

The RALEIGH MINERVA.

RALEIGH, N. C. — PUBLISHED (WEEKLY) BY WILLIAM BOYLAN.

[OR \$2.50 CENTS IN ADVANCE.]

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1810.

No. 723.

GRAND FEDERAL MEETING.

very numerous and respectable meeting of Federal Republican Electors of the City and County of New York, convened at Mechanic Hall on Monday, the 15th January, 1810. NICHOLAS FISH was called to the Chair and EDWARD DUNSCOMB was appointed Secretary. Both of them old Revolutionary Officers. The meeting being opened, Mr. David B. Ogden addressed them. He began by stating that the Federal Republicans of the city were convinced that the welfare and happiness of the good people of this state, are deeply connected with a wise, discreet and liberal administration of their executive government, and knowing from recent experience, that an administration, not on the basis, and acting under the influence of party spirit, is little capable of real public and naturally productive of great mischief, had assembled on the fifth of this month, for the purpose of nominating a suitable candidate supported for the office of Governor of this State by the Federal Republicans. At the ensuing meeting, after due deliberation, it was resolved, that Jonas Platt, Esq. of the County of Oneida, be supported as the Federal Republican candidate for Governor. In the full confidence that the administration of Gen. Platt, would be prudent and liberal, patriotic and republican, and would tend to restore and banish the pernicious influence of faction, promote justice, raise the character of the State and remedy the evils under which its citizens have so long suffered—this resolution had been communicated by our friends in Albany to the general committee of the Federal Republicans of this city, with an earnest desire that it would have the approbation of the Federal Republicans here. In consequence of this communication, our general committee had called the present meeting, in order that our fellow citizens might have an early opportunity of taking this nomination into consideration, and if they should think it proper to concur in it.

The request of the general committee Mr. Ogden said he had risen, to open this meeting, for the purpose for which they have assembled, and to submit to their consideration some resolutions on the subject.

He did not intend upon this occasion to dwell upon the great importance which it was to the honor and the happiness of the state; the office of Governor should be filled by an upright, independent and honest man, whose experience for some years past, had made observations upon that point unnecessary; he had seen party spirit triumphant among us; he had seen private rights violated and trodden under foot, we had seen the veteran, yet carrying the scars received in the Revolution, driven from the office which was his reward which his country had given him, and the way for young, ambitious and unprincipled magistrates. We had seen men promoted to the first offices of the state, not because they were virtuous, integrity, and independence of sentiment, but because they had no more talent than was necessary to teach them what their leaders wanted; more integrity than was enough to stick to their right or wrong, and independence just enough to make them the blind tools of the chiefs. There was scarce any man in the country, who had not seen and deplored these evils. Our only remedy for these was, an active, honest exercise of the rights of suffrage. It was the people who raised the present Government to power, and it was the people who must remove it from power. The people had believed that the present rulers to be the friends of freedom, and republicanism, and therefore they were put in power. The people had now found them displaying the first principles of freedom, and pursuing a line of conduct the tendency of which was to destroy our republic, and it was therefore they must now be left out of office. To a man in the conduct of the state government, a Chief Magistrate was, he said, essential; and of the necessity of such a reform no man could doubt. It therefore had become the duty of the true republicans of the state, of the friends of freedom, to take early measures relative to the removal of their Governor. He confessed that he felt happy that so early a nomination had taken place. And the gentleman who had been selected, was a man beloved and respected in the part of the state where he resided; and his virtues and his talents, had rendered his name conspicuous, in every part of the State; they were such as would enable him to be of essential service to the public if he should be elected. In his politics he had been one of those who had never swerved from principle. He had been a uniform Federalist, and was therefore entitled to our warmest support.

to be friends of their country. To them therefore I will unobscure myself, upon a subject involving their dearest interests, and the welfare and happiness of their country.

The United States are the only Republic in the world. This fact while it justly gives us reason to be proud and thankful, should at the same time awaken all our vigilance and anxiety.

In Europe, in that most civilized and powerful quarter of the globe there are no Republics left. They have all long since fallen a prey to French violence—French perfidy. Let the people of the United States seriously reflect upon this fact, and callous must be their feelings, if they do not awaken some anxiety lest the same fate should befall us which has befallen them. Will our Republic continue, or must it, like those of Europe, fall before the gigantic power of Napoleon? This is a question which must soon be decided. We have not much time for deliberation. People of America! rouse from your lethargy, or you are lost—Awaken from your slumbers, and save your country! If you sleep on but a little longer you will awaken only to death.

The French Republic began their revolution by declaring war against Kings. They have ended it by waging war against the liberties of the world. The Romans were a nation of soldiers, and conquered the world. The French are a nation of soldiers, and never would be satisfied but with universal domination.

The nations on the continent of Europe, has either surrendered to her arms, or under the name of allies, are subject to her will. Spain indeed is yet struggling for her liberties, but there is too much reason to fear, that it is the last struggle of an expiring nation.

With the continent of Europe at his command, what is to prevent Napoleon from conquering the world? Will he be satisfied with what he has already conquered? Be not deceived. Alexander, after he had conquered the world, wept because there was no other world to conquer. Napoleon cannot stop if he would—he has large armies and they must be employed. Military achievements are the only road to honor in a military nation. His ambitious and aspiring officers will thirst for opportunities to signalize themselves, and will have war as long as there is an independent nation to make war upon. What then, I ask again, is to prevent Napoleon from conquering the world?

I answer, England. In giving this answer I know I subject myself to be called a Tory. For fear of being so called, shall I not speak the truth? My countrymen, I disregard all that can be said about my being a Tory; and I despise and abhor the wretch who calls me so for I am none. Yet I speak boldly—if the people of the United States will not hear the truth; if any scoundrel who can cry Tory, can induce them to turn a deaf ear to it, then are we indeed lost. In my soul I believe that England alone stands between the world and universal domination, and believing so, I should despise myself if I feared to tell you so.

Give France the British navy, by which she could transport millions of soldiers into our defenceless country, could we successfully resist them? If we could, how much blood and how much treasure must we spend in our defence? Let every American seriously ask himself these questions.

Are the people of the United States ready to go to war with England, and thus assist France in conquering her? Suppose we should be plunged into such a war; suppose we should be as successful in it as the most sanguine of our advocates for war, could wish; suppose we conquer Canada, starve England, nay, suppose in the language of one of the enlightened majority in Congress, we should render her downfall inevitable—what then? Why we shall dig our own grave, we shall have destroyed our own liberties, we should inevitably become French provinces.

But should we be unsuccessful against England, should she annihilate our commerce, destroy our seaport towns, and land thirty thousand men among our negroes in the South, might we not then be compelled to sue for peace? and could we in such an event expect a more favorable treaty than we could yet now?

If we go to war with England, we must either be successful or unsuccessful. If successful we should be ruined, if unsuccessful, disgraced.

Why then do our rulers mean to force us into a war which must injure us materially, let its issue be what it may; let the advocates for the war answer for themselves; they tell us because the British Minister has dared to insinuate that Mr. Robert Smith, our Secretary of State, knew what he did not know, and which he told the British Minister he did not know. This insult, as it is called, is the avowed reason why Mr. Jackson has been dismissed; why resolutions have been passed by large majorities in Congress: declaring in language the most indecorous and provoking to Great Britain, that the President shall be supported. Is it for this that every thing has been done which our rulers think may induce Great Britain to make war upon us, in which we shall be called on to shed our blood, to spend our treasure, to risk the existence of our nation? Are the people of the United States ready to enter into such a war for such a reason?

But we are told we once fought England and were victorious. It is true, but we then fought for our liberties and our independence, not for a fancied insinuation against a secretary of state. It is true that we then conquered—at what expense of blood and treasure let the Soldiers of the Revolution answer. Are we willing to be at the same expense in resenting a fancied insult to

Mr. Robert Smith, that we were at in achieving our Independence?

During our revolution we were animated and encouraged by the knowledge that if we conquered we were free and independent. In a contest now, we should fight with a consciousness that if we conquered our adversary we should be slaves of his rival.

What then, I may be asked, would I submit to any degradation rather than go to war with England? No, rather than see my country dishonoured and degraded, I would risk her existence. For existence without honour and without reputation is a bauble unworthy the pursuit of a man or a nation.

If England in defiance of a solemn treaty—should capture our ships pursuing a lawful commerce—if England should arbitrarily seize our vessels upon the high seas and burn them without any compensation—if England should seize our citizens, and send them captive into prison in the interior of the country—if England should sequester all the property of our citizens upon which she could lay her hands—if England should dare to inform our Secretary of State that she wanted money and must have it, and thus endeavour to render us tributary to her—if England should tell us you shall not remain neutral—then sir, would my feelings get the better of me, and I would go to war with her instantly. And where is the independent American, who would not willingly spend his last shilling, and his last drop of blood in such a war? But England has done none of these things—but France has; and yet we hear none of our good republicans saying a word against her. If a British minister dares to make an insinuation of an insult it is good cause of war, and no means are spared to excite the passions and inflame the prejudices of the people against her. If France violates her treaty, burns our vessels, seizes our citizens, demands our money, and insists upon our becoming a party in the war with her. This is to be submitted to without a murmur because it comes from France. Americans! Are you, or are you not independent? While you assume the bold front of a lion to one foreign nation, will you cringe like a spaniel to another? While your administration are artfully turning your attention to England, will you suffer France to trample you under foot?

Mr. Ogden then stated that Washington had early declared it to be the interest of the United States, to be perfectly neutral in the war between France and England, and our present rulers, had professed to be neutral—have they been so? In 1806 France finding all her attempts to conquer England by invasion ridiculous, determines to destroy her commerce, and passes her Berlin decree, making all vessels bound to or coming from England or having British manufactures on board good prize; this was in direct violation of her express treaty with us; and yet instead of resisting it, in 1807 our Embargo law was passed, by which our own citizens were much injured, and our own country distressed, to aid Napoleon in his war upon the continent of England—This measure was then declared by the Federalists to be, what it is now unanimously admitted to have been destructive to ourselves alone—But for this we were applauded in France, and our rulers were satisfied. We suffered, and France thanked us for our sufferings in her cause. The moment however that Great Britain retaliated by her Orders in Council, the administration were ready to take up arms against her. Nay, they did not even wait to hear that the Orders had passed, but hurried through the Embargo act in anticipation of the event.

Mr. Ogden said Mr. Jackson the British minister had been dismissed, for what? For an insult which no man could point out—and yet before the fact took place it was expressly stated in the papers printed in Paris, that he "Mr. Jackson had been dismissed at Washington." Still there were some, who affected not yet to believe that the hand of Napoleon was in his thing.

As to Great Britain all our negotiations with her, at least all such parts of them as could tend to irritate the people of the United States against her, have been published. But what do we know of the negotiations with France? Nothing, but here and there an extract of a letter.—We were told last summer that a negotiation was going on between Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Hanterive, what has been done? We have not been informed, and why, are the administration afraid to let the people know? The French papers state that an alliance is about to be made by the United States with France and Russia. Mr. Adams has been sent to Russia; for what? Americans look to it. If your administration form an alliance with the Northern powers under whatever pretext, you are lost—An alliance with them, is alliance with him, whose friendship is death, once his ally, you must soon become the slave. If such an alliance be formed, call it commercial, call it what you please, your administration will have effected one darling object of their hearts—A WAR WITH ENGLAND WOULD BE INEVITABLE.

FROM THE SPIRIT OF '76.
TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.
NO. II.

SIR,
The cause of France (a transient interval during the reign of the last of the Bourbons excepted) has been the cause of universal monarchy since the days of Louis XIV. The intolerant bigotry of that priest-ridden, and senescent tyrant; the beastly sensuality of his successor; the overgrown privileges of the nobility and clergy; but above all, the unshaken constancy of William of Nassu and the extraordinary ability of a few great men, who from time to time, have appeared in Protestant Europe, as occasion called them forth; aided by the free and vigorous institutions and enterprising genius of the Dutch and English people; contributed for more than a century to counteract the tremendous physical force of France, and preserve the independence of Europe.—There is an inherent power in the French nation which under the worst management of its affairs has always rendered it formidable to the liberties of the world. A few years have sufficed to recruit her strength after the most disastrous wars. Such is the fertility of the soil, the exuberance of the population, the genius of the people, whether for policy or war: in short, such the natural resources of the country, that he who directs them at will, must always be considered as the most dangerous enemy to the other nations of the earth. It was reserved for his present majesty of England, who, like Charles the Second, seems to have been educated for a curse to his own people and a blessing to their enemies; whom God (for wise purposes we are compelled to believe) has permitted to harass his unhappy subjects, for more than half a century: it was reserved for "this king of shreds, and patches, this cut-purse of the empire!" to break down every barrier which wisdom and genius could devise, and valour could build up against the universal despotism of the natural enemy of his country—*hostis humani generis*. How melancholy, how humiliating the reflection, that perhaps through the folly of a single driver, Marlborough and Frederic, have fought, and Wolfe has bled, and Chatham spoke in vain!

Intoxicated by prosperity, corrupted by power, a venal parliament and rapacious ministry forced the colonies into rebellion, and into the arms of France, and the empire was rent in twain. The bulwark against French domination reared by the wisdom of sages, and cemented with the blood of heroes tottered to its foundations. The out-works of the great fortress of human liberty were dismantled, the citadel alone was left; it was left in the stout hearts and free institutions of the people of these states—*spes altera gentium*—the germ of future resistance—to that aspiring dominion through whose aid our independence had been established. It was reserved for the sagacity of Washington to discern through the honest prejudices of that glorious revolution which has immortalized his name, in spite of the animosities engendered during a long and cruel civil war, that it could never be the interest of the United States to swell the power of France, even by destroying that of a jealous and powerful maritime rival. But Washington was a soldier and a statesman:—his policy was enlarged and liberal; it looked to futurity; to great and permanent consequences: it was not the paltry make-shift of the day.—In earlier life he had borne arms to repel the encroachments of France on our western frontier: he justly abhorred the jackals of a French despot, clothed in the fleece of republicanism, who to suit their own wicked ends would fain represent that he was then a slave; & he equally pitied the folly of those who could be deluded by so barefaced a cheat. He knew that he had fought for liberty and his country, in both the wars in which he was engaged: and although he detested the corruptions of the British government and opposed them at the hazard of his life and fortune, he well knew how to estimate the patriotism of those, who, for conscience sake, have become the advocates of the most worthless military despotism in the world, because *ferocitudo* they cannot endure a government with a king at the head of it. The freedom of speech and of the press, the protection of property, of personal liberty and of honest fame; the trial by jury, subsisting (if we compare the prosecutions of Horn Tooke and Hardy with those of Fries and Callender, and Matthew Lyon) almost in as great purity as among ourselves—all this and much more is lost on our exclusive patriots—because "Mordcaai the Jew may sit at the king's gate!" To a president possessing regal powers, and a princely revenue, and living in a palace that would put poor old St. James's, or even Buckingham-House to the blush; through whose triumphal gates of marble Jews and infidels daily pass exulting, these worthy gentlemen can see no objection; they are even ready to empower him to legislate by proclamation: but the chief magistrate precisely to their taste is an emperor and a king, whose decrees from his imperial camp, like the dread behest of Attila and Zingis, affect not his own subjects merely, but the world and posterity.—It would seem that although a king, *per se*, is the most noxious of all animals in political zoology, yet combine him with an emperor and you neutralize all his ill qualities. This reminds me so forcibly of an anecdote which came under my own knowledge, and which is not impertinent to the present subject, that I cannot resist the temptation of relating it. For a little while then we will lay aside the dignity which belongs to our subject and particularly to him to whom it is ad