monarchy* may then without difficulty be inferred from the foregoing passage.

In page 126 of the same work, in enumerating what he calls the *capital defects* of the constitution of *Virginia*, he complains bitterly of the construction of the *senate*, as not being sufficiently *aristocratic*, although the members are chosen for *four years*, as long a period as in any state in the Union, except Maryland. But he complains, because the *senate*, and the electors of the senate, do not constitute a *different interest* from the rest of the community. He says, “The *senate* is, “by its constitution, *too homogeneous* with the house of delegates; being chosen by the same electors, at the same time, “and out of the same *subjects*, the choice falls of course, on “*men of the same description*. The purpose of establishing “*different houses of legislation* is, to *introduce the influence of dif-* “*ferent interests or different principles*. In some of the Ameri- “can states the delegates and senators are so chosen, as that “the first represent the *persons*, and the second the *property* † “of the state; but, with us, *wealth* and *wisdom* have an “*equal chance* for admission into both houses. We do not “therefore derive, from the separation of our legislature into “two houses, those *benefits* which a *proper complication of prin-* “*ciples* is capable of producing, and those which *alone* can “compensate the evils which may be produced by their *dis-* “*sensions*.”

Now can there be a stronger recommendation of *aristocracy* and *privileged orders* than we find in this passage? He wishes to see introduced into the constitution of *Virginia*, an INFLUENCE

† There is nothing of the kind in any of the American constitutions; the assertion is untrue.

of INTERESTS different from those of the mass of the *subjects* (as he calls the people) and to establish a permanent constitutional separation of two *orders* of people, on *different principles* ; one to be represented by the Senate, the other by the Delegates ; he wishes to have WEALTH altogether represented in the Senate, and *wisdom* in the other house, and laments that *wisdom* has an *equal* chance with *wealth* of admission into the Senate. What is all this but an establishment of *privileged orders* and of an *aristocracy* of the rankett kind ? The *wealth* of the state is to constitute a SEPARATE CLASS, to be represented EXCLUSIVELY in a Senate, which is to be organized on *different principles*, and which is to *maintain an influence of different interests* from those of the rest of the society. Such a body, having an equal participation of the legislative power with the poorer representatives of the poorer class, would soon crush the other branch and usurp all power ; it would soon erect itself into an *hereditary* aristocracy, like that of *Venice*. Is there any distinction, except in names, between a *privileged order*, and a distinct class of men, enabled by their possession of wealth and exclusive representation in a branch of the legislature to maintain a separate influence in the state ? What in fact is a privileged order but a separate class of men, possessing by law exclusive privileges ? What did Mr. Jefferson wish to establish in Virginia ?—" a separate and *privileged* " *class*, composed of the *wealthy*, possessing by law an *influence*, " different from that of the rest of the people, and *exclusively* re- " presented in the Senate ?" Now I defy his champions to produce any fragment from Mr. Adams's book, so pointedly in favor of privileged orders, as applicable to the United States, as the foregoing quotation.

AN *aristocracy of wealth* being thus established by law, *titles* would follow of course ; it matters little whether such a Virginia senator, as Mr. Jefferson wished to create, was to be stiled *honorable*, or *illustrious*, the title of a Venetian senator ; the latter would most probably be annexed ; for we find even *Hampden*, while extolling the republican character of his patron, so far forgets himself as to stile him the *illustrious* Jefferson ; he presently after speaks of his *wealth* ; thus connecting his *riches* with his *illustrious* character, as though he had just been reading his plan of a *Virginia house of nobles*.

WILL it be now denied that even Thomas Jefferson, that prototype of republicanism, has in his writings, countenanced doctrines favorable to monarchy and aristocracy ; that he has, in this respect, at least as much forfeited his title to the public favor, as Mr. Adams, and that henceforward his partizans, if they have any sense of decency, ought to be silent on this subject ?

It has been stated, that the object of Mr. Adams's book was to point out the tendency of a *single* legislative branch to destroy the liberties of the people. His reasoning in favour of a distribution of the legislative power into two branches, and the establishment of checks and balances, has been wickedly perverted into a reasoning in support of privileged orders. Who has not seen the venomous effusions, and the low ribaldry, which have of late been disgorged from the *Jacobine* presses against Mr. Adams's system of checks and balances? Who would have supposed, that *similar* reasoning and principles were to be found in the works of Mr. Jefferson, the *favorite of those presses*, and the very man who had first sounded the alarm against Mr. Adams's system of checks and balances, in other words, his *political heresies*? Such however is the fact.

IN the Notes on Virginia, page 126, the constitution of Virginia is condemned by Mr. Jefferson, because "all the powers of government result to the legislative body." "The *con-*
centrating these, (he adds) in the same hands, is precisely the
 "† *definition* of despotic government. It will be no allevia-
 "tion that these powers will be exercised by a *plurality* of
 "hands, and not by a single one.—*One hundred and seventy-*
 "three despots would surely be as oppressive as *one*. Let those
 "who doubt it, turn their eyes on the republic of Venice. As
 "little will it avail us that they are *chosen by ourselves*: an
 "elective despotism was not the government we sought for;
 "but one which should not only be founded on free principles,
 "but in which the powers of government should be so divided
 "and *balanced* among several bodies of magistracy, as that no
 "one could transcend their legal limits, without being
 "effectually *checked* and restrained by the others."

Now, here we find a very able recommendation of *checks* and *balances*; and we are told, that we are *not to trust* even those whom *we elect ourselves*, unless *checked* by some other power; for, if not so checked, they will soon be converted into *elective despots*.

SUCH were the opinions of Mr. Jefferson, when he wrote his Notes on Virginia. Whether his subsequent *residence in France* has effected a total change in these opinions, we have not the materials to decide; those we possess involve the matter in obscurity; for although in his letter to Mr. Madison from Paris, dated December 20, 1787, on the subject of the new federal constitution, he says, "I like the *negative* given

† This concentration might be the *establishment* of despotic government, but it is difficult to comprehend how it is the *definition* of it.

to the executive ;” yet, a few years after his return from France, this kind of check was ranked by him among Mr. Adams’s *political heresies* ; and though, in that letter, he seems to approve of the distribution of the legislative power, by the American constitution, into two branches ; yet he is said to have been consulted about, and to have approved, the French constitution of 1791, which vested the whole legislative power in one branch, and thus, according to his doctrine, established (or, to use his expression, *defined*) an *elective* despotism.

THE friends of Mr. Jefferson, while they hold him up as the quintessence of *republicanism*, affect to be prodigiously alarmed lest the enemies of republicanism should gain the ascendancy in the United States. Nothing can be more preposterous than this silly affectation. Those who make the most ostentatious parade of it, are known to be characters the most anti-republican in their private life, their public conduct, and all their views.

It is certain, that Mr. Jefferson himself, whatever he might affect, entertains none of these fears. In a letter, already referred to, from him, are these expressions : “ The rising race “ (in the United States) are *all* republicans. We were edu- “ cated in royalism : no wonder if some of us retain that idol- “ atry still. Our young people are educated in republicanism ; “ an *apostacy* from that to royalism, is unprecedented and im- “ possible.” What ground then for these apprehensions ? How must every judicious and independent citizen reprobate such base attempts to mislead the public, and to defame some of the best characters in the United States ? And of whom are these fears entertained ? Of Mr. Adams !—a citizen who, through the arduous progress of a long public life, has never been betrayed into one *act*, which his opponents can object to him ; for, it is to be observed, that, although he has been in public life for near thirty years, *they dare not attack his public conduct*, but are driven to the wretched expedient of criticising his political sentiments, by misquoting his writings. For my part, were I a southern planter, owning negroes, I should be ten thousand times more alarmed at Mr. Jefferson’s ardent wish for *emancipation*, than at any *fanciful* dangers from monarchy. *Emancipation* is a *possible* thing ; but *apostacy* to *royalism*, according to Mr. Jefferson, is *impossible*.

I HAVE produced written sentiments of Mr. Jefferson, which will bear a construction at least as unfriendly to republicanism, as any ever affixed to Mr. Adams’s works. I will now call on the adversaries of the latter to produce, from the works of the former, a more glowing panegyric on, or a more affec-

tionate evidence of attachment to, true republicanism, than is to be found in the following passage of Mr. Adams's Defence. After pointing out, with great ability, the superior advantages of a republican government, he says, in page 95, " After all, " let us compare every constitution we have seen with those of " the United States of America, and we shall have no reason " to blush for our country. On the contrary, we shall feel " the strongest motives to fall upon our knees, in *gratitude to " heaven*, for having been graciously pleased to give us *birth " and education in that country*, and for having destined us to " live under her laws. We shall have reason to *exult*, if we " make our *comparison* with England, and the *English consti- " tution*. Our *people* are undoubtedly *sovereign*—All the land- " ed and other property is in the hands of the citizens—Not " only their representatives, but their *senators* and governors, " are *annually* chosen.—There are no *hereditary* titles, honors, " offices, nor *distinctions*. The legislative, executive and judi- " cial powers are carefully separated from each other. The " powers of the one, the few, and the many, are nicely ba- " lanced in their legislatures. *Trials by jury* are preserved in " all their glory ; and there is *no standing army*. The *habeas " corpus* is in full force ; and the *press* is the *most free* in the " world : and where all these circumstances take place, it is " unnecessary to add, that *the laws alone can govern*."

IN this passage, Mr. Adams goes beyond Mr. Jefferson in commendation of democratic republicanism, for he approves of the *annual* choice of *senators*, as in New-England, while Mr. Jefferson, not content with a *quadrennial* election of the senate in Virginia, wants to invest that body with *peculiar and exclusive privileges* ; Mr. Adams rejoices that we have no hereditary distinctions in America ; Mr. Jefferson was desirous of clothing the wealthy class of Virginia, with constitutional, permanent and exclusive privileges, amounting to *hereditary distinctions*.

HAMPDEN, unable to attack with effect any part of Mr. Adams's *known* public acts, though so long in public life, relates a *fact*, as he calls it, *respecting his public conduct* : " When several important questions, which had received the sanction of " the house of representatives, have been submitted to his deci- " sion, as president of the senate, upon an equal division of that " body, he has *uniformly* decided against the opinion of the re- " presentatives, which we may reasonably suppose to be the " opinion of the people ! I believe," he adds, " no member " of congress will contradict this fact."

WITHOUT being a member of congress, I will undertake to

contradict this fact, and to prove that Hampden's assertion is as false, as his reasoning thereon is absurd.

As the vice president is, by the constitution, placed in the chair of the senate, with a casting vote, it was intended that he should exercise his judgment, in giving that vote : and whether the measure in question, had been approved by the house of representatives or not, he ought not to concur, if his judgment decidedly rejected it.

A *memorable* instance may however be adduced, where Mr. Adams gave the casting vote in the affirmative, in respect to a measure which had passed the house of representatives : it was in the session of 1790 ; a vote had passed the representatives for removing Congress from New-York ; this had been a subject of much contest, and the vote was considered as a great triumph by the southern members, because it was an important step towards fixing the seat of government in a more southern situation : the senate were equally divided on the question, Mr. Adams decided in the affirmative, and on being asked by some eastern member (who complained that such vote had been injurious to the eastern states) why he had voted in the affirmative, he made the following reply, which was related to me by a member of the senate who heard him, " That whenever the senate should be equally divided, on a subject, which had passed the house of representatives, he should always *vote with the house*, unless he had very clear and convincing reasons in his judgment against it.

THE two houses differing afterwards as to the place, whether Philadelphia or Baltimore, nothing was then done ; but the *residence bill* passed soon after. Here then is a *fact*, which completely disproves Hampden's assertion, and which ought to remove from the minds of our fellow-citizens every degree of credit to the assertions of this malignant writer, and others of a similar stamp, who do not accompany their accusations with proof.

AND I have not only destroyed Hampden's charge against Mr. Adams, of having *uniformly* voted in the senate against the opinion of the representatives, but have produced a strong instance to shew that Mr. Adams had laid it down as a rule, to vote with the representatives, in cases of equal division in the senate, unless his judgment was very clearly and strongly convinced that he ought to vote differently.

I COULD produce some other instances of his having pursued that line, but one pointed case was sufficient to convict

Hampden of a false assertion. The refutation of this, and the preceding charges, so positively made, will put the good citizens of this country on their guard against similar charges produced against Mr. Adams.

WHERE did Hampden find the fact? If in the journals of the senate, let him produce the cases, for they are all stated in the journals: if those be resorted to, I am convinced as many instances can be found where Mr. Adams voted on the one side as on the other. Hearsay and mere report are not sufficient grounds of condemnation before the enlightened tribunal of the public. It seems to be the peculiar characteristic of those, who stile themselves in this country, the *exclusive patriots*, the *true democrats*, to build up their own reputation on the ruin of their adversaries, and to support their importance by incessant detraction and the most barefaced falsehoods. But however they may have hitherto maintained some little consequence with a few uninformed citizens, the light of truth will ere long dispel the baneful mists of calumny, with which they have enveloped the best men among us, and make these designing hypocrites skulk back into their native obscurity.

IF Mr. Adams has sometimes voted differently from the representatives, it is to be fairly presumed that his judgment so directed him, nor can it be inferred that in such cases he was clearly on the wrong side; when so enlightened a body as the senate are equally divided, the question will be allowed to be a nice one, and although it may have been carried in the representatives, yet the majority there may have been small, which indeed we know to have been usually the case in important questions.

It by no means follows, as Hampden supposes, "that the opinion of the representatives must be always the opinion of the people." If so, all the senates, all the qualified negatives of the executives ought to be abolished: the assertion is a libel on the American constitutions, and a severe censure on Mr. Jefferson's doctrine, for he calls the mere will of the representatives (unchecked by the executive or senate) an *elective tyranny*, the *very definition of despotism*. If Mr. Adams ought, against his decided judgment, to vote with the representatives on every equal division of the senate, that body would soon be a superfluous member of the constitution, and the constitution, now so much admired, converted into an elective despotism.

THE universal establishment of senates in the United States, proves however, that our citizens think differently from Hampden on this subject, and their frequent approbation of the con-

duct of the senates and executives, in resisting the will of the representatives (frequently the momentary will of a wicked faction,) proves that they do not always consider their will as the opinion of the people. No act of the President's whole life has been more grateful to the citizens of America, or has added more to the lustre of his fame, than his resisting the will of the representatives on the late call for papers, which is now viewed throughout the union in its true light, as a measure of party, merely designed to answer certain views.

HAMPDEN'S reasoning is as false as his FACT : he first assumes a fact, inconsistent with truth, and then argues on it on principles, totally inconsistent with the principles of the constitution and of public freedom, and in direct opposition to the principles of his friend, Jefferson.

AMONG the other merits of Mr. Jefferson, as stated by Hampden, we find " his attachment to the CIVIL and RELIGIOUS rights of his fellow-citizens : " for the proof, we are referred to his *writings* and PUBLIC CONDUCT.

WE have seen a few specimens of his writings ; from them we may infer a pretty strong disposition to entrench on some of the civil rights of his fellow-citizens, particularly in his project of a senate, which would undoubtedly, on his plan, establish an *aristocracy*, very injurious to the rights of the *poor class* of his fellow-citizens.

BUT the proof of a steady attachment to the civil rights of one's fellow-citizens ought not to rest merely on *writings* ; this attachment ought to be evinced by *public conduct*, by *action*, and in *times of danger* ; then the hazarding of *personal safety* for the preservation of our civil rights is the highest testimony of patriotism. There is no great merit in composing, in the cabinet, in seasons of tranquillity, essays on civil rights, which are frequently done to obtain popularity, and without any risk of personal inconvenience.

IT appears, however, that Mr. Jefferson, has generally sacrificed the civil rights of his countrymen to his own personal safety. We are told, in a public address, by Mr. Charles Simms, of Virginia, who must have been well acquainted with the circumstance, " that Mr. Jefferson, when governor of Virginia, *abandoned the trust* with which he was charged, at the moment of an invasion by the enemy, by which great confusion, *loss and distress* accrued to the state, in

the destruction of public records and vouchers for general expenditures.†

Now here was a period of public danger, when Mr. Jefferson's attachment to the civil rights of his countrymen might have shone very conspicuously, by facing and averting the danger; here would have been a fine opportunity for him to have displayed his public spirit in bravely *rallying* round the standard of liberty and civil rights; but, though in times of safety, he could *rally* round the standard of his friend, Tom Paine, yet when real danger appeared, the *governor of the ancient dominion* dwindled into the *poor, timid philosopher*, and instead of rallying his brave countrymen, he fled for safety from a few light-horsemen, and shamefully abandoned his trust§ !!

AGAIN, when the peace and tranquillity of the United States were in extraordinary peril, when it required the exertions and talents of the wisest and bravest statesmen to keep the federal ship from foundering on the rocks with which she was encompassed, he, when his aid was most essential, abandoned the old helmsman; and, with his wonted caution, sneaked away to a snug retreat, leaving others to buffet with the storm, and if they were cast away, to bear all the obloquy and public disgrace which would follow.

How different was the conduct of the spirited and truly patriotic HAMILTON? He wished to retire as much as the philosopher of Montecelli; he had a large family, and his little fortune was fast melting away in the expensive metropolis, but with a Roman's spirit, he declared "that, much as he wished for retirement, yet, he would remain at his post, as long as there " was any danger of his country being involved in war." How different the conduct of the great WASHINGTON? He tells us, that he had resolved to retire before the last election, but

† Mr. Leven Powell, of Virginia, also states, in his public address, "that when *Tarleton*, with a few light horse, pursued the assembly to Charlottesville, Mr. Jefferson discovered such a want of firmness as shewed he was not fit to fill the first executive office, for instead of using his talents, in directing the necessary operations of defence, he quitted his government by resigning his office; this too, at a time that tried men's souls, at a time when the affairs of America stood in doubtful suspense, and required the exertions of all." The Governor of Virginia, during the invasion of the State by a small British force, instead of defending the Commonwealth at that alarming juncture, voluntarily and suddenly surrendered his office, and at that crisis, his country was required to choose another Governor! Is there any security he would not act in like manner again, under like circumstances?

§ This charge has been attempted to be got rid of by producing a vote of the Assembly of Virginia, after an enquiry into his conduct, acknowledging his *ability* and *integrity*, but altogether silent on his want of firmness, which had been the cause of his flight.

It was natural for his friends in the Assembly to varnish over the business as well as they could, and the danger being past, there being no prospect of his being again exposed in that station, and his flight proceeding, not from any criminality, but from a constitutional weakness of nerves, it was no difficult matter to get such a vote through the assembly, more especially as the *character* of the *State* was no less implicated in the business than that of the governor.

the then *perplexed* and *critical* situation of the country forbade such a step. How different was even *Jefferson himself*, when calmly and *safely* writing his Notes on Virginia, from what he was when called upon to *act* in times of peril? in his Notes, page 135, in reprobating the proposition made in the Virginia assembly, to appoint a *dictator*, he exclaims, “ Was this moved on a supposed right in the movers of *abandoning their posts* in a moment of *distress*? Our laws forbid the abandonment of our posts, even on ordinary occasions.”

WHETHER Mr. Jefferson *forefaw* the *western insurrection*, and either conscious of his want of courage or capacity to act on so trying an occasion, or of his good wishes towards *some* of the promoters of it, we will not determine; but it is our duty to state some facts; the comments on them will be left to a discerning public.

It is certain that Mr. Jefferson resigned the office of secretary of state in January or February 1794, and that the *insurrection* broke out the July following, having manifested threatening symptoms some months before. Citizen *Fauchet*, of glorious memory, in his intercepted letter, (which caused the dismissal of citizen Randolph, also of glorious memory, the virtuous author of *the precious confessions*,) has the following passage—“ Mr. Randolph came to see me with an air of *great eagerness*, and made to me the *overtures* of which I have given you an account in my No. 6.—Thus with *some thousands of dollars*, the *republic (of France)* could have decided on CIVIL WAR, or on peace! thus the *consciences* of the *pretended patriots of America* have already *their prices*! What will be the old age of this government, if it is thus early *decrepid*! Still there are patriots, of whom I delight to entertain an idea worthy of that imposing title. CONSULT *Monroe* †, he is of this number: *he* had *apprized me* of the men, whom the current of events had dragged along as bodies devoid of weight: *his friend Madison* is also an honest man: *Jefferson*, on whom the *patriots* cast their eyes to succeed the President, HAD FORESEEN THESE CRISES: *he prudently retired* in order to avoid making a figure AGAINST HIS INCLINATION in scenes, the secret of which will soon or late be brought to light.”

WE are informed by the newspapers that *Randolph has been to visit Mr. Jefferson*, and has announced his determination to

† Citizen Monroe, lately *recalled* by the President from France, *not* I presume for his *services* to the United States, and not at his request; possessed of a palace in Paris worth formerly 100,000 guineas (and for the purchase of which he was abused in a Paris newspaper) it is not probable he wished to return quite *so soon*.

serve, if elected president ; he has not yet announced his own determination to return to his former secretaryship, if his friend should be president : but his *activity in canvassing for him* leaves no room for doubt, as to his *wishes and expectations* : it is apprehended, however, by some of the friends of both these characters, that a *lete legal call* on *one* of them, for the immediate settlement of some accounts and *balances*, will prove highly injurious to both.†

Having adverted to these two striking instances of Mr. Jefferson's *abandonment of his trust* at very critical moments, I cannot omit the following sensible remark of Mr. Charles Simms—"These instances, he observes, shew Mr. Jefferson *to want firmness*, and a man, who shall once have abandoned the helm in the hour of danger, or at the *appearance of a tempest*, seems not fit to be trusted in better times, *for no one can know how soon or from whence a storm may come.*"

THOSE who are acquainted with Mr. Adams's public conduct, from the very commencement of the revolution, can bear witness to his *firm and steady* pursuit of his patriotic career, amidst the *proscriptions* of a powerful and enraged government, and the multiplied dangers which threatened him at various periods : his *manly* and independent conduct at Paris in *negotiating the peace*, whereby *great advantages* were acquired to the United States, can never be forgotten.

WE are next informed of Mr. Jefferson's "attachment to the *RELIGIOUS rights* of mankind," and are referred for his sentiments respecting religious liberty to his *writings, his conduct*, and particularly to the "*act establishing religious freedom*," drawn up by him.

HAMPDEN would have acted more wisely, and more conformably, I am persuaded, to the wishes of his patron, had he passed over this *tender* subject in silence. It was certainly indiscreet to mention *Thomas Jefferson* and *religion* in the same paragraph of an eulogy.—*Religious freedom* and *freedom from religion* are now become *convertible* terms with most modern philosophers, particularly those who have been educated in the philosophical schools of France. Mr. Jefferson has been heard to say, since his return from France, that the men of letters and philosophers he had met with in that country, were generally *Atheists*. The late impious and blasphemous works of Thomas Paine, reviling the *christian religion*, have been much applauded in France, and have been very industriously circulated in the United States, by all *that class* of people, who are friendly to Mr. Jefferson's politics, and anxiously de-

† Edmund Randolph is sued by the Comptroller of the Treasury for a *deficiency* in his *accounts*, while Secretary of State, of 50,000 dollars.

famous of his election to the presidency. Mr. Jefferson's friendship for *Paine* has been already mentioned ; that *anti-christian* writer had apartments at Citizen Monroe's at Paris. and should Mr. Jefferson be President, there is no doubt I'om would return to this country, and be a conspicuous figure at the President's table at Philadelphia, where this enlightened pair of philosophers would fraternize, and philosophize against the *christian religion*, and all *religious worship*.—Whatever new lights Jefferson may have acquired in France, it is certain that he had naturally very good pre-dispositions on the subject of religion. In his *Notes on Virginia*, page 169, in discussing the subject of religious freedom, he makes this witty observation—" It does me no injury for my neighbour to say there are twenty gods, or *no god* ; it neither picks my pocket nor breaks my leg ; if it be said, his testimony in a court of justice cannot be relied on, reject it then, and be the stigma on him." In page 170, he says, " millions of innocent men, women and children, *since the introduction of christianity*, have been burnt, tortured, fined and imprisoned." In page 171, speaking of the state of religion in Pennsylvania and New-York, he says, " religion there is well supported, of various kinds indeed, *but all good enough* ; all sufficient to preserve peace and order."

WHICH ought we to be the most shocked at, the *levity* or the *impiety* of these remarks ? " it does me no injury, if my neighbour is AN ATHEIST, because it does not break my leg ! " What ? do I receive no injury, as a member of society, if I am surrounded with atheists, with whom I can have no social intercourse, on whom there are none of those religious and sacred ties, which restrain mankind from the perpetration of crimes, and without which ties civil society would soon degenerate into a wretched state of barbarism, and be stained with scenes of turpitude, and with every kind of atrocity ? Good God ! is this the man the *patriots* have cast their eyes on as successor to the *virtuous Washington*, who, in his farewell address, so warmly and affectionately recommends to his fellow-citizens, the *cultivation of religion*. Contrast with the above frivolous and impious passage † the following dignified advice from that true patriot ; " of all the dispositions and habits, which lead to political prosperity, *religion and morality* are indispensable supports. In vain would *that man* (he seems to point at *Jefferson* !) claim the tribute of patriotism,

† Contrast even an observation of *his* own in one of his letters, already referred to, where he says, " the declaration that religious faith shall be unpunished, does not give impunity to *criminal acts dictated by religious errors*." He then believed that religious error would produce criminal acts ! and yet *religious error does no injury to society* ! absurd and inconsistent writer !

“ who should labor to subvert these great *pillars of human*
 “ *happiness*, these *firmest props* of the *duties of men and citizens*.
 “ The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to
 “ respect and to *cherish* them. A volume could not trace all
 “ their *connexions with private and public felicity*.

“ LET it simply be asked where is the security for proper-
 “ ty, for reputation, for *life*, if the sense of *religious* obligation
 “ *desert the oaths*, which are the instruments of investigation in
 “ courts of justice? And let us, with caution, indulge the
 “ *supposition* that MORALITY can be maintained WITHOUT
 “ RELIGION. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of
 “ *refined* education on minds of peculiar structure, reason
 “ and experience both forbid us to expect that NATIONAL
 “ MORALITY can prevail in exclusion of RELIGIOUS PRINCI-
 “ PLE. 'Tis substantially true, that virtue or morality is a ne-
 “ cessary spring of *popular* government. The rule indeed ex-
 “ tends with more or less force to every species of free govern-
 “ ment. Who that is a *sincere friend* to it can look with indif-
 “ ference upon *attempts to shake* the foundation of the fabric?—
 “ Can it be, that Providence has not connected the permanent
 “ felicity of a nation with it's *virtue*? The experiment, at
 “ least, is recommended by every sentiment, which ennobles
 “ human nature; alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?”

WHAT sublime sentiments, what admirable advice! How must it sink in our eyes the pretended philosopher, who could attempt to degrade the Christian religion by charging to it the murder of millions, who could view with such indifference the many alarming innovations on the mild and simple religion of our forefathers? “ There are religions, of *various* kinds indeed, says our philosopher, BUT ALL GOOD ENOUGH.”

Good enough indeed for him, who established and patronized a newspaper, one object of which was to *revile Christianity*! It is not forgotten, that the *National Gazette*, published by a *clerk* in the department of state and under the *auspices* of the *secretary*, lost no convenient opportunity of making a mockery of religion†, and vilifying the clergy of the country.

It is well observed by a modern writer, “ that *patriotism*, as a *moral* principle attaching itself to political society, depends, like every other moral principle, on its relation to *religion*. The Creator of man has bound the social to the divine virtues, and

† See, among various instances, the 36th number of the *National Gazette*, where the belief of a *Providence* is treated as an *impious tenet*. In the time of Robespierre, a member of the convention who had introduced into his speech the word *Providence*, was called to order, by the cry of *Point de Providence, no Providence*.

made our devotion and our reverence to himself, the ground work of our duties to our brethren and to our country."

THE *act for establishing religious freedom*, in Virginia, (the *necessity* for which is not very obvious,) has been much extolled by Mr. Jefferson's panegyrists. I ask them, what good effects has it produced? Does religion flourish in Virginia more than it did, or more than in the eastern states? Is public worship better attended? Are the ministers of the gospel better supported, than in the eastern states?

THAT *act*, which is nearly all preamble, setting forth a series of principles, some of which are proved by late experience in France to be *very questionable*, has, in my opinion, an immediate *tendency* to produce a total disregard to *public worship*, an absolute *indifference to all religion whatever*. It states, among other things, "that we ought not to be obliged to support even the ministers of our own religious persuasion, and that our *civil* rights have no more dependance on our *religious* opinions than on our opinions in physic or geometry;" the *act* then declares, "that no man shall be compelled to *frequent or support any religious worship or minister whatever*, and that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions, in matters of religion, without diminishing their civil capacities."

I WILL not accuse Mr. Jefferson of having been influenced by *selfish views*, in getting this *act* passed; but those acquainted with *his conduct and opinions* will agree with me, that he has fully *taken advantage* of every tittle of the preamble and enacting clause: he has by his conduct proved his religious freedom, or, rather, his freedom from religion; and, by his opinions, his right to maintain by argument any doctrine whatever, in matters of religion. Who ever saw him in a place of worship? The man who can say he has seen such a *phenomenon*, is himself a much greater curiosity than the elephant now travelling through the southern states.

BUT how inconsistent, not only with truth, but with themselves, are these visionary philosophers, who are thus always striking out some new doctrine? The preamble states, that our *civil* rights have *no dependance* whatever on our *religious* opinions; and yet it immediately after admits, that *religious opinions may break out into overt acts* against peace and good order; and yet the letter just quoted speaks of *criminal acts dictated by religious error*!

WHAT a conformity do we find between the sentiments of Mr. Jefferson, in matters of religion, and those of Tom Paine? Where is the wonder, then, if the *works* of the latter are *circulated* with so much *zeal* by the *friends* of the former? Tom

Paine has ridiculed the Holy Scriptures, and reprobated public worship. Tom Jefferson has attempted to disprove the *deluge*—has made it a question whether the Almighty ever had a chosen people,† and has, by *example* and *precept*, *discountenanced public worship*. Such is the Chief Magistrate whom the *patriots* of citizen Fauchet have selected for the United States!! Such the kindred philosophers, whose *new lights* are to be diffused throughout America, under the *auspices* of the *Chief Magistrate of the Union*!!

THE *opinions* of Mr. Jefferson, relative to the present *constitution of the United States*, are next in order to be considered.

IF he is not *artifederal*, it will not be denied that he entertained *very considerable objections* to the constitution, and that his advice to call a *second convention*, if pursued, would have prevented our having ever obtained *so good a constitution*.

SOME of his opinions, relative to the constitution, are to be found in a series of letters, written from Paris, in the years 1788 and '89. Partial extracts from these letters were published in 1792, by a friend of Mr. Jefferson, as a vindication of his federalism. How far they established it, will now appear.

IN a letter, dated 20th December, 1787, after expressing his approbation of some of the features of the new constitution, which had been generally approved of, and which he could not well object to, he says, “ I will now add what I do not like : first, the omission of a bill of rights, &c. &c. The second feature I *dislike*, and *greatly* dislike, is, the abandonment, *in every instance*, of the *necessity* of *rotation in office*, and *most particularly* in the case of the *President*. Smaller objections are, the appeal in fact as well as law, and the *binding* all persons, legislative, executive, and judicial, by *oath*, to *maintain that constitution*. I do not pretend to decide what would be the best method of procuring the establishment of the manifold good things in this constitution, and of getting rid of the bad. Whether by adopting it in hopes of future amendment, or, after it has been duly weighed and canvassed by the people, after seeing the parts they generally dislike, and those they generally approve, to say to them, “ we see now what you wish : *send together your deputies again ; let them frame a constitution for you, omitting what you have condemned, and establishing the powers you approved.*” Even these will be a great addition to the energy of your government.

† Notes on Virginia, p. 175. “ Those who labour in the earth, are the chosen people of God, if ever he had a chosen people.

" At all events, I hope you will not be discouraged from other
 " trials, if the present one should fail of its full effects. The
 " *late rebellion* in Massachusetts, has given *more alarm* than I
 " think it should have done. Calculate, that one rebellion in
 " *thirteen* states, in the course of *eleven* years, is but one for
 " *each state* in a century and a half: nor will any degree of
 " power in the hands of government, prevent insurrections.
 " *France*, with all its despotism, and two or three hundred
 " thousand men in arms, has had three insurrections in the
 " three years I have been here; in every one of which, greater
 " numbers were engaged than in Massachusetts, and a great deal
 " more blood spilt. Compare again the *ferocious* depredations
 " of their insurgents, with the *order*, the moderation, and the
 " almost self-extinguishment of ours." In another letter, of
 " 6th of July, 1788, he says, " I am glad to hear the new consti-
 " tution is received with favour: I sincerely wish, that the
 " *nine* first conventions may receive, and the *four last reject* it.
 " The former will secure it *finally*, while the latter will OBLIGE
 " them to offer a declaration of rights, in order to COMPLETE
 " THE UNION." In another of the 31st same month, he says,
 " The abandoning the principle of *necessary rotation* in the *se-*
 " *nate*, has, I see, been disapproved by *few*—in the case of the
 " *President*, by *none*. I readily, therefore, suppose *my opinion*
 " *wrong*, when opposed by the majority, as in the former in-
 " stance, and the totality, as in the latter." In a letter of the
 " 18th November, 1788, he says, " As to the bill of rights,
 " however, I still think it should be added; and I am glad to
 " see, that three states have at length considered the perpetual
 " re-eligibility of the President, as an article which should be
 " amended. I should *deprecate* with you, indeed, the meet-
 " ing of a *new convention*."

How far these extracts were *altered* or *mutilated*, is liable to
 question, from the manner of their appearance. It is observa-
 ble, that the extract of the letter of the 6th July, though it was
 intended as part of the one which is mentioned in the debates of
 the Virginia convention, does not answer to the description
 given of it by Mr. Pendleton, who professes to have seen it? for
 he expressly states, with regard to that letter, that Mr. Jeffer-
 son, after having declared his wish, respecting the issue of the
 deliberations upon the constitution, proceeds to *enumerate the a-*
mendments which he wishes to be secured. The extract which was
 published, speaks only of a *bill of rights*, as the essential amend-
 ment to be obtained by the rejection of four states, which by
 no means agrees with the account given of it by Mr. Pendleton.

SUCH nevertheless as they are, these extracts fully prove,
 that Mr. Jefferson advised the people of Virginia to adopt the

constitution or not to adopt it *upon a* CONTINGENCY ; and that he was OPPOSED to it in *some of its most* IMPORTANT *features*, so much so, as, at first, to DISCOURTENANCE its ADOPTION *altogether, without previous amendments*. He GREATLY DISLIKED the abandonment of the principle of *necessary rotation* in *every office*, and *most particularly* in the case of *President* : he wished the principle of rotation to extend not only to the executive, but to the other branches of the government, to the senate, at least, as is explained in a subsequent letter. This objection goes to the VERY STRUCTURE of the government, in a very IMPORTANT ARTICLE, and while it justifies the assertion that he was opposed to the constitution, in some of its *most important features*, it is a specimen of the VISIONARY SYSTEM of politics of its author. Had it been confined to the office of chief magistrate, it might have pretended to some little plausibility ; by being extended to other branches of the government, it assumes a different character, and evinces a *mind prone to projects*, which are *incompatible with the principles of stable government*, and disposed to multiply the *outworks*, while it leaves the *citadel* weak and *tottering*.

ANY person acquainted with *his manner*, and with the force of terms, will not hesitate to pronounce that he wished to recommend a recurrence to a *second convention*. The pains which he takes, while recommending a second convention, to remove the *alarm* naturally inspired by the *insurrection* in Massachusetts, which had recently occurred, are a strong confirmation of this opinion.

It is not easy to understand what other object his comments on that circumstance could have, but to *obviate* the *anxiety* which it was calculated to inspire in the people for an *adoption* of the constitution, without a previous attempt to amend it, and to remove all apprehension of *internal convulsions* from the dangerous experiment of a second convention.

WE cannot avoid remarking, by the way, that those comments afford a curious and *characteristic* sample of *logic* and *calculation*. “ One rebellion in *thirteen* states, in the course of *eleven* years, is but *one* for *each* state in a century and a half,” while *France*, it seems, had had three insurrections in three years. In the latter instance, the *subdivisions* of the entire nation are confounded in *one mass* ; in the former, the *subdivisions* are the *ground of calculation* ; and thus a *miserable sophism* is gravely made a basis of political *consolation* and conduct ; for, according to the data stated, it was as true that the *United States* had had one rebellion in eleven years, endangering their *common safety* and welfare, as that *France* had had three insurrections in three years.

Thus it appears from the *very documents produced in exculpation* of Mr. Jefferson, that he in fact *discountenanced* in the first instance, *the adoption* of the constitution in its primitive form, favouring the idea of an attempt at previous amendments *by a second convention*; which was *precisely the line of policy* followed by all those who were at that time denominated ANTIFEDERAL, and who have generally since retained their original ENMITY against the constitution. As to those letters of Mr. Jefferson, which are *subsequent* to his *knowledge* of the *ratification* of the constitution by the *requisite number of states*, they prove nothing, but that he was willing to *play the politician*. They can at best only be received as expedient acts of *submission* to the opinion of the majority, which he professed to believe infallible, (resigning to it, with all possible humility, not only his conduct, but his judgment,) not as marks of *approbation*.

It will be remarked that there was no want of *versatility* in his *opinions*; they kept pace tolerably well with the progress of the business, and were quite as *accommodating* as circumstances seemed to require.† On the 31st July 88, when the *adoption* of the constitution was *known*, the *various and weighty* objections of March 1787, had resolved themselves into the *simple* want of a bill of rights. In November following, on the strength of the authority of three states (overruling, in that instance, the maxim of implicit deference for the opinion of the majority) that *lately solitary* defect acquires a companion, in a *revival* of the *objection* to the re-elegibility of the President. And *another convention*, which had appeared no very alarming expedient, *while the entire constitution was in jeopardy*, became an object to be *deprecat*ed, when *partial* amendments to an *already established constitution* were alone in question.

FROM the fluctuations of sentiment, which appear in the extracts that have been published, it is natural to infer, that had the whole of Mr. Jefferson's correspondence on the subject been given to the public, much greater diversities would have been discovered.—But in order to determine with accuracy whether or not Mr. Jefferson was a friend to the constitution, we should refer to his opinions, while the RESULT was DOUBTFUL, and not to his opinions, when, after its adoption, his *station* and love of popularity made it *expedient* to acquiesce in the will of the majority.

It appears, from the debates in the convention of Virginia, that *Patrick Henry*, at that time the champion of the *antifederal* party in Virginia, *quoted Mr. Jefferson's opinion*, as an

† The Minister at Paris, with his wonted *political sagacity*, might well calculate, that the *nine adopting States* (in Congress) would soon *recall an antifederalist*.

AUTHORITY for REJECTING *the constitution*. Mr. Pendleton attempted to *explain away* Mr. Jefferson's opinion ; he stated it to be " a wish that the *first nine conventions* might accept the " constitution, because it would secure the *good* it contained, " and that the *four last* might *refuse* to accept till they COM- " PELLED the others to accept certain amendments." Mr. Henry replied, " the gentleman has endeavoured to *explain* " Mr. Jefferson's opinion, *into* an advice to adopt. He wish- " es nine states to adopt, and that four states may be found " somewhere to reject it. Now, *if we pursue his advice*, " what are we to do ? To prefer form to substance ? For give " me leave to ask, what is the SUBSTANTIAL PART of his " counsel ? It is, that *four* states should REJECT : they tell us " that, from the most authentic accounts, New-Hampshire " will adopt it ; where then will four states be found to reject, " *if we adopt it ?* "

What says *Mr. Madison* in reply to this—" *Is it come to* " *this then that we are not to follow our own reason ?* Is it pro- " per to adduce the opinions of respectable men, not within " these walls ? If the opinion of an important character were " to weigh on this occasion, could we not adduce a character " equally great ON OUR SIDE ? Are we who (in the gentle- " man's opinion) are not to be guided by an *erring* world, " now to SUBMIT to the OPINION of a citizen beyond the at- " lantic ? I believe, that *were* that gentleman now on this " floor, *he would be* for the adoption of this constitution ; I " wish *his name had never been mentioned* ; I wish every thing " spoken here relative to *his opinion*, may be SUPPRESSED, if " our debates should be published. I am in some measure ac- " quainted with his sentiments on this subject ; *it is not right for* " *me to UNFOLD what he has informed me ; but*, I will venture " to assert that *the clause now discussed* is not objected to by " him."

It is observable that Mr. Madison neither advocates the accuracy of Mr. Pendleton's comment, nor denies the justness of that of Mr. Henry ; his solicitude appears to be to destroy the INFLUENCE of what he impliedly *admits to be the opinion of Mr. Jefferson*, to press out of sight the authority of that opinion, and to get rid of the subject as fast as possible.

He confesses a knowledge of Mr. Jefferson's sentiments, but *prudently avoids disclosure*, wrapping the matter in a mysterious reserve. Enough however is seen to justify the conclusion, that if Mr. Jefferson's advice had prevailed, Virginia, North-Carolina, New-York and Rhode-Island, would have then *thrown themselves OUT OF THE UNION*. And whether,

in that event, they would have been at this day *re-united* to it, or whether there would be now *any union at all*, is happily a speculation which need only be pursued, to derive from it the pleasing reflections, that *the danger was wisely avoided, by not pursuing Mr. Jefferson's advice.*

WE may now safely pronounce that, while the constitution was DEPENDING before the people of this country, for their consideration and decision, Mr. Jefferson was OPPOSED to it in *some of its* MOST IMPORTANT FEATURES, that he wrote his objections to some of his friends (leading and *influential* men) in Virginia, and *at first, went so far as to* DISCOURAGEMENT ITS ADOPTION, tho' he *afterwards*, finding it received in the United States *with favor, recommended it* on the ground of expediency, in certain CONTINGENCIES.

It may be added, that some of his *objections*, which went to the VERY STRUCTURE of the PRINCIPAL *parts of the government*, have not been REMOVED by the amendments, proposed by Congress.

WE have seen that the *first advice* given by Mr. Jefferson to the people of Virginia, relative to the constitution, was *not to adopt* it, but to try a second convention; his *subsequent* advice was, to adopt or not ON A CONTINGENCY, that is, to adopt if *nine* states had not previously adopted, to reject, if that number of states had previously adopted, in other words, to risque an ULTIMATE DISMEMBERMENT of the states in an experiment, to obtain the alterations which HE deemed necessary. On examination, this advice will be found as pregnant with mischief to the United States, as it was absurd and whimsical.

If the four last deliberating states (particularly if they had happened to be states in geographical contiguity, which was very possible) had refused to ratify the constitution, what might not have been the consequence? Would the *assenting* states have tamely suffered themselves to be COERCED into the amendments, which the *dissenting* states might have *dictated*? Could any thing but objections to the constitution of the most serious kind have justified the hazarding an eventual *schism* in the union, in so great a degree as would have attended the advice given by Mr. Jefferson? Can it be denied that the person who entertained these objections was STRONGLY *opposed to the constitution*?

THE opponents of the constitution (or the *antifederalists* as they were called) acknowledged *like* Mr. Jefferson, the necessity and utility of union, and generally speaking, that the constitution contained many valuable features; *like* him, they on-

ly contended that it wanted some essential alterations, to render it a safe and good government ; *like* him, they *only* wanted a *second* convention, to alter the constitution, so as to remove all the objections which had been made, by what they called the people, but in truth, by a few factious disorganizers or visionary theorists in the several states.

IF Mr. Jefferson's advice was not *dangerous*, it certainly was *ridiculous* in the extreme. According to that advice, the question before a state convention would not have been on the merits or demerits of the constitution, but the only question would be, *in what numerical order the state stood ?* If she were the *ninth* state, then it was unnecessary to discuss the merits of the instrument ; it must be *adopted* at all events ; but if she happened to be the *tenth*, it must then be *rejected* at all events, without any discussion. It would have been simply necessary to have ascertained, how many states had adopted, which *fact* being known, the *adoption* or *rejection* followed of course ; and though in other cases, it should seem that the more states had adopted a measure, the stronger would be the recommendation, as an evidence of the approbation of the people, yet in this case, the ingenious Jefferson, reversed the rule, and the more states had adopted, the *less* credit ought it to have with the remainder.

BUT when this very sage advice was given, it happened never to occur to its author, that two conventions might be in session at the same time, and that either of them, by its adoption, would make the *ninth* : what was to be done in this dilemma ? if his advice was proper for Virginia, it was proper for *all* the other states, how would they settle the etiquette, which was to adopt without amendments, and which was to reject, to obtain them ? It would have required conferences and negotiations, in which not a syllable would have been said, respecting the merits of the constitution, but the whole discussion would have turned on, which ought to adopt, to complete the magical number, *nine*.

If the contest had occurred between a large and a small state, Virginia and Delaware, for instance, the dispute indeed might easily have been settled ; Virginia would say, do you adopt, and we'll drive them into amendments : little Delaware would not contend with the ancient dominion : But a serious difficulty would have arisen, had the contest been between Virginia and Pennsylvania, and both were determined to adopt or reject : if no *compact* could have been concluded between them, I cannot see how Mr. Jefferson's scheme could have operated : if both refused to adopt, there would not have been the *magic* number ; if both determined to adopt, then *ten* states would have adopted, and no amendments obtained.

And all this, thought Mr. Jefferson, might be accomplished with ease, and *without schism* ! Suppose the *four largest states*, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and New-York, had *rejected* the constitution, and *insisted* upon all the amendments which their several conventions required; is it probable that the other nine states would, without a struggle, have relinquished their opinions, and been *brow beat* into a string of amendments, which they, in accepting the constitution, had deemed frivolous, unnecessary or dangerous ? or on the other hand, had the *four smallest states* withheld their consent, in order to coerce the nine others into amendments, is it likely the latter would have been swayed, by any apprehensions, to alter a constitution, on which they had rested their hopes of future happiness ?

IN reviewing the sentiments of Mr. Jefferson, respecting the constitution, we are compelled to ascribe the contradictions and absurdities they discover, to a natural unsteadiness of principle, on the subject of government, and to a disposition, which is very manifest, to please both parties, uncertain for a time, which would preponderate. Thus *his* opinions, like some law cases, were often quoted by *both sides*. At the first appearance of the constitution, he had very *serions objections* to it—and *recommended another convention*—when he found that it was likely to be adopted, his objections diminished, and he advised the adoption by nine states—when he found that the constitution was a favorite with the people, then his objections nearly vanished, and he was content that *Congress*† should recommend amendments when they should be found necessary, he *deprecated another convention*.

IF, at the latter stage of the business, he found it *expedient* to acquiesce in the will of the majority, it remains to enquire, whether he has, since the operation of the federal government, continued his acquiescence, or whether, finding in this country, on his return from France, a *party*, unfriendly to that government and to the constitution, from which it emanated, his former enmity has not broke out again, and displayed itself in hostile acts, too conspicuous to have escaped notice and censure.

To prove that Mr. Jefferson has been for many years a determined opponent of the federal constitution and of the measures which have flowed from it, under the administration of Washington, I will now proceed to shew that he was the *institu.*

† In his letter of 28th August, 1799, he says, speaking of a Bill of Rights, the want of which he had but a short time before viewed as a *fatal defect*,---“ However, if we do not have it now, I have so much confidence in my countrymen, as to be *satisfied* that we shall have it, as soon as the degeneracy of our government shall render it necessary.”

tor and patron of the *National Gazette*, published in Philadelphia, the *object* and *tendency* of which were to *vilify* and *depreciate* the government of the United States, to *misrepresent* and *traduce* the administration of it (except in the single department of which he was the head) implicating in the most virulent censure the majority of both houses of *congress*, the heads both of the treasury and war departments, and sparing not even the *chief magistrate* himself; that in the *support* of this paper, thus *hostile to the government*, in the administration of which he held so important a trust, he did not scruple to *apply the money* of that very government.

THIS charge is supported in several ways.

1st. By direct proof of an OFFICIAL connection between the *secretary of state* and the *editor of the National Gazette*—a little antecedent to the *first establishment* of that paper. †

2d. By direct proof, as we have seen, of the secretary's being *opposed* to the present government of the United States, while it was *under the consideration* of the people.

3d. By his avowed *opposition* to the PRINCIPAL measures which have been adopted in the course of its administration.

As to the *connection* between the *secretary of state* and the *editor* of the *National Gazette*, neither of the following facts can or will be disputed.

1st. That the EDITOR of the *National Gazette* was a CLERK in the department of *state* for foreign languages, and as such, received a SALARY of *two hundred and fifty dollars a year*.

2d. That he, became so antecedently to the establishment of his *Gazette*, having actually received his salary from the 17th of August, 1791, and not having published the first number of his paper till the 31st October following.

3d. That at the time he became so, there was another character, a clerk in the same department, who understood the *French language*; and that the *editor* of the *National Gazette* was a *translator of that language only*.

4th. That the appointment was not made under any *special* provision, marking out a particular clerkship of the kind, its duties, or its emoluments; but under a *general authority to appoint clerks*, and allow them salaries, not exceeding the average of five hundred dollars each.

† This *Editor* was well known to be *inimical to good government*, having been a few years before, a writer in a paper, called the *Freeman's Journal*, the character of which is not forgotten.

5th. That the editor of the National Gazette, *immediately* preceding the establishment of that paper, was the superintendant or conductor of a paper belonging to Childs and Swaine, printed at New-York. •

THESE are the *facts* : the *conclusion* is *irrefragable* : the *secret intentions* of men being in the repositories of their own breasts, it rarely happens, and is therefore not to be expected, that direct and positive proof of *them* can be adduced.

PRESUMPTIVE facts and circumstances must afford the evidence, and when these are *sufficiently strong*, they ought to decide.

WE find the *head of a department* taking the *editor of a Gazette* into his employment, as a *clerk*, with a *stated salary*, not for any *special* purpose, which could not have been accomplished otherwise ; for besides his own competency to translate from the French, and his general practice, he had, *at the time*, in his department, a clerk, who was capable of performing the *very service* required, and could, without difficulty, have procured others similarly qualified : nor, from any particular necessity arising from a too limited allowance, or any other cause ; for he had it in his power to allow an adequate compensation to a character who might have been *regularly attached* to the department.

THE *very existence* of *such a connection*, then, is alone a sufficient foundation for believing, that the design of the arrangement was to secure an *influence* over the paper, the editor of which was so employed. But the circumstances which attend it, explain the nature of it beyond a doubt. That which has been just mentioned, namely, there having been *previously* a clerk in the department, *qualified to render the service*, is a weighty one. The coming of a new printer from another state, to institute a new paper—his having been appointed a clerk in the department *prior* to his removal to this city—his having been compensated *before* he was even present to satisfy the appearance of rendering service ;—*these circumstances* give a point and energy to the language of the *transaction*, which render it *unequivocal*. There, perhaps, never was a more *flimsy* covering for the pensioning of a printer. Some *ostensible* ground for giving him the public money was necessary to be contrived. The clerkship of foreign languages was deemed a *plausible pretext* : but no man acquainted with human nature, or with the ordinary wiles of political intrigue, can be deceived by it.

THE medium of negotiation between his friend, the *secretary of state*, and Mr. Freneau, in order to the institution of his paper, is well known, and documents are possessed which ascertain the person ; but they are withheld, from particu-

lar considerations. These are the more readily yielded to, because the facts which have been stated, render it *unnecessary* to exhibit them. Those facts must prove, to the satisfaction of every impartial mind, that Mr. *Jefferson* was the *INSTITUTOR* and *PATRON* of the *National Gazette*.

THE complexion and tendency of that Gazette, are sufficiently known. There was no man who loved the government, or was a friend to the public order and tranquillity, but reprobated it as an *incendiary* and pernicious publication, and *condemned* with *indignation*, the *auspices* by which it was supported.

It is unnecessary to add, what is equally well known, that this incendiary paper *expired* about the time of Mr. *Jefferson's* retirement from office.

HAVING traced and *ascertained* the *improper connection* which existed between Mr. *Jefferson*, while *secretary of state*, and the editor of the *National Gazette*, it will not be ill-timed to call the public attention to some specimens of the *spirit* and *disposition* by which that Gazette was influenced.

WE all remember the *alarming situation* of this country in the summer of 1793, when the *President's proclamation*, supported by his energy and *firmness*, and by the good sense of an enlightened nation, maintained our *neutrality*, and saved us from war, in spite of the persevering efforts of a host of foreign and domestic incendiaries.

MR. *Jefferson* is applauded by Hampden for having been "an *enthusiastic* admirer of the French revolution, without however *surrendering the independence and self-government* of America even to forward that glorious cause ;" for the proof of which he refers to the secretary of state's letter to Mr. Morris, then our minister at Paris, *counteracting* Genet's intrigues and demanding his recall.—Wonderful forbearance and moderation truly in the *enthusiastic* secretary not to *surrender the independence and self-government* of his own country, to forward the glorious cause of another ! ! !

BUT the *real* sentiments and wishes of the secretary of state are to be looked for in the *publications*, which issued from a press, of which he was the *institutor* and *patron*, and from the pen of an editor, who was *pensioned* by him.

THE *ostensible* writings of the mere organ of the executive will, after the public sentiment had become too *unequivocal* to be mistaken, are not sufficient to convince an intelligent people, that Mr. *Jefferson* was originally desirous of *counteracting* Genet's intrigues.

WE find by a recurrence to the *National Gazette*, that after the President issued his proclamation of neutrality, that Gazette did not cease for months to *reprobate* in the most *scurrilous* terms the *conduct of the executive*, charging him with the commission of an *illegal act*, and with a *flagrant violation of the constitution*; and that when the President ordered a prosecution to be instituted against two Americans for *violating the neutrality* of the country by entering on board a French privateer, that Gazette accused him in the harshest language, of *cruelly and illegally imprisoning innocent men* “for having generously forsook their country, to assert the cause of liberty in France†.”

MR. Jefferson's translator of the French language, after many similar attacks, impatient at length of the *tyranny* of the *President* and his *resistance* to the *will of Genet*, breaks out in his Gazette, of Wednesday, 10th July, 1793, under the signature of *Juba*, in the following patriotic strain—“The *minister of France*, I HOPE, will act with FIRMNESS and with SPIRIT: the PEOPLE are *his friends* or the friends of France, and *he* will have nothing to *apprehend*; for, *as yet*, the PEOPLE are the *sovereign* of the United States. Too much complacency is an *injury* done to *his* cause, for as every advantage is already taken of France, (*not by the people*) further condescension may lead to further abuses. If one of the leading *features* of our GOVERNMENT is PUSILLANIMITY, when the British lion shews his teeth, let *France and her minister* act as becomes the dignity and justice of their cause, and the honor and faith of nations.”

THIS attempt to make a distinction between the people of the United States and their own government (so congenial with the attempts then made by the minister himself) and this exhortation to Genet *to disregard the will of the government*, were nothing short of a *proposition to transfer all the powers of the executive to a foreign agent*. And such was the disorganizing spirit, which then prevailed, that another Gazette‡, the General Advertiser (now the Aurora) finding such doctrines countenanced by the secretary of state, declared, in a piece under the very appropriate signature of a *Jacobin*, that it was no longer possible to doubt that the *intention of the executive was to look upon the treaty with France as a nullity*, “and that the government was preparing to *join the league of kings against France*.”

So much were the enemies of the government elated, at that time, with the conviction that the *secretary of state* coun-

† See the *National Gazette* of July 1793.

‡ See the *General Advertiser* of July 1793.

tenanced their views, that they were emboldened to pursue those high-handed measures, which would soon have prostrated our excellent constitution and placed us at the mercy of a foreign agent, had not *the people themselves* interfered.

WHEN *Genet*, thus supported, boldly threw aside the mask, and raised the standard of opposition to our government, the people, whose government it was, came forth from New-Hampshire to Georgia, and with a loud voice, and an imposing aspect, silenced the meddling and crafty foreigner, and put to flight his patricide myrmidons. *Then it was* that Jefferson found it *expedient* to abandon so rash an intriguer, and to enlist on the side of the people ; he, who had greatly disliked the constitution, while its fate was doubtful, but had apparently approved of it when it met a favorable reception from the people, with his usual cunning and *political sagacity*, supported the very measures of the executive, when they were found to be popular, which he had, through his agents, *resisted* while the *contest with Genet was dubious*. Then it was that, like the *friends of the insurrection* of whom *citizen Fauchet* speaks, he wished to do away all suspicions of having favored Genet's intrigues, by a parade of great zeal for the independence of our government ; for *these men*, to use the words of Fauchet, "as soon as it was decided, that the French republic purchased no men to do their duty, men *about whose conduct the government could at least form uneasy conjectures*, were seen giving themselves up with a *scandalous ostentation to its views, and even seconding its declarations.*"

It will be proper, in this place, to state some *facts* and recur to some *dates*, which will throw great light on this subject, and fully corroborate the foregoing suggestions.

THE *proclamation of neutrality* was issued 22d April, 1793. Genet arrived in the ensuing month in Philadelphia ; and, supported by the democratic societies, the discontented and seditious of all classes, and the *National Gazette*, immediately began his intrigues against our government. The United States were kept in a state of *perpetual ferment and alarm* from the time of Genet's arrival in Philadelphia, till the month of August, when his open threat, "to *appeal from the President to the people*," roused the people to come forward and support their President, and thus completely overset Genet and his adherents, and all their wicked machinations.

Now, Jefferson's *letter* to Morris was not written till THE 16TH AUGUST ; and the gazette, published under his AUSPICES, was filled, from the moment the proclamation was issued, till the month of August, with *invectives* against the President

for issuing it, and with *exhortations to Genet to persist* in his career !

A FEW extracts from that letter will aggravate, if possible, the gross misconduct of the secretary of state, in having tolerated such *treasonable* sentiments from a press, the editor of which was a confidential clerk in his department, and was paid by him with the money of the government, which he was thus openly resisting.

He informs Mr. Morris, "that Genet's landing at one of the most distant ports of the Union, from his points both of departure and destination, was calculated to *excite attention*, and that *very soon afterwards* the government learnt that he was undertaking to authorise the *fitting out privateers*, at Charleston, *enlisting American citizens* and giving them commissions to commit *hostilities* on nations at peace with us, that these vessels were bringing prizes into our ports, that the French consuls were *assuming* to hold courts, &c. &c. and all this *before Genet had even presented himself or his credentials* to the President : " He adds, " Genet, not content with using our force, whether we " will or not, in a military line, against nations with whom we " are at peace, *undertakes also to direct the civil government ;* " thus in his letter of June 8th, he promised to respect the " political opinions of the President, *till the representatives should* " *have confirmed, or rejected them*, as if the President had undertaken to decide what belonged to the decision of Congress : " In his letter of June 14th, he says more openly, that the " President *ought not to have taken on himself to decide* on the " subject of the letter, but that it was of importance enough " to have consulted congress thereon ; and in that of 22d June, " he tells the President, in *direct terms*, that congress *ought al-* " *ready to have been consulted on certain questions which he had* " *been too hasty* in deciding, thus making *himself*, and not the " President, the *judge of the powers* assigned by the constitution, " and *dictating* to him the occasion when he shall exercise the " power of convening congress."

From these extracts it then appears, that as early as *May*, the attention of the government had been excited to view *with anxiety* Genet's conduct, that he had, even before he was *accredited* by our government, fitted out privateers, enlisted Americans, raised a military force, assumed jurisdiction, and not content with that, had proceeded as early as June, to undertake to *direct our civil government, dictating to the President* the exercise of his powers. And yet, strange to tell, Mr. Jefferson's translator of the French language, the very clerk in his office, who had *confidentially translated these very insolent letters*, in his news-

paper of 10th July, published *under the eye* of Mr. Jefferson, “ EXHORTS GENET to act with FIRMNESS AND SPIRIT, tells him that the *people* are *his friends*, that, as yet, they, and not the President, are sovereign, that the *President* is *pufillanimous*, and that Genet has nothing to do but to act as *becomes the dignity of his cause* !” And stranger still, this clerk thus *openly encouraging* the SURRENDER of our *self government* and INDEPENDENCE TO A FOREIGN AGENT, retained his place as *confidential* clerk to the very man, who makes these complaints the basis of Genet’s recall, and the affections of the very officer, whose duty it was to punish such treasonable practices !

IN another part of the letter, the secretary says, “ IF OUR CITIZENS have not been already SHEDDING EACH OTHER’S BLOOD, it is not owing to the moderation of Mr. Genet, but to the forbearance of the government.” And yet the secretary fostered within his bosom the ABETTOR of Genet !

AFTER this, who will be hardy enough to say, that Jefferson did not connive at Genet’s practices, while the issue of his *contest* remained *doubtful* !—Had he felt the indignation which, at that alarming crisis, swelled the heart of every independent and patriotic citizen, would he not have spurned from his office, the foul source of such atrocities ?

THE wretched apology offered by Jefferson’s friends, “ that he could not, in a free country, controul the publications of that Gazette,” is too contemptible to require an answer. Could he not dismiss from his office a confidential clerk, entrusted with the *secrets* of the department of state, who was betraying his trust, and *openly abetting* a foreign agent in a *contest* with the *government of his own country* ? Ought he to have maintained any further *official connection* with a Gazette, which exhorted the foreign agent to *persevere* with spirit in usurping our government, dictating to the executive, and committing acts which must terminate in *civil war* ?

THIS circumstance is so strongly stamped with political infamy, that it can admit of no apology.—It marks the views of Mr. Jefferson, in *colours* which *cannot be effaced* : it fixes a stain on his administration, which *can never be washed out*.

It will not now be denied, by any person acquainted with the state of public affairs at the alarming crisis of which we have been speaking, that Mr. Jefferson was averse to the President’s issuing his proclamation of neutrality, and that he advised the calling together of congress, deeming the proclamation a step too important to rest on the President’s bare authority.—Whether this advice proceeded from a *secret* wish to involve us

in *war*, or from a constitutional timidity, is immaterial to the present question : certain it is, that such a step would have been fatal to the peace and tranquillity of America : certain it is, that Genet, and all the Jacobins of the country, and all the democratic societies, were extremely anxious for such a step ; and while they rested all their hopes of war on the *convoking of congress*, there was no man, who valued the welfare of this country, who did not then shudder at the idea of such a calamity.— For had congress been convened in Philadelphia in the summer of 1793, bringing together all the *passions* which had been artfully excited in various parts of the Union, finding a *mass of passions* ready prepared in the metropolis, *operated on* by all the wiles and intrigues, of Genet, and the *manœuvres* of the *democratic society*, congress would, most undoubtedly, have been driven to some intemperate act, of which war would have been the immediate consequence.

If it was so difficult to restrain a *party* in congress from carrying *hostile* measures in the winter following, when the passions had considerably abated, when the public mind had manifested a marked wish for neutrality, and when Genet's influence was almost prostrated, how impossible would it have been to have resisted them, in the midst of those agitations, which convulsed the whole nation, in the summer of '93, in the midst of those political tempests and whirlwinds which were then directed by Genet ? The few rational and moderate lovers of peace, instead of being listened to with that attention which their opinions afterwards excited, would have been silenced by the overwhelming acclamations of a factitious *enthusiasm*, and swept away from their ground by the irresistible torrent of exasperated passions.

WELL might Genet wish for the calling of congress,† when he found that he could not *mould* the executive to his views : well might he rave and threaten, when he found the *advice* of the secretary of state, on which he had depended, over-ruled in the council, by the discretion of the two other secretaries, and by the wisdom and firmness of the President !

THE letters which Mr. Jefferson afterwards wrote to Genet and to Mr. Morris, and which have been quoted by his friends as evidences of his opposition to Genet's intrigues, prove only, that Mr. Jefferson possessed political sagacity enough to foresee,

† In his letter to the secretary of state (printed correspondence, page 75.) among other causes of *complaint* against the President, he states the following : " That he has deferred, in spite of my respectful intinuations, to *convene congress immediately*, in order to take the *true sentiments of the people*, to *fix the political system of the United States*, and to decide whether they will break, suspend, or tighten, their bonds with France.—an *honest* measure, which would have avoided to the government much contradiction and *jubterfuge*."

that had he *after* the public sentiment was fixed, persisted in encouraging Genet, he would, like his less cunning successor, have been disgracefully dismissed from office, and, like him, ruined in the public estimation : like the friends of the insurrection when they saw the government strong, he therefore made an ostentatious display of “ his zeal to maintain our independence and self-government.” It is evident, that Genet considered this conduct as a *defection from his cause* ; for in his letter, referred to in the note, he *complains* bitterly of Mr. Jefferson’s *treachery* and *abandonment*. He uses, in that letter, these remarkable expressions : “ Besides, sir, whatever may be the *result* of the *achievement* of which *you* have rendered yourself the *generous instrument*, AFTER HAVING MADE ME BELIEVE THAT YOU WERE MY FRIEND, after having INITIATED ME INTO MYSTERIES which have INFLAMED MY HATRED against all those who ASPIRE to an ABSOLUTE POWER, there is an act of justice,” &c. page 70.

HERE Genet complains of Jefferson’s treacherously becoming the *instrument* of his *recall*, after having persuaded him that he was *his friend*, and initiated him into *mysteries* of state, which had inflamed Genet’s hatred against the President, and the rest of the administration ; in fact, after having caballed with this foreign agent, and by calumnies against the executive, excited him to resistance. Again, page 73, Genet says to him, in the language of reproach, “ If I have shewn firmness (in opposing the President) it is, because it was not in *my character* to *speak* as many people do, in one way, and *act* in another, to have an OFFICIAL language, and a language CONFIDENTIAL.”

NOTHING further is necessary to prove, beyond a doubt, the improper encouragement which the secretary of state had given to Genet to resist the President’s authority ; were any further proof requisite we might refer to the writings of *Helvidius*†, written in the month of *July* by a *confidential* friend of Mr. Jefferson, for the express purpose of proving that the President had no authority to issue the proclamation of neutrality, and inviting the people to disobey it ; we might refer to the obstructions which prevented the recall of Genet, which did not take place *till the 16th August*, though he had dictated to and *insulted the President* as early as *June*, and which obstructions and delay, must have arisen altogether from the *division of*

† These writings were so much suited to Genet’s views, that, in his letter to Jefferson, above quoted, he says, “ I will join only, in *support* of the *opinions* which I meant to profess some Writings which have been published here, such as those of *Veritas*, “ *HELVIDIUS*,” &c. Page 70.

opinion which existed in the cabinet ; to what other cause can we ascribe the delay of demanding the recall of a foreign agent, who had grossly insulted the government of the country, from the beginning of June to the middle of August, but to the powerful support which that agent found, even in the *department*, where his conduct was the most notorious, and against which his attacks had been the most outrageous ?

WHEN finally the measure of recall was agreed upon, and the secretary of state was at no loss for materials, on which to predicate it, when the President's opinion, as well as that of the public, became too imposing to admit of further hesitation, then the secretary, to whom the talent of epistolary composition is not denied, produced an able letter, in which he endeavoured to make atonement by elegance and energy of style for his previous misconduct and opposition.

I SHALL conclude this part of the subject with the following remarks : 1st. The circumstance of Mr. Jefferson's being an enthusiastic admirer of the French cause (as Hampden describes him to be) is far from recommending him, in the judgment of *real* Americans, to the presidency. The President of the United States ought to be an *enthusiastic* admirer of no cause, but that of *his own country* ; *enthusiasm*, in a politician, is closely allied to *error* and *passion*, both of which are the *bane* of good government : but enthusiasm for a *foreign country* leads *directly* to subservience and devotion to *foreign interests* ; a chief magistrate, *enthusiastically* attached to France, will therefore soon become a *devoted tool of France*.

2dly. I CANNOT discern the *merit* in Mr. Jefferson, of having, as Hampden expresses it, forborne to *sacrifice* the *independence and self government* of his *own country* even to the glorious cause of *France* ; what attachment must that man have to his own country who could, for a moment, consider this, as *meritorious* ? Were the fact as stated (which I deny, and the contrary of which I have proved) I should never be induced to view, as meritorious, the mere forbearance to be a *traitor* to one's country, by sacrificing its independence and self-government to the views of a foreign nation.

IN the preceding pages it has been satisfactorily shewn, that Mr. Jefferson, while Secretary of State, countenanced the intrigues of Genet, till they had proceeded to such lengths as to rouse the people to support the President, and to compel the secretary to unite with the rest of the administration in demanding his recall.

THIS has been substantiated by various corroborating circumstances and direct proofs.

1st. By the publications in the National Gazette, by a clerk of Mr. Jefferson, reprobating the President's conduct and exhorting Genet to persevere in his opposition, for months after Mr. Jefferson knew that Genet was resisting the government.

2d. By the obstructions which prevented the recall of Genet, from the time of his first open act against the government, till the 16th August, and which could only have arisen from Mr. Jefferson's opposition in the cabinet to that measure.

3d His advice to convoke congress, a measure urgently demanded by Genet, and his opposition to the issuing the proclamation of neutrality.

4th. The writings of *Helvidius* against that proclamation, composed by a *confidential* friend of his, and quoted by Genet, as authority on his side.

5th. Genet's charging him with *defection*, after having professed to be his friend, and *initiated him* into *mysteries*, which had inflamed his hatred against the government, and accusing him of having two languages, one *confidential* the other *official*.

6th. His being an *enthusiastic* admirer of the French cause.

7th. His being recommended and pointed out by citizen Fauchet, in his intercepted letter, as the man whom the Patriots had fixed on as President, shewing that Jefferson was considered by Fauchet, as a friend to Genet's intrigues, notwithstanding his *official* letter.

WE shall now proceed to notice some other features of Mr. Jefferson's violent aversion to the measures of the federal government, which will still further prove his participation in the views of the National Gazette.

THE friends and advocates of Mr. Jefferson have made no scruple to *boast* of his *abhorrence* of the *leading principles* of the *administration of the finances of the United States*; and the *National Gazette*, one of the main objects of which was to abuse that administration, in conformity to that abhorrence, went so far in one of the numbers, as to urge the *necessity* of a *revolution*, in order to overthrow the whole system of *public credit*.

THE leading principles of our fiscal administration were, that the public debt ought to be provided for, in favor of those, who, according to the express terms of the contract, were the true legal proprietors of it; that it ought to be provided for, in other respects, according to the terms of the contract, except so far as deviations from it should be assented to by the credit-

ors, upon the condition of a fair equivalent, that it ought to be funded upon ascertained revenues, pledged for the payment of interest, and the gradual redemption of principal, that the debts of the several states ought to be comprised in the provision, on the same terms with that of the United States, that to render this great operation practicable, avoid the oppression of trade and industry, and facilitate loans to the government, in cases of emergency, it was necessary to institute a national bank, that indirect taxes were in the actual circumstances of the country, the most eligible means of revenue, and that direct taxes ought to be avoided as much, and as long as possible.

NOW, I AVER from competent opportunities of knowing Mr. Jefferson's ideas, that he has been decidedly *hostile* to all these positions, except perhaps the last, and that, even in regard to that, his maxims would oblige the government in practice speedily to resort to direct taxes.

I AVER moreover, that his opposition to the administration of the government was not confined to the measures connected with the Treasury Department, but was extended to almost all the important measures of the government.

IF Mr. Jefferson's opposition to the measures which are connected with the administration of the national finances had ceased, when those measures had received the sanction of *law*, nothing more could have been said, than, that he had transgressed the rules of official decorum, in entering the lists against the head of another department (between whom and himself, there was a reciprocal duty to cultivate harmony) that he had been culpable in pursuing a line of conduct, which was calculated to sow the *seeds of discord* in the executive branch of the government in the *infancy of its existence*.

BUT when his opposition extended beyond that point, when it was apparent, that he wished to *render odious* and of course to *subvert* (for in a popular government these are convertible terms) all those deliberate and solemn acts of the legislature, which had become the *pillars of the public credit*, his conduct deserved to be regarded with a still severer eye.

WHATEVER differences of opinion may have *preceded* those acts—however exceptionable particular features in them may have appeared to certain characters, there is no enlightened nor discreet citizen but must agree, that they ought when clothed with the sanction of law to remain *undisturbed*. To set afloat the funding system, after the *faith* of the nation had been so *deliberately and solemnly pledged* to it—after such numerous and extensive *alienations* of property for full value had been made un-

der its sanction—with adequate revenues, little burthenfome to the people—in a time of profound peace—with not even the *shadow* of any *public necessity*—on no better ground than that of *theoretical* and *paradoxical* dogmas—would have been one of the most *wanton and flagitious acts*, that ever *stained* the annals of a civilized nation.

YET positions tending to that disgraceful result were maintained in public discourses, by individuals, *known* to be devoted to the then secretary of state, and were privately *smiled* upon, as profound discoveries in political science.

YET the less discreet, though not least important *partizans* of *that officer*, spoke familiarly of *undoing the funding system*, as a *meritorious* work : Yet *his gazette* (which may fairly be regarded as the mirror of his views) after having *labored* for months to make it an object of public detestation, told us at length, in plain and triumphant terms, that “ the funding system had had its day ; ” and very clearly, if not expressly, “ that it was the *object of the party to overthrow it.* ” †

It may be justly then, and from sufficient data, inferred, that Mr. Jefferson's politics, while secretary of state, *tended* to *national disunion, insignificance, disorder and discredit*. That the subversion of the funding system would have produced *national discredit*, proves itself. *Loss of credit*, the reason being the same, must attend nations, as well as individuals, who voluntarily and without necessity, *violate* their *formal and positive engagements*.

† I find in the Boston Independent Chronicle, (an antifederal paper) of September, 1792, the following publication :—

MR. ADAMS,

AS the friends of civil liberty wish at all times to be acquainted with every question which appears to regard the public weal, a great number of gentlemen in this and the neighbouring towns, have subscribed for the *National Gazette*, published by Mr. Philip Freneau, at Philadelphia : and it is hoped, that *Freneau's Gazette*, which is said to be printed *under the eye* of that established patriot and republican, Thomas Jefferson, will be generally taken in the New-England States. Q.

In the Columbian Centinel (of Boston) the following reply appeared a few days after :—

“ A Correspondent in the last Chronicle, recommends to the people of New-England, a general perusal of the *National Gazette*, said to be printed, &c. Whether this is intended as an avowal on the part of Mr. Jefferson, that *he* is the *real*, and the imprudent Freneau only the *nominal* editor of this *diseste* Gazette, the public is at a loss to determine. The advice is adapted to all who *delight* in the most violent abuse on a government framed and administered by the people of America, to the honour, dignity, and happiness of America ; and all who affect too much learning to have any *pique*, will be pleased with the recommendation. The Clergy of the country *vilified*, *religion* constantly *ridiculed*, must afford a rich repast to *infidels* and *freethinkers*. To deprive us of all confidence in a government instituted and administered by ourselves, and under the auspices of which the United States have progressed from discord, poverty and contempt, to happiness, wealth and honour, is a task worthy the pen of a malignant stranger, to take from us all trust in that religion, for which our pious ancestors exchanged a civilized country for the wilderness, and on which we build our brightest hopes for happiness in this and a future world, may afford delight to a man like Freneau ; but surely T. Adams ought to be well-founded in his assertions, before he brings forward Mr. JEFFERSON as the *patron* of such a Gazette.”

Mr. Jefferson's friends never denied the truth of the paragraph in the Chronicle.

INSIGNIFICANCE and *disorder*, as applied to communities, equally with individuals, are the natural *offspring* of a *loss of credit*, *premeditatedly* and *voluntarily* incurred.

DISUNION would not long lag behind. Sober-minded and *virtuous* men, in every state, would lose all confidence in, and all respect for a government, which had betrayed so much levity and inconsistency, so *profligate* a disregard to the *rights of property*, and to the *obligations of good faith*. Their support would of course be so far withdrawn or relaxed, as to leave it an easy prey to its *enemies*. These comprise the advocates for separate confederacies; the zealous partizans of unlimited sovereignty in the state governments—the never to be satiated *lovers of innovation* and change—the tribe of *pretended philosophers*, but real fabricators of *chimeras* and *paradoxes*—the *Catalines* and *Cæsars* of the community (a description of men to be found in every republic) who leading the dance to the tune of *liberty without law*, endeavour to intoxicate the people with delicious, but *poisonous draughts*—to render them the *easier victims* of their *rapacious ambition*; the *vicious* and the *fanatical* of every class, who are ever found the willing or the *deluded* followers of those seducing and *treacherous leaders*.

BUT this is not all—the *invasion* of *seventy millions* of property could not be perpetrated without *violent concussions*. The states, whose citizens, both as *original creditors* and *purchasers* own the largest portions of the debt (and several such there are) would not long remain bound in the trammels of a party which had so *grossly violated their rights*. The consequences in experiment would quickly awaken to a sense of injured right, and interest such of them, whose representatives may have wickedly embarked, or been ignorantly betrayed into the atrocious and destructive project.

WHERE would all this end but in *disunion* and *anarchy*—in *national disgrace* and *humiliation*?

THE votaries of Mr. Jefferson vainly endeavoured to vindicate his conduct, respecting his connection with the editor of the National Gazette, and his opposition to the measures of government, while secretary of state.

IN respect to the first, they said, “that Mr. Freneau was recommended by several of his fellow-collegiates, men of high reputation and who were interested in his welfare*: and that, to entitle him to the office which Mr. Jefferson bestowed on him, it was merely necessary that he should be a citizen of

* See the American Daily Advertiser of the 13th October, 1792.

the United States, irreproachable in point of morality, and in other respects well qualified to discharge his duties."—It is at once seen that, such an apology, to an enlightened public, is as insulting as was the conduct which it was designed to gloss over.—As well might Mr. Jefferson, should he be elected president, and pension a printer to support his measures, attempt hereafter to varnish over such an act by a like vindication.

As to the second point, these votaries, whose devotion for their idol kindled at every form, in which he presented himself, even deduced matter of *panegyric* from *his opposition to the measures of the government*. 'Twas according to them, the sublimest pitch of virtue in him, not only to have *extra-officially* embarrassed plans, originating with his colleagues, in the course of their progress, but to have *continued* his opposition to them, *after* they had been considered and enacted by the *legislature*, with such modifications as had appeared to them proper, and had been *approved* by the *chief magistrate*. Such conduct, in their opinion marked a firm and virtuous independence of spirit†.

If any proof were wanting of that strange perversion of all ideas of decorum and order, which has long characterised a certain party, this making a theme of *encomium* of what was truly a demonstration of a *caballing, self-sufficient, and refractory temper*, would afford it.

I SHALL endeavour to state what course a firm and virtuous independence of character, guided by a just and necessary sense of decorum, should have dictated to an officer in Mr. Jefferson's station.

I do not hesitate to reprobate the position, that a man, who had accepted an office in the executive department, should be held to throw the weight of his character into the scale, to support a measure, which in his *conscience he disapproved*, and in his *station had opposed*—or that the members of the administration should form together a close and secret combination, into whose measures the profane eye of the public should not pry. But there is a *very obvious medium* between *aiding or countenancing*, and *intriguing and machinating* against a measure; between *opposing it in the discharge of an official duty* or *volunteering an opposition to it in the discharge of no duty*, between *entering into a close and secret combination* with the other members of the administration, and *being the active leader of an opposition to its measures*.

† See the American Daily Advertiser of the 10th October, 1792.

THE *true line of propriety* appears to be the following:—A member of the administration in one department ought only to *aid* those measures of another, which he approves—Where he disapproves, if called upon to *act officially*, he ought to manifest his disapprobation, and avow his opposition; but, out of an official line, he ought not to interfere, “*as long as he thinks fit* TO CONTINUE A PART OF THE ADMINISTRATION.”

WHEN the measure in question has become a *law of the land*, especially with a *direct sanction of the chief magistrate*, it is his *peculiar DUTY to acquiesce*. A contrary conduct is *inconsistent* with his *relations as an officer of the government*, and with a *due respect* as such for the decisions of the legislature and of the *head of the executive department*.

THE success of every government, its capacity to combine the exertion of public strength with the preservation of personal right and private security, must always depend on the energy of the executive.

THIS energy again, must materially depend on the *union and mutual deference*, which subsist between the members of that department, and the conformity of their conduct with the views of the executive chief.

DIFFERENCE of opinion between men engaged in any common pursuit, is a natural appendage of human nature. When only exerted in the *discharge of a duty*, with delicacy and temper, among liberal and sensible men, it can create no animosity: but when it produces *officious interferences*, dictated by *no call of duty*; when it volunteers a display of itself in a quarter where there is *no responsibility*, it must inevitably beget ill-humour and *discord*.

APPLIED to the members of the executive administration of any government, and more particularly of a *republican government*, it must necessarily tend to occasion, more or less, *distracted councils*, to foster *factions* in the community, and particularly to *weaken the government*.

MOREOVER, the *heads* of the several executive departments are to be viewed as *auxiliaries to the executive chief*. Opposition to any measures of *his*, by either of those heads, except in the shape of frank, firm, and independent advice to himself, is evidently *contrary to the relations*, which subsist between the parties. And a measure becomes *his*, so as to involve this *duty of acquiescence*, as well by its having received *his sanction in the form of a law*, as by its having previously received his approbation.

ONE of the powers entrusted to our chief magistrate is, that *objecting* to bills which have passed the two houses of congress.

This supposes the *duty* of objecting, when he is of opinion that the subject of any bill is either *unconstitutional* or *pernicious*. The *approbation* of a bill implies, that he *does not think* it either the one or the other; and it makes him *responsible* to the community for this opinion. The measure becomes *his* by adoption; nor could he escape a portion of the blame, which would finally attach itself to a bad measure, to which he had given his consent.

SOLID as are these principles, the public ear has, notwithstanding, been frequently assailed with common place topics, and plausible flourishes and declamations against them. However such flourishes may be dexterously retailed by the traffickers in popular prejudice, these principles, founded on political truth, may, with confidence, be submitted to the deliberate opinion of an enlightened and sober people.

It may be asked—*What* is a man to sacrifice his *conscience* and his judgment to an *office*? Is he to be a *dumb* spectator of measures which he deems *subversive* of the *rights* and *interests* of his fellow-citizens? Is he to *possess* to the frivolous rules of a false complaisance, or the arbitrary dictates of a tyrannical decorum, the *higher duty* which he owes to the community? I answer, no! he is to do none of these things. If he cannot coalesce with those, with whom he is associated, as far as the rules of *official decorum*, propriety, and obligation may require, without *abandoning* what he conceives to be the *true interest* of the community, let him *place himself* in a situation, in which he will experience no collision of *opposite duties*. Let him *not cling* to the honours or emoluments of an office, and content himself with *defending* the *injured rights* of the people, by *obscure* or *indirect means*. Let him *renounce* a situation which is a clog upon his patriotism, tell the people that he could no longer continue in it without forfeiting his duty to them, and that he had quitted it to be more at liberty to afford them his best services.

Such is the course that would have been indicated by a firm and *virtuous independence* of character, that would have been pursued by a man attentive to unite the sense of *delicacy* with the sense of *duty*—in earnest about the pernicious tendency of public measures, and more solicitous to act the *disinterested friend* of the people, than the *interested, ambitious, and intriguing head* of a party.

BUT Mr. Jefferson clung for *four years* to the honours and emoluments of office, under an administration, whose measures he greatly disapproved, and perseveringly *opposed*, when a very *perplexed* state of affairs, and the *alarming prospect* of *approaching war*, could alone dictate his relinquishment of a station, then too pregnant with *anxieties* to continue an object of desire.