

THE NORTH-CAROLINA MINERVA, AND RALEIGH ADVERTISER.

RALEIGH:—PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY BY HODGE & BOYLAN, PRINTERS TO THE STATE.

VOL. V.

TUESDAY, JULY 29, 1800.

224.

From the Boston Centinel.
THE JEFFERSONIAD.
No III.

"Ancient establishments are abolished by slow and imperceptible means."

MR. RUSSELL,

I have heretofore, in a brief and cursory manner, sketched the political life of Mr. Jefferson, by which it will be seen, that an inordinate ambition, a thirst for public honors, and distinctions, and a cupidity for the emolument, have been the powerful and operative springs of this man's patriotism. With such conclusive proofs of the interested and selfish policy which he has uniformly pursued, I might venture to rest the public decision upon the purity and exalted virtue of a man, who has instituted himself a Court of Inquisition upon the motives, the designs, and the integrity of the most eminent men in our country. But I have engaged to consider his theoretical character in religion, philosophy and politics, and although the subject will be both dry and laborious, yet as it is certainly improvement and ought to be interesting, I feel it my duty to acquit myself of my engagements.

Men, who undertake to perform actions, or commit crimes which are of an atrocious nature, and which bring down upon them the detestation of mankind, generally aim to accomplish their views in secret; and speculative and visionary theorists who would sap the foundations of society, and overthrow those maxims and principles which have been hitherto sacred, but which they denominate prejudices, are compelled to resort to sly, artful and unsuspected means. Hence it would be as impossible to produce direct common law proof, that Voltaire, D'Alembert, Volney, and Jefferson were either deists or atheists, as that Genet bribed our leading Jacobins, or that Graham actually cut the plates of the bank bills which he was convicted of forging.

All rational men will therefore adopt that excellent rule of law and common sense, to require such evidence as the nature of the case will admit of. I do not, therefore, expect to produce, that Mr. Jefferson has openly ridiculed the Christian Religion;—that he has expressly denied the existence of revelation, or the being and attributes of God—I do not pretend, that I can point out a passage in his works in which he declares all revealed religion to be a farce; and that the doctrine of a future state, is a bug bear invented by devils. But I pledge my reputation as a writer, that I will prove that he has maintained doctrines, which have convinced me that he is an infidel, and which tend to the destruction of all religion, order, and civil government.

Religious tests as an admission to public office, I know have been condemned in this age of liberty and virtue—I am one of those unenlightened men who still believe them highly useful to a regular and well ordered society.—But I believe the most loose of the modern philosophers in this country, except the Illuminati, admit that a belief of christianity upon some principles is really indispensable in civil rulers; they have only contended, that the government should not extend its protection and patronage to one set of Christians only.—But as Mr. Jefferson, early as the year 1781, (and before the sublime idea of deposing the Almighty is suggested by Danton, and substituting the Goddess of Reason in his place, was intimated in France) broached an opinion, that it was improper to make any Religious test, a condition of admission to office. In his notes on Virginia, page 255 says, "But the legitimate powers of government extend only to such acts as are injurious to others;—But it does me no injury for my neighbour to say there are twenty Gods or NO GOD." Here then it is manifested, that Mr. Jefferson contends, that an Atheist may be as valuable a member of society, and as worthy of places of trust as the most sincere Christian.

For, if my neighbour is not as good a man and as valuable to society, because he is an Atheist, then it does me an injury, because I can have no confidence in nor derive advantage from the talents and services of my Atheistical neighbour; And I counted against the authority of the great, sublime and enlightened Jefferson, that I would not trust Voltaire, Thomas Paine, or the Correspondent of Mazzei himself, with either my person or property, where human punishments could not reach them, because if they have no belief of a future state, they would rob my purse or cut my throat, if neither disgrace nor punishment should ensue the commission of the crime.

If therefore, a dread of future punishment adds a solemn and important sanction to human laws, any man and particularly any man of public character, who maintains that there is no God, inflicts a severe wound upon the principles which hold society together, and necessarily does me, and all mankind an irreparable injury. But I could forgive Mr. Jefferson, if he had not misguidedly

he had with the ardor and sincerity of an infatuated bigot, seriously contended that a public profession of Atheism was not injurious to society;—I should have pitied his errors, and have obliterated them with my tears. But with the malignity of Voltaire and D'Alembert, he has attempted to effect by ridicule, what he could not accomplish by reasoning. The elegant and refined philosopher of Monticelli, who has given a polish to the character of the American style, and who is master of the boldness, as well as the most beautiful imagery, when speaking of the awful and sublime subject of the belief of the existence of a God, says in the language of Billingsgate, "if my neighbor says that there is no God it neither picks my pocket nor breaks my leg." What language could low wit and malice have devised more calculated to lessen the dignity and importance of the subject upon which he was treating? Are such expressions becoming the awful solemnity of such a question! Do they correspond with the reverential awe, and sincere devotion of a real believer in the existence and attributes of the Deity? Or, forgiving or overlooking the contemptuous nature of the expressions, have they tendency to convince or persuade? Is there any force in the reasoning? Certainly not. Let me ask the Philosopher of Virginia, if his hero, Buonaparte, should lend his myrmidons and seize the Consulate in this country by the bayonets of the soldiers of Liberty, or if he should liberate the slaves at Monticelli, and they should commence the reign of Equality, and send the Philosopher to work in his own fields, would these things either "pick his pocket or break his legs?" I shall enlarge on this subject of Mr. Jefferson's piety in my next. DECIUS.

From the Baltimore Federal Gazette.

HOW extensive, how despotic is the government of prejudice. In all the concerns of life we are more or less the subjects of her controul. In her sight, generosity is profusion economy, avarice, forbearance pugnacity, courage rathness, virtue ostentation, and religion hypocrisy. Now like the drunkard she sees double; and now like the jaundiced person she beholds every other object tinged with an unnatural hue. In politics her power is universal and irresistible. She has a centinel at the avenues of the mind; guards with circumspection the approaches of truth, and the assaults of reason; nor suffers their entrance into the inclosures of intellectual operations. She swears the Andes are mole hills, and public virtue self interest. She fetters angles in the circle, and the spirit of Cromwell in Washington. She discovers filth in the diamond, and treason in John Adams.—It is the labor of wisdom to throw off her yoke; to examine men and facts as they are.

With how much heat and violence is agitated the approaching election of President. How vehement, how passionate the struggle. Is it not the combat of principles, whose victory shall enliven, advance, establish; or benumb, congeal and destroy the energies, the honor, the prosperity of united America? Do we not find that some settled systems of opposition to government, which for 13 years, had perplexed and disturbed our national councils, now more than ever united? Are not their designs conceived, established, organized, and pursued with secrecy and venomous fortitude from St. Mary's to St. Croix? And by what means have so large a part of our citizens become politically corrupt; and the unconscious protectors and supporters of a system, which, once in operation, will pull down the banners of national calamities on their own heads?

It is caused by that violent current of national and domestic prejudice, which in one common destruction, sweeps away virtue, reason and truth. With what eyes of mad delight did we foolishly admire the commencement of the French revolution. With what mistaken enthusiastic ardor was it celebrated by all ages and classes. How did we humbly rejoice at the triumph of a revolution, the murder us vagaries of which have spotted nations with human blood; cut the cords of love and piety, which connect man with his Creator; freed a nation from a load of unjust oppression and plunged them in infamy, irreligion and a far worse tyranny.

When the cruelty of her tender mercies to us, her black policy, her insidious intentions, became apparent to all, whose minds were open to investigation; then was faction busy, her high expectations, though checked, were not crushed; demagogues were incessant in specious arguments, to continue the prejudices of the uninformed and credulous, to represent the cause of France as the cause of real liberty; our own government, just and impartial to all, as opposed to the rights of humanity, and the progress of freedom; as the advocates of British intolerance, and the enemies of their own country. But there was a barrier. A mountain of characters must be levelled, sunk. She

opened her damnable tongue, and Washington became a dupe and a traitor. But the delusion soon vanished. Time had covered him with glory, and his calumniators with shame and infamy, by every good and discerning man. But the same sally ungenerous spirit remains. Those who have spent their lives in the service of their country; those whose talents and whose virtues entitle them to gratitude, respect and authority, meet opposition, hatred and detraction.

That laudable candid jealousy, which ought ever to distinguish the examination of the characters, transactions and motives of men in office, has become, even among many who are not inimical to our constitution, a constant, fault finding, mean suspicion; distorting every public transaction, and imputing the worst designs to the most upright intentions. The same mode of conduct with the same attendant circumstances, is now applauded and now condemned, as particular objects may suit. Sending Mr. Jay to Great Britain was impugned to partiality. War, war, was the cry. But under similar circumstances, three attempts at reconciliation with France are imputed to what? To a determination to wage war with that power, and draw close the cords of affection with England. The most upright, faithful and steady conduct in the executive, is no mean of meeting the good opinion of men, who, with

"Th' unconquerable will, the steadfast hate,
And courage never to submit or yield"
are bent on the continuance of their most inveterate opposition, till the present administration shall be overturned, and themselves in offices, once filled with talents and integrity. CAIUS.

RICHMOND, July 15.

(From the Examiner.)

BALTIMORE, 13th July, 1800.

Mr. Meriwether Jones,

By accident I saw a Card directed to me by the writer of a letter dated at Philadelphia, 7th May 1800, of which an extract was published in your paper styled "The Examiner," on the 20th of the same month.—In my note to you, at Richmond, on the 26th of May, I requested you to inform the author of that letter, that I desired he would repute it with his name, (or leave his name with the printer) in some of the newspapers printed at Philadelphia; that I would prove him a false, scandalous, wicked and malicious slanderer and calumniator; that for this purpose, I would sue him in the supreme court of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and that if he would appear to the action, I would consent that he might give the truth of his publication in evidence to the jury as his full justification. My reason for this proposition was, because the author of this letter had wilfully and basely, and against his own knowledge, misrepresented my conduct as presiding Judge of the circuit court of the United States held in Philadelphia in April last. Any person who will take the trouble to compare the statement of the trial of Mr. Thomas Cooper, as published by himself, with the statement made by the author of the letter alluded to, will desire no farther proof, (if he credits Mr. Cooper,) of the base misrepresentation, and the barefaced falsehood and calumny of the latter. When any one publishes a libel on a Judge, he is liable to a prosecution by way of indictment; and he is also subject to a civil action. As the facts that took place on the prosecution and trial of Mr. Cooper, and my conduct as one of the Judges, happened in Philadelphia, I therefore proposed to bring a civil action against the author of the libel in the Supreme Court of that Commonwealth, and not in the Federal Court, as the author of the letter wishes the public to believe. I am a resident of Maryland; the author is not a resident of Pennsylvania, but it is believed of Virginia.—The author of this letter says—"he is not disposed to enter into controversy in the Federal Court, with a Judge of that court, under the existing practice of packing juries." This observation could only have been made to deceive the public, to make them believe that I proposed to sue him in the Federal Court for Pennsylvania, and is directly contrary to the truth; and also for the further purpose of charging the Marshal of Pennsylvania with packing juries in violation of his duty, and oath of office. The author of this letter now proposes that I should sue him in the highest Court of the State in which he resides; which he does not mention, but I presume is Virginia; and that he will join issue on the truth of the publication; and he annexes two conditions, that a general commission shall issue to take the depositions of all witnesses, to be used on the trial; and that each party give security to answer the ultimate decision of the cause. I shall not sue in Virginia, because of the distance from Baltimore to Richmond, and the expense, and because the facts took place in Philadelphia, and a great number of persons who reside there were present in the Court, and to