(XLIId YEAR.) THE (No. 2116.)

MARYLAND GAZETTE.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 2, 1787.

RISTIDES to PUBLICOLA.

IF you possessed the vast superiority, you affect, your treatment of Aristides would be different. The experience of almost half a century might have taught you, that, in controversies like ours, world ever considers clamour and reviling as als of defeat. Although you manfully persist in ing him the partisan of power, and insinuate, t he looked for some kind of compensation from senate, you have assigned no reason in support of suggestion. Unless they shall succeed in their tocratic views, it will be difficult for them to rerd him, so long, as he shall remain obnoxious to other more numerous, and more powerful branch. t one eminent proof of your "exemplary patience" an attempt to lay him under the displeasure of h branches. The meaning of that passage in my address, which you so ingeniously misconstrue, ds no explanation to those, who are acquainted h the proceedings alluded to. On account of his ent "*exertions*," and for no other reason, as he lieves, was his character traduced, in a place, ere he had no opportunity of defending it. This s done too, at a most critical time; and the men, o thought as he did, on the great political questns, which called forth those *exertions*, sat by with most frigid indifference. Perhaps the term "given ," or sacrificed, might have been more proper, in some measure, denoting the inferiority of Arises. Be that as it may, the *desertion*, or giving up, sacrifice, affected him far more, than the open mity of his prosecutors. And yet neither of them ected him so far, as to produce "whining or blubing."

You have not scrupled to assert, that he offered nself as a delegate to the convention. I shall not quire what are *your* "privileges." I deny, that her directly, or indirectly, I ever made the offer. ur eagerness to depreciate my character may be y commendable; but it has induced you to mentn an affair, which, from a regard to your own retation, and the honour of the state, you ought, if ssible, to bury in oblivion. What circumstance is ere relative to that affair, which can dishonour istides? As he does not mean to write a pretty neral satire, he will content himself with remarkg, that the appointment was subsequent to his opsition against paper, and that every method was, by me men, practised to prevent his election; whilst that, as on every other occasion, he disdained to the vile acts of intrigue.

My non-appointment to that arduous ticklish emoyment, I consider as a circumstance favourable to e in a variety of lights. One consolation is that I all save the effusion of that precious cash, which uld be as illy spared from my "house," as from any other noble houses. Do you take it as a sted point, that every failure at an election must nder a man unhappy? I ought perhaps to return u thanks, for consoling me, in pretty nearly the me manner, as the affectionate FREEMAN, in the dness of his soul, administered comfort to his beved friend, the associate of his youth and manod, his faithful counsellor, and the reviser of all s productions, intended for the press, save only e. "Regard them not, thou beloved of my heart! thou mirror of patriots, thou perfect pattern of every political moral, and christian virtue! What though, after manfully *standing by* Annapolis, its citizens have turned their backs upon thee! thou art now leaving this ungrateful city. Peradventure *in the dispensations of Providence*, thou mayst have it in thy power to return them *evil for evil*."

Another mark of your exemplary patience is your tertaining comment on the word "house," "that mmy Twitcher should 'peach me, I own, surprised e." You here shine in a new light; for, amongst our manifold attributes, no man ever yet thought enumerating humor and wit. Had I the pompoty of the mighty Ventosus, of the great Pomposo, even of yourself, your comment might have been ared; because foreign from the dispute; because plain man might well use "house" for "family," d because half a column is taken up in proving thing but a determination, at all events, to load your iversary with abuse. It would have been infinitely etter to save yourself the fatigue of your learned reearches; more especially, as the laborious exercise f your fancy has not, in the slightest degree, softend your rancour. When a man jokes, there ought be some appearance of good humor.

I had before heard of the old foolish proprietary heme for introducing into Maryland an order of bility. Happily the good sense of the people saw the matter in its true light. I am, however inclined to believe, that, if the titles you mention, could be conferred, we might probably hear something about the most illustrious, high, noble, and puissant DUKE of WYE. But you are out, with respect to DUKES, EARLS, and LORDS. You forget that such could not have been created. If they could, the plan would, in all human probability, have succeeded to the condign praise of the projector, the emolument of the Lord PARAMOUNT, and the gratification of his trusty adherents. There were to have been, alas! only such paltry things as POTENTATES, POTENTEES and POTENTESSES. You thought there was some how or other, a good joke, and you had a mind to tell it, "having a fine opportunity to bring it in". But, like many other tellers of good jokes, you unluckily forget the cream of the story.

A third mark of exemplary patience is your application of the Athenian law. At first no civil officer had a right to meddle with politics. It was next monstrous in a judge to interfere; because his whole time should be devoted either to the administration of justice, or the study of the law. Now forsooth the enormity of one officer's interference is demonstrated by the passiveness and silence of the rest. With wonderful address my citation of the Athenian law is converted into a charge of high treason against the governor and council, the chancellor, the chief justice and the judges of appeals. With all these gentlemen nevertheless, I hope to remain on good terms. They will perceive that I quoted this law merely on account of that salutary principle upon which it was made, and which ought ever to prevail in all republican governments. I never thought them under an obligation, to imitate my conduct. I never once mentioned or alluded to them. My idea is, that any of them may speak, write, or be silent, as inclination or judgment may determine. They might not think the situation of our affairs to be critical. *I did*. It appeared to me, that, although there was little danger of the peoples interference in favour of an emission, it was of the last importance to their future welfare to set them right, with respect to the doctrines contained in their delegates address. In the discharge of my official duty, I have always construed the constitution and laws upon the plain principles of common sense. *I have ever reprobated arbitrary or occasional constructions*. I knew of no law, under which that address, the appeal, and the adjournment could be fairly construed into a crime punishable by the courts of justice. Besides, I considered a majority of the delegates as men acting under a full persuasion, that they were doing what was right. God knows, that in addressing the people, I wished not to expose their representatives, provided I could otherwise perform the part, to which I found myself strongly impelled.

My *exertions* were not indeed so *animated*, as the harangues at Chester mill, &c. and as certain debates in the house of delegates. My aim was to convey instruction; and he, that seeks it, will do well to prefer the perusal of a publication, written with care, and open to the examination of all the world, to the frothy, noisy declamation at public meetings. Of the former he may at leisure examine the arguments, divested of all ornament, and wanting those dangerous aids, derived from the personal influence of the orator, the force of look and gesture, the charms of utterance, and all "the pomp, pride, and circumstance" of glorious speechification. To men of sense and candour, Aristides will perhaps appear entitled to some credit, even if his doctrine be erroneous, for his "*laborious exertions*," and for pursuing the dictates of his conscience, at the hazard of interest, and with the certain prospect of provoking the indignation of interested, powerful, vindictive men. How is it, you dare to speak so contemptuously of news-papers, of all other publications the most proper for conveying general information? How often by their means have insidious views been exposed and defeated! How often have they kindled, far and wide, the flame of patriotism! Their importance is so well known, that I should expect objections to news-papers from a *partisan of power*, much sooner than from a friend to the people, and an assertor of liberty, and equal rights. It is true they do not always afford either entertainment or instruction; but they can seldom do harm. Is there any man, who has resorted to them oftener than Publicola? But Aristides has not only descended into news-papers. After charging with high treason the house of delegates, the executive and the judicial, "he pusillanimously shrinks from the duty and dignity of his elevated station," and suffers all those daring offenders to go at large. Alas! Publicola, how art thou shrunken and fallen!

Mourn, mourn ye people! join them patriots all!
In concert "*whine* and *blubber*" at his fall.
How often, in that stadt-house, has he said,
Curse on all laws, except what ye have made.
My *people want—my people* did I say?
My *masters order*, and ye *shall* obey.
How oft, in list'ning raptures, have ye hung,
And caught those glorious accents from his tongue!
"*Yon towering steeple*" echoed back the sound,
Whilst the glad throng their plaudits buzz'd around.
Blot from the calendar the fatal day!
He fell by curs'd "aristocratic sway.
Tho' sycophants and "*partisans of power*"
Deride your tears, and hail the lucky hour,
Come, all ye patriots! bear the plaintive call,
Whine for your leader, blubber one and all!

Accept, Publicola, these few elegiac lines, in return for your friendly consolatory remarks. But every thing you have said or written against Aristides, is nothing more than an opposition to his doctrines. If you have even a little deviated, Aristides began, and therefore has no right to complain of the poignancy of your satire. This kind of morality is as novel as your politics and logic. I did not, after all, mean to call any person "a pestilent fellow." I trust, that I have more sense and good manners. I did not charge you with high treason, or insurrection. I did not compare you to Catiline or Cethegus, and (if it will give you any satisfaction) I declare, that I do not think, such a comparison would be just.

Having said more than perhaps was necessary, in reply to the abusive part of your address, I proceed to speak fully to the very little you have said by way of argument.

In a genuine republic, there is no such political idea as that of master and servant, applied to the governing and governed. The idea of the people being masters is one of the most incongruous, and absurd, that ever entered into a human brain. Every person is subject to the constitution. This is the sovereign and the protector. This is the bond of union. And if in a regular system of government, there can be such a department as the * people having a constitutional legislative power, as a collective body, the constitution is its creator.

That the people as a collective body, possess rights "*paramount*" the compact or institution of government, I will allow you the full credit of discovering. Notwithstanding you may have read Locke and Sydney before Aristides could read at all, if your pen and heart be in union, you never understood the whole of these, or other writers on government. You could not otherwise utter such jargon about "*paramount*" rights, not transferred by the compact, and the natural right of controling "*agents, deputies and trustees*." Admitting now, that, in a state of nature,

* *The common and proper acceptation of the word "people" is all the inhabitants of a country, existing in the same society, and under the same laws. It comprehends the governing as well as the governed. By Mr. Locke, and from him by our declaration of rights, the word is used to signify either the governed as distinguished from the governing, or a majority of the individuals, bound by the compact. In each of these senses it is used, at different times. If by people be understood a collective body, as such, having certain powers and rights, as a part of the government, my idea is, that there can be no such thing, unless created by the compact. Should we ask some of those who are continually acclaiming about the* people, the people *what the mean by the people, it is possible the question might put them to a stand. Are the governor and council a part of this people, which may control the legislature? No. They are the* servants *of the legislature, as well as of the people. Are the judges, the other magistrates, and the rest of the* civil list? *They are the bloodsuckers of the people. The senate and the delegates cannot be a part of this people, from the nature of things. Is then the body of merchants? Surely not. They are the enemies of the people, as much as the lawyers. They have quite distinct and opposite views and interests. Are the country gentlemen, and respectable landholders? These are your aristocratic gentry, the friends of the senate. Were the inquiry pursued, without disclosing the intent, we should probably find, at last, that what some zealous patriots mean by the people is in reality, (if they have any precise meaning at all) those who possess the least of knowledge, worth or property, the most likely to be inflamed by declamatory harangues, to be driven forwards, and drawn back at the will of a few. By means of this engine, would these few manage the senate and the house of delegates. Blessed be Providence! Not a great many of our countrymen can be reckoned amongst this people. The attempts to convert them into this political engine have been most miserably defeated.*