The National Intelligencer,

AND

WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

Vol. I. WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, NEW-JERSEY AVENUE, NEAR THE CAPITOL. *No.* C.

FIVE DOLLS. PER ANN. MONDAY, JUNE 22d, 1801. PAID IN ADVANCE.

For the National Intelligencer.

Baruel and Robison.

In the Independent Chronicle, doctor Morse has published a long and elaborate vindication of himself against a charge of falsehood which, he *affects* to believe, I have expressed through the organ of the National Intelligencer. I say he *affects* to believe it; for I cannot suppose him to be serious. No such charge was there expressed, nor intended to be expressed. The truth most obviously is this. I wished the public to be correctly informed with respect to the truth and importance of Robison's proofs of a conspiracy, and Baruel's history of Jacobinism. A letter relating these books had, in the year 1798, appeared in a number of our public prints. In every newspaper in which I saw it, it was called "Proffessor Ebelling's letter to doctor Morse: or, "a letter said, or supposed to be written by Proffessor E. to Dr. M." By Ebelling himself I was assured, in Oct. 1800, that he actually wrote the letter referred to, and consequently, that it was genuine. I deemed it my duty to convey this assurance to my deluded fellow citizens, viewing the letter as I did, an ample refutation of those jesuitical and infamous books. The letter to which I wished to direct the public attention, was most intelligibly and precisely designated by the name which had, almost universally been given it; viz. "Professor Ebelling's letter to doctor Morse." This doctor, it was well known, had denied the reception of this letter. And if, without mentioning his name, I had *otherwise* designated the letter, and proved it to be genuine, falsehood, in denying it, would have been naturally and unavoidably inferred. Therefore chose *explicitly* to wave the confederation of his denial, and proceeded to prove three propositions, viz.

1st. That a number of Clergymen in New-England have written to Ebelling for information.

2d. That he has answered them, intending to destroy their belief in the books of Baruel and Robison.

3d. That the letter referred to, is genuine.

In the extracts, which are adduced in support of these propositions, doctor Morse's name is not even mentioned. How then can those extracts be intended, or pretended, to proclaim guilty of a falsehood?

It is but too evident that doctor Morse, fully and solemnly proves himself innocent of a crime, with which he is not *charged*, to divert the public attention from one of which he is unquestionably *guilty*. He is one of the New England clergymen who wrote to Ebelling for information: who received an intended refutation of the books in question: and who unfaithfully concealed that refutation from the people whom they had deceived by recommending and inculcating these books.

It is needless for the doctor to say, that he was not permitted to publish the letter of his German friend. The name might have been concealed, while the moll material sentiments were honourably and beneficially published. It is equally frivolous for him to say, that Ebelling's letter did not infeeble his conviction of the truth and importance of these books. Faithfulness required an exhibition of the evidence which he possessed. And the public would have judged which of the characters was most entitled to their credit, the refractory Jesuitical Priest, or the pious, learned, and celebrated German Professor.

The evils which these books have produced, are immense. They have disposed a large portion of our citizens to view with jealousy, to reduce, to hate another portion, equally great and respectable as enemies of religion, morality, and government. These deplorable effects are moll likely to be removed by developing the fallacy and malignancy of the cauf which produced them. To remove them, or in other words to contribute, what he could to the restoration of harmony, love and mutual confidence among his fellow citizens, was the ultimate object of the "friend of truth" in the extracts and remarks which he has presented to the public. In doing this, he was aware, it would be proved that "several clergymen in New England" had acted a base, false, and seditious part. But, in this state of imperfection it is not to be expected that any class of men are universally upright. Neither the religion of Jesus, nor the reputation of his ministry, needs the support of pious frauds. And a conviction of the public, and that there are, in New England, even among the sacred order, a few unprincipled men, a few who are enemies to the constitution and liberties of our country, who have become the tools of deft potism is, in my opinion, less hurtful to religion than the uncontrolled prevalence and growth of that jealousy, animosity, and hatred which these few clergymen have designedly produced by extolling and circulating books which they knew to be false, scandalous, and calumniatory.

To palliate the conduct of these few, doctor Morse in the 4th number of his vindication, affirms that a number of the laity, both in and out of office, have been in the same manner, deceived by these books of Baruel and Robison should be extensively spread and universally believed.

That a number of the laity, in and out of office, have participated in this anxiety, I do not, at present, pretend to deny.

Fervently do I wish that the deep, dark, and malignant design of abolishing our excellent federal constitution, and of erecting a despotism in its place, were confined to this "sacred few". Though influential among their *order* and their *flocks*, they are but the criminal tools of political hypocrisy.

"The very object of their efforts has been to suppress all opposition to the encroachments of tyranny: to accumulate power on aspiring layman. It is therefore not surprising, that their designs should assiduously co-operate with these efforts. But it is truly astonishing that this co-operation should be adduced to apologize for the conduct of the clerical few."

Doctor Morse observes, "Proffessor Ebelling does not appear to us to be free from undue prepossessions in favor of his own country, or from unreasonable prejudices against some foreign nations. And besides, we do not probably think exactly with this learned proffessor either on the subject of politics or religion. His letters are abound rather with *assertions* than *proofs* against the authority of the books in question."

I feel, with the tenderest sensibility, this insidious attempt to lower, in the eyes of Americans, the reputation of this excellent man. The amount of it is obviously this. Ebelling's letters against the writings of Barruel and Robison are chiefly but mere assertions. On these assertions we must not rely. For governed, unduly and unreasonably, by prejudices and prepossessions, he is blind to the truth. Differing from us in politics he is, consequently, a disorganizer, a friend to anarchy. Thinking not exactly with us on the subjects of religion, he rejects those sacred and recommending principles which are universally received by us.

I cannot more justly animadvert on this outrage of the doctor than by quoting his own words with respect to Ebelling and others who have spoken, not very respectfully, of Messrs. Barruel and Robison.

"Nothing has contributed more to confirm our faith in these book [illegible] an the diabolical efforts which have [illegible] to blacken and ruin the character of these respectable authors, that, in this way, they might destroy the credit and influence of their productions. Such means are never resorted to by honest men in support of a good cause. They are ruled only by knaves to conceal truths which, if known and believed, would defeat their wicked schemes, and bring disgrace on themselves."

I trust the doctor will impartially apply these words to the man, if such a man there be, who to conceal truth and accomplish the wickedest of schemes, endeavours to detroy the credit and influence of Ebelling's letters, by artfully staining his reputation.

But, as a friend of truth, I demand of the Rev. doctor, a statement of the noxious politics, heretical theology, and false assertions of Ebelling. And I ask him, why has he not disproved what the proffessor says of the education, character, or patrons of Barruel?

Why has he not disproved, or accounted for, the Imperial prohibition of the history of Jacobinism as libellous, scandalous, and calumniating?

Why has he not denied that it is an abridgment of forbidden Jesuitical pamphlets? The unworthiness of these books is the point to which I invite the attention of my countrymen. And I hope they will keep that point in view, notwithstanding the doctor's efforts to conceal it by an affected, verbose, and endarkening refutation of a charge which lies not against him.

A friend of truth.

WORKS of HUGH BOYD.

The miscellaneous works of Hugh Boyd, whole pretensions to the authorship of the celebrated political pieces under the signature of "Junius" has been a subject of discussion, have lately been published in England. The style of these pieces contained in this collection affords conclusive proof that he was not the author of Junius. Yet though greatly inferior to the celebrated Junius, the performances of Mr. Boyd are well written, and many of them will be perused by the friend of political tolerance with delight. In reporting some of the speeches of the earl of Chatham, he is considered as peculiarly faithful to his original.

In the first volume we have abstracts of two of these celebrated *speeches*. The first was delivered in the house of Lords on the 20th of January in 1775, with respect to the removal of the British troops from Boston; and the second was in opposition to the address moved in answer to his majesty's speech on the opening of the session of 1777.

The speech and the address chiefly alluded to the situation of the American colonies, and an amendment was moved by Lord Chatham, for restoring peace and adjusting differences between Great-Britain and her settlements. Both speeches are admirably reported, and breathe the fire and enthusiastic spirit of patriotism, from which that great man's orations were distinguished. Some observations which fell from Lord Suffolk, the Secretary of state for the northern department, who undertook to defend the employment of the Indians in the war, drew from Lord Chatham a burst of eloquence, that is given by Mr. Boyd in terms happily paint to the animated feelings and glowing language of the speaker. And on the importance and philanthropy of the subject Lord Suffolk contended, that belide it policy and necessity, the measure was allowable on principle, for that "it was perfectly justifiable to use all the means which God and nature had put in our hands."

Lord Chatham's answer needs no panegyric; it is short, but it expresses as much in favour of humanity as could be written in volumes. It is reported with uncommon energy of thought and expression, and is perhaps the only instance in which nothing of the original is lost.

SPEECH.

"I am astonished," exclaimed Lord Chatham as he rose, "shocked to hear such principles expressed; to hear them avowed in this house, or in this country—principles equally unconstitutional, inhuman and unchristian!

"My Lords, I did not intend to have encroached again on your attention; but I cannot repress my indignation—I feel myself impelled by every duty.—My Lords, we are called upon as members of this house, as men, as christian men, to protest against such notions standing near the throne—soliciting the ear of majesty! That God and nature put into our hands! I know not what ideas that Lord may contertain of God and nature, but I know that such abominable principles are equally detestable to religion and humanity.

"What! to attribute the sacred sanction of God and nature to the massacres of the Indian scalping knife, to the cannibal savage, torturing, murdering, roasting and eating—Literally my Lords, *eating* the mangled victims of barbarous battles—such horrible notions, shock every sentiment of hope; they thrill me as a lover of honorable war, and a detester of murderous barbarity.

"These abominable principles, and this more abominable avowal of them, demand the most decisive indignation. I call upon the *right reverend* bench, those holy ministers of the gospel, and pious pastors of our church: I conjure them to join in this holy work and vindicate the religion of their God. I appeal to the wisdom and the lawn of this learned bench, to defend and support the justice of their country. I call upon the bishops to interpose the unsullied sanctity of their lawn—Upon the learned judges to interpose the purity of their ermine, to save us from this pollution. I call upon the honor of your bardships to reverence the dignity of your ancestors and to maintain your own—I call upon the spirit and humanity of my country to vindicate the national character—I invoke the genius of the constitution! From the tapestry that adorns these walls, the immortal ancestor of this noble Lord frowns with indignation at the degeneracy of his country. In vain he led your victorious fleets against the boasted Armada of Spain; in vain he defended and established the honor, the liberties, the religion, the protestant religion of this country against the arbitrary cruelties of popery and the inquisition; if these more than popish cruelties, and inquisitorial practices are let loose among us, to shake the seat of our forefathers, the tombs of our ancient connections, friends and relations, the merciless cannibal, thirsting for the blood of man, woman and child. To lord forth the infuriated savage! Against whom? Against your protestant brethren! To lay waste their dwellings and extirpate their race and name with these horrible hell-hounds of savage war! Hell hounds I say, of savage war. Spain, armed herself with blood hounds to extirpate the wretched natives of America, and we improve on the inhuman examples of Spanish barbarity. We turn loose these savage hell-hounds, on our brethren and countrymen in America, of the same language, laws, liberties and religion, endeared to us by every tie that should kindle humanity.

"My Lords, this awful subject, so important to our honor, our constitution, and our religion, demands the most solemn and effectual enquiry, and I again call upon your bishops and the united powers of the state, to examine it thoroughly and decisively, and to stamp upon it an indelible stigma of public abhorrence. And I again implore these holy prelates of our religion, to exert their episcopal authority on this occasion. Let them perform a lustration, let them purify this house and this country from fiend. My Lords, I am old and weak, and at present very ill and very unfit for my feelings and my indignation were too strong for me to have said less. I could not have kept this night in my bed, nor repose my head upon my pillow, without giving this vent to my abhorrence of such prejudicious and enormous principles!"

If, we, who read this reply, existed as it was by the impulse of universal benevolence, and enforced by the irresistible powers of genius, feel ourselves deeply interested in the subject, what must have been the emotions of Mr. Boyd, and of those who heard Lord Chatham at the moment? We have indeed the words, but how forcibly would their meaning have been impressed on us, had we witnessed the animation, the expressive countenance, and the dignified action of him who delivered them! What *Eschines* said to the people of Rhodes, in praise of the oration which had caused his banishment from Athens, may be more justly applied in this case.—"How would you have felt, had you heard Demosthenes deliver it himself?"