

THE MARYLAND REPUBLICAN.

"FREEDOM IS THE BRILLIANT GIFT OF HEAVEN.—TIS REASON'S SELF.—THE KIN OF DEITY."

Vol. I.]

ANNAPOLIS, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1869.

[No. 15.]

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
JOHN WEST BUTLER,

CONDITIONS
OF THE
MARYLAND REPUBLICAN.

THE MARYLAND REPUBLICAN is published twice a week during the annual sessions of Assembly, and once a week during the remainder of the year. Its regular day of weekly publication is *Saturday*; and, during the Session of Assembly, *Tuesday* and *Saturday*.

The terms are three dollars per annum; the first year payable six months from the date of subscription, to continue half yearly in advance. The Editor confidently trusts that Subscribers will be particularly attentive to PUNCTUALITY in their payments, as that can alone enable him to meet those necessary and unavoidable expenses naturally resulting from such an establishment.

All communications (post-paid) from literary gentlemen, will be thankfully received; and, if admissible, shall receive immediate attention.

From the Providence Phoenix.

A DIALOGUE

BETWEEN A CANDID FEDERALIST AND
A DEMOCRATIC REPUBLICAN.

Republican. YOUR servant, Sir; if you are at leisure, and I am so disposed, I should be glad to have a little conversation with you upon what is commonly called politics.

Federalist. Sir, your servant; if it will be of any service or pleasure to you, I have no objection to a few moments political conversation, though I must confess I am nearly tired of politics.

Rep.—I am also quite tired, and in fact never was pleased with political conversation as they are commonly managed, and it is not in one of those kind of conversations that I now wish to engage; but interested as we all are in our common country, its welfare, its situation with regard to foreign nations, the measures which may be taken, and which it may be necessary to take, are subjects upon which I am never tired, so long as any new light may be produced from the collision of different thoughts and sentiments.

Fed.—Sir, your hand; I perceive that although we may differ in sentiments, upon some points, that yet we agree as to one, a love for our country; and where we are both striving for the same end, though by different means, the purity of our motives ought to make us mutually respect each other, much more than if we were co-operating with each other as to means, but differed as to ends.

Rep.—Very true, Sir; and to enlarge a little upon your idea,—how often do we see men, of different views, motives and character, united in seeming harmony, because calling themselves by the same party appellation; and on the other hand, men of views equally upright, of like motives and character, at sword's points with each other, and filled with jealousies and prejudices against each other, merely because they differ in the name which they choose to affix to their political sentiments! Thus under the broad mantle of a party, will you find united men of interested and disinterested motives, traitors and patriots, and men whose characters with regard to religion or morality are directly opposite; but it is in vain for us to sigh for that perfectibility which we shall never find; and if we cannot make all men honest, or hope for a union of all really honest men, we must endeavour so to manage the different interests, passions and prejudices of men, as to extract medicine from poison, and make them all tend to produce the greatest possible good. But we have been insensibly drawn from our proposed subject, though what we have been observing I consider not amiss by way of introduction.

Fed.—Well, sir, upon what particular point did you wish to converse, or did you wish to take a larger range?

Rep.—The particular subject which I had more immediately in view, when I first spoke, was the disavowal by the British ministry of the late act of their minister, Mr. Erskine, and their refusal to perform their part of the agreement stipulated. This text will furnish us with many commentaries, and we shall undoubtedly be led to touch upon other topics with which this disavowal is immediately connected, or upon which it serves to throw much

light. And, in the first place, let me ask you, are you not now convinced, that the sole reason why our differences were not settled with G. Britain under the Jefferson administration, was not because of any unwillingness on the part of Mr. Jefferson to settle matters amicably with Great Britain? and whether you do or do not believe that Mr. Jefferson could have settled a year ago our differences with Great Britain (as was asserted by your side, when the propositions of Mr. Erskine, and the proclamation of the President, were in April, last) upon the terms offered by Mr. Erskine?

Fed.—I have no objection to your questions, are rather inclined to consider it more disgraceful to persist in error than to acknowledge and renounce it, I will say to you, that I am not now convinced that Mr. Jefferson could have settled our differences with Great Britain, if the British ministry ever made such propositions to our Government, except by Mr. Erskine.

Rep.—I admit your candor, Sir, and I consider it the best proof of your good sense; I have ever found the most narrow minds to be the most obstinate and perverse; and so far as the man who finds himself in an error and acknowledges and renounces it, from being vanquished, that in fact he has obtained a noble triumph, having gained the most difficult of all victories, a victory over himself. And it is upon the known good sense of my countrymen that I build, when I believe that this disavowal will in the end be productive of that best of all blessings to our country,—union, without which, like a person without health, every other acquisition is only productive of more misery. You will pardon me, sir, if I ask, what you now think of there having been French influence operating upon the last administration?

Fed.—I will endeavour to answer you up in this point with the same candor. No doubt the greatest reason for my believing that the last administration were under French influence was, that I believed that they were not disposed for an amicable settlement with Great Britain; and as this reason no longer exists in my mind, my faith, in this article of my former creed, is undoubtedly much weakened, and particularly as Mr. Madison has thus cleared himself, whom I thought, when he was candidate for the Presidency, more under this influence than Mr. Jefferson, from the words said by Randolph to be spoken by him, though susceptible of a construction which I was not then willing to put upon them.—But don't you think that there is rather a leaning in your party in favour of France?

Rep.—The candor which I admire in you I will endeavor to imitate in my answer to this question. You know, sir, how difficult it is to eradicate deep impressions, and that much time is required before even an individual can hate what he loved, and love what he hated. It much time is required to produce such a change in an individual, how much more time in a nation! In proportion to the circumference of a globe of iron is the time required to heat and to cool it. The revolution, which terminated in our Independence, left us with sentiments of aversion to Great Britain, and of partiality and even gratitude to France. For, although we well understood that it was from motives of hostility and jealousy of Great Britain which induced Lewis XVI. and his court to espouse our cause, and not out of any regard to us, or the principles of our revolution, yet we found many Frenchmen, and among the rest the Marquis De La Fayette, who espoused our cause from the most pure, disinterested and magnanimous views. We saw also that the hearts of the French nation were with us, and we distinguished between the government and the people. When the French Revolution commenced, we found among its promoters the man who had so deservedly obtained so great an interest in our affections, we beheld engaged in it men from whose talents and virtues the cause of genuine liberty had every thing to hope, and nothing to fear. We beheld the crowned despots of Europe leaguings with each other for the purpose of destroying the infant in his cradle, and obliging France to restore to Lewis the despotic sceptre.—Our love and admiration on the one hand, and our indignation and detestation on the other, were called into action. We now beheld that revolution, which would have secured rational liberty to France had she been suffered to have remained in peace long enough to have perfected and established it, in consequence of this league and threatened war, as the source of evils and crimes, the catalogue of which make the heart sick in the perusal. The King became the object of suspicion to his subjects, they considered him as in the view of their enemies, and an attempt made by him to leave France and fly to them, in which he was detected and arrested, confirmed the suspicion, strengthened the hands of those who were for abolishing altogether the monarchy, and finally

brought Lewis to the scaffold. Factions now arose, men of talents but destitute of virtue, and possess of all the qualifications of the most bloody tyrants, took advantage of the storm; they directed the inflamed passions of an abused and suffering people upon those whom they feared as possessing talents and incorruptible integrity, or whom they envied as being rich, and whose possessions they coveted. But the sound of liberty had electrified France, and the imperial standard fled before the republican banner. While our hearts were yet beating warmly in the cause of republican France, Great Britain joined the league against her; this served to continue in us those sentiments towards her which had their origin in our revolution. Her refusal to deliver up the western posts agreeably to the treaty of 1783, and the Indian war which she was more than suspected of encouraging and supporting, had filled us with emotions towards her, which, with our enthusiasm in favor of France, made it extremely difficult for us to preserve that neutrality which was our interest, and which was not forbid by our honour.—The treaty, commonly called Jay's treaty, you know, sir, went down hard; whether we could have got a better one, I must confess myself at a loss to determine; happily it preserved our peace at a critical moment, and we continued to grow and prosper. Now commenced the difference in opinion and prejudices among us with regard to Great Britain and France.—Our signing a treaty at this time with Great Britain, raised suspicions in France that we were hostile to her; this produced coldness on her part; our mind was rejected, our commerce spoiled, and the two countries were on the verge of open and unqualified war. This was fortunately prevented by mutual explanations, and a treaty was formed. This could not however immediately restore those affections which her conduct had alienated, and the partisans of Great Britain added fuel to the flame. The usurpation of Bonaparte destroyed the republic, and the real republicans of America called home their affections with a sigh. They now view France with emotions of pity, and believing that her present situation was caused by the war of the confederated kings against her liberty, and in the crushing of which they have been but too successful, (though in a different way from what they intended) they cannot help viewing the desolation of their kingdoms, and the overturning of their thrones (by the wonderful man who seems to be the genius of France, hurling the thunderbolts of vengeance,) otherwise than as a just judgment of heaven upon them. The conduct of Napoleon towards us we consider as perfectly unjust; but we are prevented from obtaining redress from him and asserting our rights, by Great Britain, who has flung herself between us and France; and who by her power on the ocean, and addressing herself to the cupidity of our commercial spirit, seems determined to affix upon us those badges of colonial slavery which seven years of privation, suffering and conflict, could not induce us to wear. Let Great Britain do us justice, and we are ready to assert our rights of France. Whatever French influence there may have formerly been in this country, it has expired with the causes which produced it, or if not entirely extinct, will soon be so, and is too weak to produce any effect. The cry was raised, I have no doubt, to turn the attention of the people from that British influence which is so apparent, and which threatens to undermine the principles of our glorious revolution.

Fed.—You think then there is a dangerous British influence existing in our country—but do you not think that the great reason why those of our party look with such favorable eyes upon Great Britain, is that we consider her power as the only barrier to the universal domination of Napoleon?

Rep.—No doubt it is so with those of your party who really love their country, and the present constitution of its government, but there are others whose partiality to Great Britain may be traced to the profits which they derive from British manufactures; others who have never renounced in their hearts allegiance to the British king, and who instil into their children the same notions and principles which constituted (in the time of the revolution) a *party*; others, who are Englishmen by birth and feeling, but who find (for the convenience of neutral trade) an interest in assuming the character of an American citizen—with such combustible materials in our country, it is no wonder that those Englishmen who, to serve their king, become the editors of many of our public journals, should find it so easy to kindle a flame, which demands all our diligence to prevent its reaching and consuming the citadel of our independence and freedom.

Fed.—There may be much truth in what you say, but I can never believe that the majority of the federalists are for becoming again the colonists of Great Britain, or that they would surrender to

Great-Britain the essential rights and interests of their country.

Rep.—Perhaps not, knowingly, and with that design; but if all their opposition and actions tend to this, it is of but little consequence to their country what may be their motives. It is of but little consequence to the man who is killed whether it was done by accident, from sudden passion, or deliberate malice.

Fed.—But, sir, do you think that there is any thing can save us, but the naval power of Great-Britain, from the yoke of Bonaparte?

Rep.—Suppose there is not, shall we submit to wear the chains of Great-Britain, for fear, that by possibility, we may come under the dominion of France? This would be as wise as the person who, with a thousand guineas in his purse, destroyed himself, for fear he should come to want.

Fed.—I grant it sir, but still I will thank you to answer my question; consider it if you please merely a question of curiosity, and not as having any connection with the course which we ought to take with G. Britain?

Rep.—The question, sir, is of great importance; it is more than a mere question of curiosity, and deserves a serious answer. If it could be demonstrated that in case France conquers Great-Britain, she will also conquer this country, and if it could be also demonstrated that, by our assistance, the conquest of England could be prevented, or even, advantageously for us, procrastinated, self defence would induce us to render England that assistance, provided we could do it without a sacrifice of our rights and independence. But these are four things to be established before we shall be justified in taking such a course. 1. Is it probable France will conquer Great-Britain? 2. Will she then prevent us? 3. Could our interference prevent it? and 4th. Could we render such assistance, until Great-Britain does us full and complete justice, without a surrender of our rights and our independence? The first I think improbable, and if it should happen, I think the second more improbable still, and to the third and fourth I without hesitation answer no. We are a world by ourselves, far removed from the convulsions of Europe, and were it not for our commerce, we should not know that they existed. We are already a great, a growing nation, and amply competent to defend our territory whenever invaded. Shall it be told us, and that too without exciting emotions of honest indignation in our bosoms, that we are dependent upon that power for the preservation of our national existence, against which we successfully struggled and from which we in a state of comparative infancy, wrested the charter of our independence. The man who inculcates sentiments like these, is preparing his countrymen to submit without a struggle to the dominion of France, in case Great-Britain should fall before the conqueror. Rather let us be told that our swords are our protection, and the tombs of our departed heroes the ramparts of our freedom. We are no longer an independent people whenever we turn our eyes upon a foreign nation as our guardians and protectors; and those who would induce us thus to look upon Great-Britain, are unworthy of the name of freemen, and are corrupting and destroying the free and noble spirit of their countrymen.

Fed.—I thank you, sir, for the warmth and freedom of your sentiments; you have aroused in me that spirit which I hope the descendant of every whig possesses, and without which I readily admit with you, it is impossible to preserve a national existence. In viewing our wide spread commerce I had almost forgot that we had a soil capable of producing all the luxuries of the table and all the materials for manufacture.—While we possess this, and can defend it, we shall be free and happy; let us therefore turn our eyes at home, cultivate our natural advantages, and we shall soon be in truth, a great and independent nation.

Rep.—Yes sir, this is undoubtedly our policy, and then France may issue her decrees and Great Britain her orders in council, and we, secure and happy at home, shall suffer them to spend their rage on the elements. They will then perceive our real independence, and find their interest in cultivating our favour. And now, Sir—let me exhort you to disseminate among those of your party who may be yet blinded, these sentiments, which I am rejoiced to hear you express; they will receive them from you with that consideration which they might not give them coming from an adverse quarter, and we may once more join our hands in promoting the interest and happiness of our country.

The Tories are extremely alarmed at the progress of manufactures. If Jackson has not power to ratify Mr. Erskine's engagements, (and it is firmly believed they will constitute the basis on which our government will treat with him) we may expect to hear of many manufacturing establishments being destroyed by fire.

It published a short time since, a piece, extracted from the *Washington Watchman*, on the subject of the *Maryland Church Bill*,—which we have observed to be a able, written in the first paper over the signature of "Amicus" and "Civilians" but we think of republication, but on the latter, is more interesting, we have selected it.

FROM THE WASHINGTON WATCHMAN.
Observations on the Maryland Church Bill, and Quaker's Petition.

NO I.
The gospel of Jesus Christ will never have its full and proper effect upon mankind, until it is completely disentangled from every human institution.

I have perused with great pleasure the ingenious and impartial essays of *Amicus*, on the subject of the *Maryland Church Bill*, that have just been published in the *Watchman*. These essays will be consulted with interest by every friend of civil and religious liberty, who whose hands they may fall; and while they contribute, along with other interesting publications upon the same subject, to arrest the attention of the people in general, I hope the society of Friends in particular will be stimulated to vigilance in the peaceful defence of their most sacred rights and liberties, which are presumptuously assailed by the writer of the *Maryland Gazette*.

Abstracted from all party considerations, the *Church Bill* unquestionably involves within itself principles that are radically wrong, as they are essentially subversive of the very foundation of that religion, which it is the *præ-est* object of the *Bill* to promote. Although necessarily limited in the extent of its powers, it regards an ecclesiastical dominion over other denominations of Christians, the contemplated new jurisdiction of the Convention of the *Protestant Episcopal Church in Maryland*, differs only in degree and not in principle from every other church establishment that has ever existed, whether *Papal* or *Presbyterian*; and the means of innocent loss that have been shed as a consequence of such establishments, and that has lately streamed from the veins of hundreds of thousands in the anti-christian struggle, to preferre them from falling into ruin, mourning still beyond the power of contradiction, their abominable industry, and utter inconsistency with the *city religion of Jesus Christ*. If the influence of this religion was universally felt by those who profess to believe in it, all coercive restraints would be found to be unnecessary and absurd, and such which have evidently had their origin in corruption, would cease to disgrace the christian character. If, (as a pious Episcopalian clergyman who dared to separate himself from the Episcopalian hierarchy in England, on account of its abominations) "the salvation of a man's own soul will not move him to promote the interests of religion, nothing else will be of any avail." Church Establishments are in their nature monarchical and serve to keep up inequalities amongst mankind, and while the few are enriched and aggrandized, the many are necessarily kept in poverty and ignorance. The clergy of England at this time undoubtedly exhibit a melancholy picture of human depravity! It is notorious that those who are the pretended guardians of religion in that dilapidated land, revel in all the luxuries and vices which deform the human character, while the poor are starving both for temporal and spiritual food, and the righteous friends of reform are persecuted. There may be considered bold statements, but I challenge the world to dispute them; and if there is indeed any truth in christianity; if there is any confidence to be placed in the concurrent testimonies of pious men of every denomination whose lives are a practical comment upon their principles—then indeed, the time will come when this "Protestant Babylon" shall be humbled in the dust, and the reign of the prince of peace be established in its place.

The *Layman* informs us that "the church of England is admitted by the intelligent and unprejudiced, to become beyond any other national church, the most in its principles and *ecclesiastical* in its faith. With respect to religious liberty, moderation is its governing character! except during the usurpation of Cromwell, the Episcopal government has prevailed in England to the PROSPERITY of the subject and the TRANQUILLITY of the State." A people of Maryland—people of the United States, who have the sacred cause of liberty and pure religion at heart, mark the preceding sentiments of the Maryland churchman—they are fraught with instruction that ought to be indelibly engraven in your minds, and transmitted to your posterity. Recollect the actual state of the *BRITISH HIERARCHY* of which I have attempted a faint sketch, and rejoicingly avail yourselves of the opportunity which is still afforded you of slipping in the bud every alarming attempt at innovation, which would gradually lead to the subversion of your liberties, and the creation of a spendid church government similar to that which the wretched inhabitants of England, and ill fated Ireland, groan under. You see that this defender of the *CHURCH BILLS*—this avowed enemy to LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE, has been bold enough to give a decided preference to the CHURCH of ENGLAND over every OTHER NATIONAL CHURCH, thereby admitting the *HIERARCHICAL* principle of church establishments; of course, nothing but the POWER is wanting to extend the principle throughout the union.

I have been much astonished in looking over the *Baltimore Federal Gazette* of the 29th ult. to find the *Church Bill* defended by the editor of that paper, who was born and educated a Friend. The principles held forth by that people, I presume, he still professes; and I have been informed, that he was likewise a republican until bribed to print a federal paper. It is then his love of worldly riches—that powerful spring of action which stimulates the friends of church establishments, that has induced him, in a language unbecoming the christian and the gentleman, to abuse the opponents of the *Church Bill*, and tacitly to acquiesce in the flagrant injustice of rejecting the petition of his fellow believers for *liberty of conscience*. Of such a spirit—and of such a republicanism, we may emphatically exclaim in the language of scripture: *He went out from us, but he was not of us!*

CHRYSOSTOM.
* The Rev David Simpson, M. A.
PRINTING
OF EVERY DESCRIPTION,
EXECUTED IN THE NEATEST MANNER,
AT THE OFFICE OF THE
MARYLAND REPUBLICAN.