

POLITICAL HISTORY.

APPEAL OF THE FEDERALISTS, CONCLUDED.

We proceed, then, to a brief consideration of the alleged project of 1803-4, of the Northern Confederacy.

In the 1st place, we solemnly disavow all knowledge of such a project, and all remembrance of the mention of it, or of any plan analogous to it, at that or any subsequent period. 2dly. While it is obviously impossible for us to controvert evidence of which we are ignorant, we are well assured that it must be equally impossible to bring any facts which can be considered evidence to bear upon the designs or measures of those, who, at the time of Mr. Adams's interview with Mr. Jefferson, and afterwards, during the war, took an active part in the public affairs of Massachusetts.

The effort discernible, throughout this letter, to connect those later events, which were of a public nature, and of which the nature and adequate causes were public, with the mysterious project, known only to himself, of an earlier origin and distinct source, is in the last degree violent and disgusting.

Thecession of Louisiana to the United States, when first promulgated, was a theme of complaint and dissatisfaction, in this part of the country.— This could not be regarded as factious or unbecomingly, when it is admitted by Mr. Adams, that Mr. Jefferson and himself entertained constitutional scruples and objections to the provisions of the treaty of cession. Nothing, however, like a popular excitement grew out of this measure, and it is stated by Mr. Adams that this project "terminated" until the period of the embargo in Dec. 1807. Suppose, then, for the moment, (what we have not a single shadow of reason for believing, and do not believe,) that upon the occasion of the Louisiana Treaty, "certain leaders," influenced by constitutional objections, (admitted to have been common to Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Adams and themselves,) had conceived a project of separation, and of a Northern Confederacy, as the only probable counterpoise to the manufacture of new States in the South, does it follow that, when the public mind became reconciled to the cession, and the beneficial consequences of it were realized, (as it is conceded by Mr. Adams was the case) these same leaders, whoever they might be, would still cherish the embryo project, and wait for other contingencies, to enable them to effect it? On what authority can Mr. Adams assume that the project merely "slumbered" for years, if his private evidence applies only to the time of its origin?

The opposition to the measures of Government in 1808 arose from causes, which were common to the people not only of New-England, but of all the Commercial States, as was manifested in New-York, Philadelphia and elsewhere? By what process of fair reasoning, then, can that opposition be referred to, or connected with a plan which is said to have originated in 1804, and to have been intended to embrace merely a Northern Confederacy? The objection to the Louisiana treaty was founded on the just construction of the compact between sovereign States. It was believed in New-England, that new members could not be added to the Confederacy beyond the territorial limits of the confederating parties, without the consent of those parties. This was considered as a fair subject of remonstrance, and as justifying proposals for an amendment of the Constitution. But so far were the Federal party from attempting to use this as an additional incentive to the passions of the day, that, in a report to the Legislature of 1813, by a Committee of which Mr. Adams's "excellent friend" Josiah Quincy was Chairman, (Louisiana having at this time been admitted into the Union) it is expressly stated, that "they have not been disposed to consider this great constitutional question with the transient calamities of the day, from which it is, in their opinion, very apparently distinguished, both in its causes and consequences." That, in their view of this great constitutional question, they have confined themselves to topics & arguments drawn from the Constitution, "with the hope of limiting the further progress of the evil, rather than with the expectation of immediate relief during the continuance of existing influences in the National Administration." This Report was accepted; and thus the "project," instead of being used as fuel to the flame, is deliberately taken out of it, and presented to the People, by the "leaders," as resting on distinct considerations from the "transient calamities," and for which present redress ought neither to be sought, or expected.

To the embargo, imposed in Dec. 1807, nearly all the delegates of Massachusetts were opposed. The pretences for imposing it were deemed by her citizens a mockery of her sufferings.— Owing nearly one-third of the tonnage in the United States, she felt that her voice ought to be heard in what related to its security. Depending principally on her foreign trade and fisheries for support, her situation appeared desperate under the operation of this law in its terms, perpetual. It was a bitter aggravation of her sufferings to be told, that its object was to preserve these interests. No people, at peace, in an equal space of time, ever endured severer privations. She could not consider the annihilation of her trade, as included in the power to regulate it. To her lawyers, statesmen and citizens in general, it appeared a direct violation of the Constitution. It was universally odious. The dissatisfaction was not confined to the Federal party. Mr. Adams, it is said, and not contradicted, announced in his letters to the Members of Congress, that Government must not rely upon its own friends. The interval from 1807 to 1812, was filled up by a series of restrictive measures, which kept alive the discontent and irritation of the popular mind. Then followed the war, under circumstances which aggravated the public distress. In its progress, Massachusetts was deprived of garrisons for her ports—with a line of sea-coast equal in extent to one-third of that of all the other maritime States, she was left during the whole war, nearly defenceless.—her citizens subject to momentary alarm, a portion of the country invaded, and taken possession of as a conquered territory; her own militia arrayed and encamped at an enormous expense; pay and subsistence supplied from her nearly exhausted treasury, and reimbursement refused, even to this day. Now what, under the pressure and excitement of these measures, was the conduct of the Federal party, the "devoted majority," with the military force of the State in their hands; with the encouragement to be derived from the conviction that the Northern States were in sympathy with their feelings, and that Government could not rely on its own friends? Did they resist the laws? Not in a solitary instance. Did they threaten a separation of the States? Did they array their forces with a show of such disposition? Did the Government or People of Massachusetts, in any one instance, swerve from their allegiance to the Union? The reverse of all this is the truth. Abandoned by the National Government, because she declined, for reasons which her highest tribunal adjudged to be constitutional, to surrender her militia into the hands of a military prefect, although they were always equipped, and ready and faithful under their own officers, she nevertheless clung to the Union as to the ark of her safety, she ordered her well-trained militia into the field, stationed them at the points of danger, defrayed their expenses from their own treasury, and garrisoned with them the national forts. All her taxes and expenses were paid with punctuality and promptness, an example by no means followed by some of the States, in which the cry for war had been loudest. These facts are recited for no other purpose but that of preparing for the inquiry,

what becomes of Mr. Adams's "key," his "project," and his "postulates." The latter were to all intents and purposes, to use his language, "consummated."

Laws, unconstitutional in the public opinion, had been enacted. A great majority of an exasperated People were in a state of the highest excitement. The Legislature (if his word be taken) was under the "management of the leaders." The judicial courts were on their side, and the juries were, as he pretends, contaminated. A golden opportunity had arrived. "Now was the winter of our discontent made glorious summer." All the combustibles for revolution were ready. When, behold! instead of a dismembered Union, military movements, a Northern confederacy, and British alliance, accomplished at the favorable moment of almost total prostration of the credit and power of the national rulers, a small and peaceful deputation of grave citizens, selected from the ranks of civil life, and legislative councils, assembled at Hartford. There, calm and collected, like the Pilgrims from whom they descended, and not unmindful of those who had achieved the independence of their Country, they deliberated on the most effectual means of preserving for their fellow-citizens and their descendants, the civil and political liberty which had been won, and bequeathed to them.

The character of this much injured assembly has been subjected to heavier imputations, under an entire deficiency, not only of proof, but of probability, than ever befel any other set of men, discharging merely the duties of a committee of a legislative body, and making a public report of their doings to their constituents. These imputations have never assumed a precise form; but vague opinions have prevailed of a combination to separate the Union. As Mr. Adams has condescended, by the manner in which he speaks of that Convention, to adopt or countenance those imputations on its proceedings, we may be excused for making a few more remarks on the subject, although this is not a suitable occasion to go into a full explanation and vindication of that measure.

The subject naturally resolves itself into four points or questions:— First, the constitutional right of a State to appoint delegates to such a Convention;—

Secondly, the propriety and expediency of exercising the right at that time;—

Thirdly, the objects intended to be attained by it, and the powers given for that purpose by the State to the Delegates; and

Fourthly, the manner in which the delegates exercised their powers.

As to the first point, it will not be doubted that the People have a right, "in an orderly and peaceable manner, to assemble to consult upon the common good," and to request of their rulers "by way of addresses, petitions, or remonstrances, redress of the wrongs done them, and of the grievances they suffer." This is enumerated in the Constitution of Massachusetts, among our natural, essential, and unalienable rights; and it is recognised in the Constitution of the United States; and who shall then dare to set limits to its exercise, or to prescribe to us the manner in which it shall be exercised? We have already spoken of the state of public affairs and the measures of the General Government, in the year 1814, and of the degree of excitement amounting nearly to desperation, to which they had brought the minds of the People in this and the adjoining States.— Their sufferings and apprehensions could no longer be silently endured, and numerous meetings of the citizens had been held on the occasion in various parts of the country. It was then thought that the measures called for in such an emergency would be more prudently and safely managed and promoted by the Government of the State, than by unorganised bodies of individuals, strongly excited by what they considered to be the unjust and oppressive measures of the General Government. If all the citizens had the right, jointly and severally, to consult for the common good, and to seek for a redress of their grievances, no reason can be given why their legislative assembly, which represents them all, may not exercise the same right in their behalf. We nowhere find any constitutional prohibition or restraint of the exercise of this power by the State; and if not prohibited, it is reserved to the State. We maintain, then, that the People had an unquestionable right, in this, as well as in other modes, to express their opinions of the measures of the General Government, and to seek, "by addresses, petitions, or remonstrances," to obtain a redress of their grievances, and relief from their sufferings.

If there was no constitutional objection to this mode of proceeding, it will be readily admitted that it was in all respects the most eligible. In the state of distress and danger which then oppressed all hearts, it was to be apprehended, as before suggested, that large and frequent assemblies of the People might lead to measures inconsistent with the peace and order of the community. If an appeal was made to the Government of the United States, it was likely to be more effectual, if proceeding from the whole State collectively, than from insulated assemblies of citizens, & the application in that form would tend also to repress the public excitement, and prevent any sudden and unadvised proceedings of the People, by holding out to them the prospect of relief through the influence of their State Government. This latter consideration had great weight with the Legislature; and it is believed to have been the only motive that could have induced some of the delegates to that convention to quit the seclusion to which they had voluntarily retired, to expose themselves anew to all the fatigue and anxiety, the odium, the misrepresentations, calumnies, and unjust reproaches, which so frequently accompany and follow, the best exertions for the public good.

If each one of the States had the right thus to seek a redress of grievances, it is clear that two or more States might consult together for the same purpose; and the only mode in which they could consult each other was by a mutual appointment of delegates for that purpose.

But this is not the only ground, nor is it the strongest, on which to rest the justification of the proceedings in question. If the government of the United States in a time of such distress and danger, should be unable, or should neglect, to afford protection and relief to the People, the Legislature of the State would not only have a right, but it would be their duty to consult together, and, if practicable, to furnish these from their own resources. This would be in aid of the General Government. How severely the People of Massachusetts experienced at that time the want of this ability or disposition, in the General Government, we need not repeat. If the Legislature of a single State might, under such circumstances, endeavor to provide for its defence, without infringing the national compact, no reason is perceived why they might not appoint a committee, or delegates, to confer with delegates of neighbouring States who were exposed to like dangers and sufferings, to devise and suggest to their respective Legislatures, measures by which their own resources might be employed "in a manner not repugnant to their obligations as members of the Union." A part of New-England had been invaded, and was then held by the enemy, without an effort by the General Government to regain it; and if another invasion, which was then threatened and generally expected, had taken place, and the New-England States had been all deserted by the Government, and left to rely on their own resources, it is obvious that the best mode of providing for their common defence would have been by a simultaneous and combined operation of all their forces. The States, originally, possessed this right, and we hold that it has never been surrendered, nor taken from them by the People.

The argument on this point might be easily extended; but we may confidently rely on the two grounds above mentioned, to wit, the right of the People, through their State Legislature, or otherwise, to petition and remonstrate for a redress of their grievances; and the right of the States in a time of war and of threatened invasion to make the necessary provisions for their own defence. To these objects was confined the whole authority conferred by our legislature on the delegates whom they appointed. They were directed to meet and confer with other delegates, and to devise and suggest measures of relief for the adoption of the respective States; but not to represent or act for constituents by agreeing to, or adopting any such measures themselves, or in behalf of the States.

But what we strenuously maintain this right of the people, to come in, to petition, and to remonstrate in the strongest terms against measures which they think to be unconstitutional, unjust, or oppressive, and to do this in the manner which they shall deem most convenient or effectual, provided it be in an orderly and peaceable manner; we readily admit that a wise people would not hastily resort to it, especially in this imposing form, on every occasion of partial and temporary discontent or suffering. We therefore proceed to consider,

Secondly, the propriety and expediency of adopting that measure in the autumn of 1814.— On this point it is enough to say, that the grievances that were suffered, and the dangers that were apprehended at that time, and the strong excitement which they produced among all the people, which is stated more particularly elsewhere in this address, rendered some measures for their relief indispensably necessary. If the Legislature had not undertaken their cause, it appeared to be certain, as we have already suggested, that the people would take it into their own hands; and there was reason to fear that the proceeding in that case might be less orderly and peaceful, and, at the same time, less efficacious.

Thirdly, We have already stated the objects which our State Government had in view, in proposing the Convention at Hartford, and the powers conferred on their delegates. If, instead of these avowed objects, there had been any secret plot for a dismemberment of the Union, in which it had been desired to engage the neighbouring States, the measures for that purpose, we may suppose, would have been conducted in the most private manner possible. On the contrary, the resolution of our Legislature for appointing their delegates, and prescribing their powers and duties, was openly discussed and passed in the usual manner; and a copy of it was immediately sent, by direction of the Legislature, to the Governor of every State in the Union.

Fourthly, The only remaining question is, whether the delegates exceeded or abused their powers. As to this, we have only to refer to the report of their proceedings, and to their journal, which is deposited in the archives of this State.

That report, which was published immediately after the adjournment of the Convention, and was soon after accepted by the Legislature, holds forth the importance of the Union as paramount to all other considerations; enforces it by elaborate reasonings, and refers, in express terms, to Washington's farewell Address, as its text book. If, then, no power to do wrong was given by the Legislature to the Convention, and if nothing unconstitutional, disloyal, or tending to disunion, was in fact done, (all which is manifest of record,) there remains no pretext for imputing to them covert and nefarious designs, except the uncharitable one, that the characters of the men justify the belief that they cherished in their hearts wishes, and intentions, to do what they had no authority to execute, and what in fact they did not attempt. On this head, to the People of New-England who were acquainted with these characters, no explanation is necessary. For the information of others, it behooves those of us who were members to speak without reference to ourselves. With this reserve we may all be permitted to say, without fear of contradiction, that they fairly represent whatever of moral, intellectual, or patriotic worth, is to be found in the character of the New-England community, that they retained all the personal consideration and confidence which are enjoyed by the best citizens, those who have deceased, to the hour of their death, and those who survive to the present time. For the satisfaction of those who look to self love, and to private interest, as springs of human action, it may be added, that among the mass of citizens, friends, and connexions, whom they represented, were many, whose fortunes were principally vested in the public funds, to whom the disunion of the States would have been ruin. That Convention may be said to have originated with the People. Measures for relief had been demanded from immense numbers, in counties and towns, in all parts of the State, long before it was organized. Its main and avowed object was the defence of this part of the country against the common enemy. The war then wore its most threatening aspect. New-England was destitute of national troops; her treasuries exhausted; her taxes drawn into the national coffers.

The proceedings & report of the Convention were in conformity with this object. The burden of that report consisted in recommending an application to Congress to permit the States to provide for their own defence, and to be indemnified for the expense, by reimbursement, in some shape, from the National Government, of at least a portion of their own money. This Convention adjourned early in January. On the 27th of the same month, an act of Congress was passed, the very power which was sought by Massachusetts:—that of "raising, organizing, and officering" State troops, "to be employed in the State raising the same, or in an adjoining State," and providing for their pay and subsistence. This, we repeat, was the most important object aimed at by the institution of the Convention, and by the report of that body. Had this act of Congress passed before the act of Massachusetts, for organizing the Convention, that Convention never would have existed. Had such an act been anticipated by the Convention, or passed before its adjournment, that assembly would have considered its commission as in a great measure superseded. For although it prepared and reported sundry amendments to the Constitution of the United States, to be submitted to all the States, and might even, if knowing of this act of Congress, have persisted in doing the same thing; yet, as this proposal for amendments could have been accomplished in other modes, they could have had no special motive for so doing, but what arose from their being together—and from the consideration, which might be hoped for, as to their propositions, from that circumstance. It is this matter of absolute demonstration, to all who do not usurp the privilege of the assuetude of hearts, that the design of the Hartford Convention and its design, were not only constitutional and laudable, but sanctioned by an act of Congress, passed after the report was published, not indeed with express reference to it, but with its principal features, and thus admitting the reasonableness of its general tenor, and principal object. It is indeed grievous to perceive Mr. Adams condescending to intimate that the convention was adjourned to Boston, and in a strain of rhetorical pathos connecting his imaginary plot, then at least in the thirteenth year of its age, with the "catastrophe" which awaited the ultimate proceedings of the Convention. That assembly adjourned without doing anything worthy of report. It was ipso facto dissolved, like other committees.— One of its resolutions did indeed purport, that,

"if the application of these States to the Government of the United States, (recommended in a foregoing resolution,) should be successful, and peace should be concluded and the defence of these States should be neglected as it has been, since the commencement of the war, it will be, in the opinion of this Convention, expedient for the Legislature of the several States, to appoint Delegates to another Convention to meet at Boston on the third Tuesday of June next, with such powers and instructions as the exigency of a crisis so momentous may require." On this it is to be observed,

First, that the Convention contemplated in the foregoing resolution never was appointed, and never could have been, according to the terms of that resolution; because, as is shown above, the object of the intended application to Congress had been attained. And, secondly, if the contingencies mentioned in that resolution had occurred, the question of forming such a new convention, and the appointment of new delegates, must have gone into the hands of new assemblies; because all the Legislatures of the New-England States would have been dissolved, and there would have been new elections, before the time proposed for the second Convention. And lastly, it is matter of public notoriety, that the report of this Convention produced the effect of assuaging the public sensibility, and operated to repress the vague and ardent expectations entertained by many of our citizens, of immediate and effectual relief, from the evils of their condition.

We pass over the elaborate exposition of constitutional law in the President's letter, having no call, nor any inclination at this time to controvert its leading principles. Neither do we comment upon, though we perceive and feel, the unjust, and we must be excused for saying, insidious mode in which he has grouped together distant & disconnected occurrences, which happened in his absence from the country, for the purpose of producing, by their collocation, a glaring and sinister effect upon the Federal party. They were all of a public nature. The arguments concerning their merit or demerit have been exhausted; and time, and the good sense of an intelligent people, will place them ultimately in their true light, even though Mr. Adams should continue to throw obstacles in the way to this harmonious reaction of public opinion.

It has been a source of wonder and perplexity to many in our community, to observe the immense difference in the standards by which public opinion has been led to measure the same kind of proceedings, when adopted in different States. No pretence is urged that any actual resistance to the laws, or forcible violation of the constitutional compact, has ever happened in Massachusetts. Constitutional questions have arisen here as well as in other States. It is surprising and consolatory that the number has not been greater, and that the termination of them has not been less amicable. To the discussion of some of them great excitement was unavoidably incident; but in comparing cases with causes and effects, the impartial observer will perceive nothing to authorize any disparagement of this State, to the advantage of the pretensions of other members of the confederacy.

On this subject we disclaim the purpose of instituting invidious comparisons; but every one knows that Massachusetts has not been alone in complaints and remonstrances against the acts of the National Government. Nothing can be found on the records of her legislative proceedings, surpassing the tone of resolutions adopted in other States in reprobation of the Alien and Sedition laws. In one State, opposition to the execution of a treaty; in others, to the laws instituting the Bank, has sounded the note of preparation for resistance in more impassioned strains than were ever adopted here. And at this moment, claims of State rights, and protests against the measures of the National Government, in terms, for which no parallel can be found in Massachusetts, are ushered into the halls of Congress, under the most solemn and imposing forms of State authority. It is not our part to censure or to approve these proceedings. Massachusetts has done nothing, at any time, in opposition to the National Government, and she has said nothing in derogation of its powers; that is not fully justified by the Constitution; and not so much so as other States have said, with more decided emphasis; and as it is believed, without the stimulus of the same actual grievances. We are no longer at a loss to account for the prevalence of these prejudices against this part of the Union, since they can now be traced, not only to calumnies openly propagated, in the season of bitter contention, by irritated opponents, but to the secret and hitherto unknown aspersions of Mr. Adams.

Mr. Jefferson, then at the head of Government, declares that the effect of Mr. Adams's communication to him, at their interview in March 1808, was such on his mind, as to induce a change in the system of his administration. Like impressions were doubtless made on Mr. Giles and others, who then gave direction to the public sentiment. Notwithstanding these disadvantages, if Mr. Adams had not seen fit to proclaim to the world his former secret denunciation, there had still been room to hope that those impressions would be speedily obliterated; that odious distinctions between the people of different States would be abolished; and that all would come to feel a common interest in referring symptoms of excitement against the procedure of the National Government, which have manifested successively on so many occasions, and in so many States, to the feelings, which, in free Governments, are always roused by like causes, and are characteristic, not of a factious, but a generous sensibility to real or supposed usurpation. But Mr. Adams returns to the charge with new animation; and by his political legacy to the people of Massachusetts, undertakes to entail upon them lasting dishonor. He re-affirms his convictions of the reality of the old project, persists in connecting it with later events, and dooms himself to the vocation of proving that the Federal party were either traitors or dupes. Thus he has again, (but not like a healing angel) troubled the pool, and we know not when the turbid waters will subside.

It must be apparent that we have not sought, but have been driven into this unexpected & unwelcome controversy. On the restoration of peace in 1815 the Federal party felt like men who, as by a miracle, find themselves safe from the most appalling peril. Their joy was too vigorous to permit a vindictive recurrence to the causes of that peril. Every emotion of animosity was permitted to subside. From that time until the appearance of Mr. Adams's publication, they had cordially joined in the general gratulation on the prosperity of their country, and the security of its institutions. They were conscious of no deviation from patriotic duty, in any measure wherein they had acted, or which had passed with their approbation. They were not only contented, but grateful, in the prospect of the duration of civil liberty, according to the forms which the people had deliberately sanctioned. These objects being secured, they cheerfully acquiesced in the administration of Government, by whomsoever the People might call to places of trust and of honor.

With such sentiments and feelings, the public cannot participate in the astonishment of the undersigned, at the time, the manner, and the nature, of Mr. Adams's publication. We make no attempt to assign motives to him, nor to comment upon such as may be imagined. The causes of past controversies, passing, as they were, to oblivion among existing generations, and arranging themselves, as they must do, for the impartial scrutiny of future historians, for the revival of them can be no less distasteful to the public, than painful to us. Yet, it

could not be expected, that Mr. Adams, from his high station, sends forth the unfounded suggestions of his imagination, or his jealousy, as materials for present opinion, and his future history, we should, by all means, give countenance to his charges; nor that we should neglect to vindicate the reputation of ourselves, our associates, and our fathers.

H. G. OTIS,
ISRAEL THORNDIKE,
T. H. PERKINS,
W. M. PRESCOTT,
DANIEL SARGENT,
JOHN LOWELL,
WILLIAM SULLIVAN,
CHARLES JACKSON,
WARREN DUTTON,
BENJ. PICKMAN,
HENRY CABOT,
Son of the late George Cabot,
C. C. PARSONS,
Son of Theophilus Parsons, Esq. deceased,
Boston, January 28, 1829.

I subscribed the foregoing letter, and not the Reply, for the following reasons:— Mr. Adams, in his statement published in the National Intelligencer, spoke of the leaders of the Federal party, in the year 1808, and for several years previous, as engaged in a systematic opposition to the General Government, having for its object the dissolution of the Union, and the establishment of a separate confederacy by the aid of a foreign power. As a proof of that disposition, particular allusion is made to the opposition to the embargo in the Courts of Justice in Massachusetts. This pointed the charge directly at my late father, whose efforts in that cause are probably remembered; and was the reason of my joining in the application to Mr. Adams to know on what such a charge was founded. If this construction of the statement needs confirmation, it is to be found in one of the letters lately published in Salem as Mr. Adams's.

Mr. Adams, in his answer, has extended the accusation to a subsequent period. In the events of that time, I have not the same interest as in those preceding it; & as the reply was necessarily co-extensive with the answer, that reason prevented me from joining in it. I take this opportunity, however, to say, for myself, that I find in Mr. Adams's answer no justification of his charges; and, in reply to that portion of his letter particularly addressed to me, that I have seen no proof, and shall not readily believe, that any portion of my father's political course is to be attributed to the influence there suggested.

FRANKLIN DEXTER,
Boston, January 28, 1829.

Mr. Brougham.—This gentleman is known to many of our readers, as one of the most eminent members of the British Parliament. The Massachusetts Journal says, "It may be doubted if any man at present upon the earth, is doing so much for the improvement of popular education, and the diffusion of knowledge, as Henry Brougham." He asserts, at once, and asserts boldly and fearlessly, that every man and every woman in the kingdom of Great Britain may be, and can be, & shall be, enlightened. He asserts more; that they can and must enlighten themselves. Upon the heels of assertion, tread efforts. His tongue gives the word, and his hand the blow, together. He maintains that no one in the kingdom is so much occupied as not to find time, and none so poor that they cannot spare money to procure knowledge—to elevate their character, while it promotes and gives effect to their industry, and raises them above pleasures which are extensive as well as brutish. The motto which he holds up in conspicuous letters, before them is "BEGIN."

Since one bold and elevated spirit, by urging to immediate action, his ignorant, degraded, and suffering countrymen, to acquire knowledge, that they may assume the respectability and power, which tyrants and oppressors have wrested from their hands, has, in a few years, given greater purity & health, and will present a new creation in the intellectual and moral atmosphere resting upon Great-Britain,—it is hoped that every daily, weekly, monthly and yearly journal in our Union; that every statesman and patriot, that every teacher and parent, that every clergyman, lawyer, physician, farmer, mechanic and merchant; that every man, woman and child will say, in the language of Mr. Brougham, and in a voice which will be heard from Canada to Mexico, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific—"BEGIN."

Managers' Office,
Richmond, Va.
SPLENDID FORTUNES
At Head Quarters,
NEW YORK CONSOLIDATED, No. 4
\$30,000 for 10!

1 of \$30,000 is \$30,000,
1 15,000 15,000,
1 10,000 10,000,
1 5,000 5,000,
1 4,000 4,000,
10 1,000 10,000,
10 600 6,000,
10 500 5,000,
10 400 4,000,
10 300 3,000,
29 200 5,800,
51 100 5,100,

Besides \$90, \$80, and \$70.
102 each of \$60, \$50, and \$40.
204 of \$30,
1120 of 20,
11475 of 10.

Whole Tickets \$10, Halves 5, Quarters 2 50, Eighths 1 25.
All orders post paid promptly attended to.—
Send all your orders to—
YATES & MINTYRE,
Richmond.

Periodicals,
PHILADELPHIA Medical Journal, by Carey and Lea, published quarterly, at \$3 per annum.
American Quarterly Review, \$2 per annum.
North-American Review, \$3 do do
Southern Review, \$5 do do
Flint's Western Review, published once a month, \$3 per annum.
Franklin Journal, devoted to Science and Literary Improvements, \$5 per annum.
National Intelligencer, Daily \$10, and Tri-weekly \$6 per annum.
Subscriptions for the above received by
J. GALE & SON,
Feb. 1, 1829.