by creating a WILL in the community *independent* of the people, both the civil and relligous liberties of the citizens are endangered. Government possessing *hereditary* power, or an authority lodged in the hands of a *few* to the *exclusion* of the *many*, leaves but a precarious security for the people in general; because a power, entirely independent of the people, will turn its strength against their civil as well as religious rights. The experience of every age and every country leaves no room to doubt upon this subject. The history of England, France, Germany, and every European government supports this opinion with proofs as strong as holy writ.

The *attempt* of the *leaders* of federalism in the years 1798 and 1799, to take from about one fourth of the people the right of voting was despotic and oppressive. It was an endeavor to put the *whole power of governing*, in the hands of the *rich*. If it had succeeded, the *wealthy* would have been *formed into a body independent* of the people and out of their controul. The great bulk of the people deprived of the right of suffrage, would have been also deprived of the *peaceable* corrective of abuses. The measure was contrary to republican principles; and to the genius of our government, which places the right of self-government under the controul of the people, and secures to every denomination of christians the free exercise of opinion and worship.

History and experience prove that whenever the *few possess power and rights independent* of the nation, the civil and religious rights of the people, in a short time, become destroyed. Many instances might be adduced, but we need only instance the English government to convince the reader—There, the *king* and *lords* are *independent* of the people. The civil power of that government is directed by *them*. The people unable to controul them, submit to the union of church and state; and rather than hazard a struggle for civil and religious freedom, they pay their burthens imposed upon them by the nobility and the clergy.

And if the *leading federalists* could have excluded all people they intended from the right of voting, we should have seen, in this country, a constant effort and one continued policy to raise themselves on the ruins of the people. We should have had, in all human probability, a government of church and state, in which the *wealthy federalists* would have been the *nobles* and the *clergy*:—Holding the civil power in their hands, and placed beyond the control of the great body of the people, taxes would have been imposed on them without their consent; and to some one religious denomination, all the others would have been tributary. For men, who so ambitiously aspire to grasp at a political authority would have no scruple in possessing themselves of all religious authority.

In the meekness of the christian doctrine we find nothing that justifies a part of mankind, depriving or endeavoring to deprive the other part of the right of freely expressing and voting their opinions on civil matters,—but men, having neither excellency nor grace, will needs be struggling for exclusive rights and privileges, *to satisfy their ambitious and ostentatious* minds, which is a manifest token of their unworthiness and unfitness to be trusted as public men.

The distinction which the *leaders* of federalism want to make between themselves and the middle and poorer class of people, is what I oppose. Many of them educate their children for divines or public men, and they cannot bear the idea of farmers' and mechanics' sons having an equal chance with them. Bred up to idleness and pleasure, thinkiug it a disgrace for them to work with their hands, they think nobody who has not a college education ought to express an opinion on government, whereby all honest mechanics and farming men who have not learnt logic, philosophy, &c. at *school*, ought to be excluded from having this privilege.

Let not any think, from my opinion in these things, that all men must have things in *common*, and that I approve of the *levelling* principle. Not so. "My principle leaves every man to enjoy that *peaceably*, which either his own industry or his parent's has purchased to him, and that he is to use it aright both to *promote his own good and that of his fellow-citizens*; in which all their acts are voluntary and not constrained."

In civil and religious matters the right of voting at elections and the freedom of opinion should be enjoyed by all classes and denominations.

The attempt made by the *leading* federalists in 1798 and 1799 to restrict the right of suffrage, I consider as a blow intended by them to destroy the political and religious rights and liberties of the people. For it, they have forever forfeited my confidence: and it is a duty I owe to my country and myself, to say that, in my apprehension, on the success of the republican interest depend the liberty, peace, and happiness of the people of this country.

BARCLAY.

July 27th, 1803.

Blank Indentures for sale,

FOR THE STAR.

[RE-PUBLISHED BY PARTICULAR DESIRE.]

THE proceedings of the Convention, of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland, having fallen into my hands; being a member of that Church, I read them with attention; and I confess not without surprise at the Bishops seditious crimination of the American Constitution, in that "it offers it only toleration" but what astonished me, was that he received the thanks of the Convention, for his treasonable attack on the equal religious liberty secured by that constitution. That I may avoid the suspicion of designing to misrepresent either, the Bishop, or the Convention, I will insert the parts alluded to literally—which here follow—with the vote of thanks:

"The Bishop then delivered the following address to the Convention; for which their *respective* thanks were presented, with an assurance, that they will pay attention to the several subjects contained therein.—

"The Jewish government was a Theocracy, and of course religion was, with them, placed in its proper station.—The heathen nations too had intimately blended their different systems of religion with those of their polities. They all viewed Christianity, as hostile to their sovereignty, and prejudicial to their interests: Both Jews and Heathens therefore opposed the introduction of this religion, with all the force of argument, and all the powers of persecution. In opposition, however, to all the reasoning of their priests and philosophers, and to all the fury of ten bloody persecutions, christianity in the course of a few centuries, spread itself through all the then known world, and ascended the throne of the Cæsars, conducted at first, only by a few illiterate fishermen, and mechanics, unaided by the sword."

"The advantages, which christianity *offered* to civil governments, were so great, as to be thought for many ages, absolutely essential to their very existence. *Christendom affords no instance, from the time of Constantine, to the time of the American Constitution, of a single government which did not protect and support it. The American Constitution, although preserved by it, offers it only toleration: It suffers it to wander about our country in the character of a mendicant. This experiment was new to the world, and excited attention. Many of the wisest and best Christians in America, as well as in England, when reasoning on this subject, have argued the declention of rational religion, and the promotion of infidelity and fanaticism among us, through this neglect.* They have grounded their *morals*, and the lukewarmness and indifference towards religion, so *characteristic of the present age*, and so opposite to the true spirit of the gospel, and and to that of the first christians. How far these predictions have been already *verified*, a slight survey of the present state of religion and morals in our country, *will be amply sufficient to shew*. Let facts speak for themselves.'

That the Bishop and Clergy of the Episcopal church are as a body solicitous of *an establishment of that church*, the foregoing sentiments of the Bishop, and the *approbation* of the Convention, are *record evidence*, which no man can doubt; and that *they* are in direct hostility to the *American Constitution*, for guarding the *professors* of *every* religion in *equal religious liberty*, they, have not left to conjecture—The constitution declares "that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." That this pious body would prefer the despotic government of their quondam King whom they recognise as the *head* of that church, with the train of *priests* and nobles established as they are, they have too plainly expressed, and from the ready approbation of the convention and their well known political creed, there is too much reason to suppose they would not *violently* oppose it.

The Bishop tells us that the heathen nations blended their different systems of religion with their civil polities, from whence I presume he intended to say we were *worse* than heathens,—yes the heathens did so, we recollect the impious practices of the kings and priests, who confederated to enslave mankind by their wicked crafts, we shall never forget the practice of consulting the Oracles, which were under the direction of the kings and priests—a large image of the God they worshipped was set up in their church, which the priests taught the deluded people, could foretell events; in the belly of this Image they concealed a priest who was instructed in his answers, and to the astonished multitude replied to every question that was propounded, and thus regulated the events of war, and the rise and fall of Empires, for it was held sacraligious not to believe, and more so not to conform to the Oracles.

Nor have our christian kings and priests made a much better use of their royal and holy functions, for the benefit of the human race—they also have combined to establish their civil and religious despotims; the king of Great Britain is to be supported by the priesthood in all his royal functions as the *head* of the *church*; and they are to inforce by their preaching the divinity of kings, and secure the permanency of their authority, by the doctrines of passive obedience and nonresistance—in return—their religion is established and incorporated with the government, with one tenth of every product, of the crops, and of the stock, of the whole nation, but this is secured to the Bishops, who compose a part of the House of Lords, who support a half-starved clergy with a bare subsistance, who are *poor indeed*.

In the State of Maryland during the establishment, we have witnessed the happy fruits of that pious institution which is now so *feelingly* bewailed by his holiness—we have seen the hard earned bread of a pious Quaker forced from him by the sword of the law, and sold at public auction, to support a drunken parson in his impious revelings, nay more, we have seen that drunken parson obtain his Induction into the parish by drinking more bumpers than a drunken Governor, who in the exercise of the petty regalia in Maryland, had that right as the head of the church here. I ask if the patriot of Maryland, who abolished the establishment, did not act with a *virtuous* and an *even hand*, by putting all religions upon a footing, and securing every man in his own confession of faith, from the impious necessity of supporting any religion but his own—which is the case throughout the union, except in the state of Massachusets, which under the *pious* and imposing auspicies of John Adams, has an establishment; and hence we discover the reason why the clergy advocate him, and the history of Virginia, where, by the agency of Thomas Jefferson the establishment was abolished, furnishes us with the true grounds of the clergy's hatred to him, and accounts for all their calumnies.

That the clergy of the established church, at all times were obliged, and did by the religious hold they had on the minds of the people, aid their kings, in all their wicked attempts to enslave mankind, the history of every nation of the old world attests, that they did endeavour by their sacriligious doctrines to establish the divinity of kings, is a truth well established—and that the clergy of that church, even at this day are *men*, there can be but little doubt when we see them, for the addition of a few dollars thisking, from parish to parish, and from shore, to shore, and now daring in the convention to advocate the establishment of their church, and the *consequent* taxing all religions for its support, and denouncing the abolition of the establishment, as the downfal of religion which the christian prophets of *England* and *America foretold*—but that they were false prophets, a short review of the state of the Church in 1776 and in 1803 will prove beyond a doubt, and the freedom of our religion will justify our investigating the truth, even should it criminate the Pope himself.

I will speak of the state of the church in Talbot, Queen-Anns and Kent counties in 1776, and 1803: In Talbot there were in 1776 four churches, in Queen-Anns six, in Kent five—there were three or four Presbiterian, and Quaker meeting *houses, and no others: the Episcopal* churches were built by taxes on all denominations—in 1776 the establishment was abolished—since that time, by voluntary contribution in Talbot, eight Methodist meeting houses have been built, and three others are now building; in Queen-Anns six are built, and in Kent five, all of which are filled with moral and truly pious preachers, and all these meeting houses are crouded with the meek and humble professors of that church, who pay their clergy a satisfactory compensation without the force of law; and as "by their fruits ye shall know them" we have discovered "that they were good."

I ask if there is a single clergyman of the episcopal church, who has a parish, that does not receive as much for his services as five of the Methodist preachers do, and if there are not glebes to many parishes of great value, I ask if they do not get much better paid than the English clergy, (the bishop excepted) whence then the necessity or propriety of the establishment—why the outcry of the downfall of religion—there were more persons on Sunday last at one Methodist church in Chester, than the meeting house and market house could hold, in both of which there was preaching at the same time, altho' the bishop preached at a church in the county on that day. I ask then if religion is not in a flourishing state at this time, and whether it is not justly to be ascribed to the freedom of the church, occasioned by the abolition of the establishment, little preferable to the inquisition. I profess to be a member of the Episcopal church, although I have not lately attended it, when the incumbent officiated—because he introduced class-meetings, and anathmatised those who disapproved of them, neglected the Liturgy, and instead thereof used prayers of his own composition; and introduced men of immoral and infamous characters to pray in the church at his meetings; but altho' I am a member of this church, before I could see it flourish on so impious a foundation, I would contribute to pay their passage, and vote to transport the whole priesthood *who wish* the establishment to that land of religious despotism, whose despot they recognize as the head of their church.

PLAIN TRUTH.

Eastern Shore, Maryland,
6th August, 1803.

From the NORTHUMBERLAND ARGUS.

Finance, or the curses of war!

The late war added to the national debt of Great Britain 258 millions of pounds sterling, a sum equal to *eleven thousand, four hundred and sixty-one millions, nine hundred and eighty thousand dollars*:—to the *annual* taxes of Great Britain, it added 15 millions sterling, equal to 666 *millions*, 390 thousand dollars. The population of Great Britain is eleven millions—thus by the late war, averaging each person to pay equally, every man, woman, and child in Great Britain, has contracted a debt of *one thousand and fifty-two dollars*—for which (in taxes occasioned by that war,) each has to pay an annual interest of upwards of sixty *dollars*.—Whoever after this statement is so stupid as not to see the blessings of having a *wise* and *good* king, and a *heaven-born minister*, must be considered as one of Mr. Burke's incorrigible jacobins.

Finance, on the blessings of peace.

The population of the United States is something more than *five millions*—the purchase of Louisiana, of New Orleans, and consequently of the great river Missisippi is *fifteen millions of dollars* and a fraction—let the surplus of the five millions pay the surplus quarter of a million in the purchase, and we find that for *three dollars* each, we have acquired a right to a territory of great extent, and a most luxuriant soil and climate, and have added half a million of people to our population—People who will soon feel the thousand advantages they possess under a republican government, when compared with their situation as colonists under a despotic government. The expenses incurred by John Adams to support his odious measures in opposition to the will of the people, far exceeded the purchase of a country, 'where from the favorableness of the climate, two annual crops of Indian corn as well as rice may be produced.' The fruitless expense of John Adams to enslave five millions of freemen, was far greater than the sum which is to be paid to make citizens of half a million of slaves. Let the wise and sober minded among the federalists reflect upon these things—let the mad men who were for plunging the country into a war gnash their teeth in the vexation of their hearts, and let the democratic republicans rejoice, and proudly exult in the blessings which are enjoyed, and those which are to be expected under the administration which is composed of the men whom the people love.

Poverty, the consequence of war!

In a debate in the house of commons, on the conduct of Mr. Pitt and the late administration of England, Mr. Nichols thus expressed himself. "By an injurious extention of *paper* money; by an exorbitant rise in the price of all the necessaries of life; by reducing the tradesman to poverty and wretchedness, and by filling the poor-houses with thousands of miserable inhabitants, who for the last two years, were doomed to perish, to the amount, he would not say, of hundreds but of thousands." (Strong and general murmers in the house.) Mr. Nichols continued, "*I repeat sir, that thousands have perished in the poor-houses within the last two years. I speak from good information and from my own knowledge. If any gentleman doubts the accuracy of this statement, let him move for a committee of enquiry, and I pledge myself to produce such damning proofs, as shall make his hair stand on end.*" *Such is the property, such the happiness of the* PEOPLE of Great Britain! such are the fruits, of that most stupendous fabric of human wisdom, the British constitution.

Plenty—the consequence of peace.

Citizens of America! when you are thus from *unquestionable* authority assured, that poverty, wretchedness and death, in its most terrifying forms have been the lot of the people of England (said to be the most free and happy country in Europe,) how must your hearts swell with pride and gratitude, on a comparison between your situation and theirs. When the friends of British influence confound you with their sophisms in praise of British liberty and British happiness, remember the "*damning proofs*" to the contrary, which we have this day laid before you. Plenty and peace, liberty and happiness have been, may they ever be, the blessed, enviable lot of the citizens of the United States.

FROM THE BOSTON CHRONICLE.

A MAN who is not a democratic republican, in this country, is an enemy in heart to the American constitution, and to that of this commonwealth in an especial manner. If a citizen be not a democratic republican, what, in the name of wonder, is he? Is he an aristocratic republican? Is he a friend to those distinctions which originate in birth? Does he wish for two sorts of people—patrician and plebian, lords and commoners, with a king at their head? Does he wish for hereditary power or family distinctions? Does he wish for a government like Venice, or Switzerland, before the last revolution.

Those were aristocratic republics.—John Adams has said, in his letter to Samuel Adams, that such governments were worse than the most despotic, with a single magistrate, in which the despot is all and the people nothing. Shall we have the lion's mouth kept open, for scoundrel informers to deposit in secret their infamous and anonymous accusations, as was the practice in Venice? Shall the free citizens in America be sold by masters, as was the custom in Switzerland before the late revolution in Europe, like a flock of sheep or a drove of oxen, to the highest bidder? Shall they become the disposeable property of a foreign government, to fight in any cause or on any occasion, as the Swiss were obliged to do, by those who hired them? Is this the sort of government that the whinning hypocrites, who bemoan the fate of Venice and of Switzerland, with their crocodile tears, would wish to see established in the seventeen states of North America, when they say they are not democratic republicans? Do they wish such a royal republic as that of Poland, before it was partitioned and cut up by the surrounding monarchs without the means of defending itself, in which two thirds of the miserable subjects were sold with the glebe, and in which the cultivator of the soil was the slave of its owner? Or do they prefer the government of England as a model? These two have been called royal republics, by Doctor Adams!!!

As to the last, we well know what that is, by the full experience we felt of its peculiar blessings in the time of our revolution. If that is the model proposed for imitation, our secession was a rebellion, our bill of rights libels, our declaration of independence the most infamous outrage on truth, decency and just government, that was ever promulgated; and Washington an insurgent and traitor to the best of kings. If then we are not royal nor aristocratic we must be democratic republicans; or, we repeat the assertion, we are enemies to our free and excellent constitutions. Constitutions which exist only in the will, and are supported by the common sense and common interest of the people who made them—in which the soverign power is in the people, from whom all the officers of the state directly or indirectly proceed, and to whom they must return whenever their creators think proper to "dam them to private life."

Any other than an elective democracy is impracticable. That alone is the sort of democracy which exists in this country; and it shall and must prosper. Experience, with all its lights blazing, has shewn it to be possible. In our colonial and national state, these governments, in principle and practice, have been fundamentally the same during the lapse of two centuries. The arts and arms of Great Britain, by sap, treachery or fraud never have been able to destroy them.—The people of Massachusetts have invariably deposed their tyrants, by their sovereign will. Andros, Hutchinson, Gage, *were successively dethroned and expelled* the country. Let those who wish, under whatever pretext, to follow on their footsteps, beware. The ground trembles under them already; and if it is once discovered and universally believed that they wish for any other forms of government than those which time hath here consecrated, they are lost forever.

We again ask, if our governments be not democratic republics, what are they? Speak out ye would be despots—but ye dare not. Ye just hint your wishes, and the equivocal manner alone in which you express them, leaves you yet a faction. The moment the truth is known universally the question will be settled. Great Britain may receive you in her arms, but in America you will have left only a name, and your fate will be another beacon to warn future malefactors of their approaching destiny.

The constitutions of these United States are the kind of democracies that command our warmest wishes and our liveliest affections. They are founded on equal rights, and must be protected by equal laws. They abjure all foreign influence, civil or spiritual: they have suppressed and extinguished forever all distinctions of power that are hereditary; all distinctions of family birth. They hold not the honors and emoluments of government, as the monopoly of a noble or patrician faction. Our clergy are but public teachers of piety and morality; elected by the people and amenable to them. The rights of primogeniture are no more. The highest is but a citizen, the lowest is as much. Property is inviolable, persons secure, and liberty entwined with the ligaments of our hearts. Public worship free, and the rights of conscience, sacred. This is the theory—if in any state the practice deviates from the rule, a little time will correct it.—What is it ye want then, ye who are not democratic republicans? If ye want any thing more or different, the life and fortune is staked against you, of every honest man who is a constitutional American.