

AN EXPOSITION

OF THE

POLITICAL CHARACTER AND PRINCIPLES

OF

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

Showing by Historical Documents, and Incontestible Facts, that he was educated a Monarchist: has always been hostile to Popular Government, and particularly to its great bulwark, the Right of Suffrage: and that he affected to become a Republican only to attain the power to pervert and degrade the Democratic Party; and to pave the way for such a change of the Constitution as would establish the United States, an Aristocratical and Hereditary Government.



WASHINGTON:

PRINTED BY DUFF GREEN.

1827.

Letter to SAMUEL D. INGHAM, Esq. member of Congress, New Hope, Bucks county, Pennsylvania.

PHILADELPHIA, Oct. 30, 1827.

DEAR SIR—The general committee appointed by the democratic citizens of this district, to aid in effecting the election of Gen. Jackson to the Presidency, have directed us to address you.

The character and principles of the present Chief Magistrate of the Union are sincerely believed to be, as a politician, in the enlarged sense of that word, dangerous to the institutions of the country, and, as a party politician, counterfeit and hypocritical. In the last essay from your pen, communicated to the public, you intimate an intention to develop this interesting topic, and to put the results of your research before your fellow-citizens.

Considering the subject of much more importance than the ordinary themes of controversy—as one which, treated by you, will confirm the judgment and sentiments of the people of this Commonwealth—the committee regard it as incumbent upon them to request, that they may be made the means of giving to your exposition, if it be prepared, such a diffusion as may be calculated to subserve the noble democratic cause to which they are devoted. On their behalf, therefore, and agreeably to their instruction, we beg that your paper, if completed, may be forwarded to us.

We are, Dear Sir, very respectfully,

Your friends and servants,

HENRY HORN,
G. M. DALLAS.

REPLY.

GENTLEMEN—I have received your favour of the 30th ultimo, requesting that I will forward to you, in behalf of the General Committee appointed by the democratic citizens of the city and county of Philadelphia, to aid in effecting the election of Gen. Jackson to the Presidency of the United States, the exposition of the political character and principles of the present Chief Magistrate, which I had promised some time since to prepare, and make public. It is gratifying to find that you have so highly appreciated the importance of discussing this branch of the great question which now agitates the public mind, as to have expected even from my very defective labors some beneficial developments. The countenance of so very respectable a body cannot fail to stimulate other and better pens to a more thorough investigation of the same subject, from which, when employed in so extensive a field, we may hope for an abundant collection and disclosure of highly interesting facts.

I transmit the paper you have requested, in the hope that, however deficient in the execution, it may prove of some use to the great cause of public virtue and political principles involved in the present contest. But it seems proper in justice to myself, when presenting this paper for publication, to explain how it has happened that I have been drawn into a discussion of this subject under my own signature. Some time in April last, a meeting of democratic republicans was advertised to be held at Doylestown, in this county, to take into consideration the matters involved in the approaching Presidential election. Owing perhaps to the supposition that my public station afforded an opportunity for information on that subject, which was not common to all my fellow citizens, I was specially requested by some of the committee, who called the meeting, to state the principal grounds on which Mr. Adams was deemed less worthy to be supported for the presidency than Gen. Jackson. I accordingly made such a statement, and with a scrupulous regard to facts either publicly known or susceptible of proof from historical documents. These statements, with some additional matters suggested by others, were made the basis of the proceedings of the meeting, which approved and published them. I was soon after violently assailed in some of the papers that advocate the claims of Mr. Adams for the Presidency, which was followed up by an intemperate attack, somewhat of a personal nature, from Mr. *Jonathan Roberts*, that necessarily caused a reply under my own signature. In the course of his essays, Mr. Roberts undertook a defence of Mr. Adams against all the allegations in the Bucks county resolutions, in which he rashly denied most of the facts therein stated.

This defence (if such it could be called) contained internal evidence of having been written, in part at least, under the eye of Mr. Adams himself. Thus assailed and opposed by such high authority, and already embarked in the discussion, I had no choice but to continue it, and present some of the proofs which I had in my possession. Thus have I been forced into this discussion by circumstances in which I had but little agency, and which I trust will excuse me among my political friends, for what might otherwise have seemed improperly assuming. The exposition will, I hope, satisfy you that the facts asserted in the Bucks county resolutions in relation to Mr. Adams' alleged conversion to democracy can be fully sustained, and that instead of acting the part of an "intemperate cabal," as charged by Mr. Roberts, we have presented them with great moderation.

I am, with very great respect,

Your obedient servant,

S. D. INGHAM.

HENRY HORN, and

GEO. M. DALLAS, Esqs.

Great Spring, 1st Nov. 1827.

EXPOSITION &c.

This paper will be devoted to an exposition of the evidence on which the third allegation in the Bucks county resolutions rests for its support. That allegation is in the following words:—"We have the best reason to believe that Mr. Adams affected to become a Republican in 1807, with a view to deceive the democratic party, and to obtain its assistance to acquire power, only when he had lost all hope of obtaining the object of his ambition through his old political friends."—The answer given to this charge is a simple negative, viz:—"that Mr. Adams did not affect to become a Republican in 1807, but was always a republican, in the true sense of that term."

This charge is one of the most serious that has been made against Mr. Adams prior to the events of the late Election. It deeply implicates his political and moral integrity. For it is very clear that he who, without any conviction of error, shall deliberately apostatize from the faith in which he had been educated, and had continued, till at the full of meridian of life, whether to gratify avarice, ambition, or any other passion, must have cultivated in his moments of retirement the odious art of hypocrisy, and silenced the admonitions of conscience, by cherishing a cool premeditated contempt for all moral obligation that conflicted with interest. The charge, it will be seen, is that of an affected conversion from federalism to democracy for sinister purposes. It will not be necessary to prove in this place, that there existed an essential difference in principle between the *federalists* and the *republicans*, from an early period of our government. It would be a libel upon both parties to say that the difference which so long agitated the country, was

nothing but a mere scramble for power. We have the authority of JAMES MONROE, in confirmation of numerous facts long since recorded as a part of our history, that monarchical principles were not exterminated from our country by the revolution, and that a portion of the whigs had struggled for Independence, but not for Republican Liberty. While Washington ruled, his purpose was to dispose of every thing for the glory and happiness of his country. His singleness of heart and illustrious public services, inspired such universal confidence, that he readily controlled the jarring elements around him, and exerted his power to give such stability and beauty to our government, as would teach all that it was the most perfect system for the preservation of human happiness. But no sooner was his determination to retire at the end of his second term made known, than the deepest anxiety was awakened as to the political principles of a successor. Mr. Adams the elder was among the highest toned of the monarchical party. He had labored with great zeal and persevering industry to establish independence, and in the dawn of that independence, with no less zeal and ability to inculcate *monarchical principles*. For that purpose he had written several volumes of labored papers, sometimes insidiously disguised, occasionally open and unequivocal. Those who are not familiar with the discussions of 1797-8-9, will better understand these facts by perusing some extracts from the works alluded to; it will be recollected that *John Adams* wrote his book entitled the "Defence of the American Constitution," immediately before the organization of the Convention which adopted the present Constitution of the General Government—and for the purpose of operating on the

minds of the American people, and especially upon the members of the expected convention, in the formation of a government for our Union. The Book was written in the year 1786-7-8. The sentiments then expressed will show what sort of Government he would have given us, and especially what were his views of a Democratic Government. These will be found in the following extracts:

“The people in all nations are naturally divided into two sorts, the gentlemen and the simple men, a word which is here chosen to signify the common people.”—“By the common people we mean laborers, mechanics, husbandmen, and merchants in general, who pursue their occupations and industry, without any knowledge in liberal arts and sciences, or in any thing, but their own trades and pursuits.” vol. 3, p. 458.

“It must be acknowledged, in every state, Massachusetts for example, there are inequalities, which God and Nature have planted there, and which no human legislature can ever eradicate.”—“*Inequality of birth!* Let no man be surprised that this species of inequality is introduced here. Let the page of history be quoted where any nation, ancient or modern, civilized or savage, is mentioned, among whom no difference was made between the citizens on account of their extraction.—The children of *illustrious families* have generally greater advantages of education, and earlier opportunities to be acquainted with public characters, and informed of public affairs, than those of meaner ones, or even those in middle life, and what is more than all, an habitual national veneration for their names, and the character of their ancestors described in history, or coming down by tradition, removes them further from *vulgar jealousy* and *popular envy*, and secures them in some degree the favour, the affection, and respect of the public.” vol. 1, p. 109, 10.

“The son of a wise and virtuous father finds the world about him sometimes as much disposed as he is himself, to honor the memory of his father: to congratulate him as the successor of his estate, and to compliment him with election to the places he held.” Same vol. p. 116.

Thus did Mr. Adams artfully attempt to lay a foundation for his favorite theory of an hereditary Government; but hear him further.

“The distinctions of poor and rich are as necessary in states of considerable extent (such as the United States) as labor and good government; *the poor are destined to labor, and the rich, by the advantages of education, independence, and leisure, are qualified for superior stations.*” Same vol. p. 360.

These quotations must prove, that Mr. Adams was disposed to base his system of government upon the imperfections and corruptions of mankind, and to perpetuate the adventitious inequality in the condition of man, by *incorporating it into the Government*, instead of founding it upon a natural equality, and breaking down the contrivances of the old world to maintain and perpetuate artificial distinctions in society. Let us, however, follow him while he attempts to prove that the people are incompetent to self-government.

“It has been the *common people* then, and not the *gentlemen*, who have established *simple monarchies* all over the world.”—vol. 3, p. 459.

“It is the true policy of the *common people* to place the *whole executive power* in the hands of *one man*.”—vol. 3, p. 460.

“By *kings and kingly power* is meant the *executive power* in a *single person*.”—Same, p. 461.

“*The people themselves, if uncontrolled, will never long tolerate a freedom of inquiry, debate, or writing; their idols must not be reflected on, nor their schemes and actions scanned upon pain of popular vengeance, which is not less terrible than that of despots or sovereign senators.*”—Same, p. 326.

What a libel on the principles of free government, and how strikingly illustrated in the history of *his own* administration, where the *men in power*, for fear of the scanning of the people, stopped “*the freedom of inquiry*”—for which they were overturned by the people, whose idol (Mr. JEFFERSON) maintained and established as the everlasting maxim of his country, that error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it!

“*The whole history of Rome* shows that *corruption began with the people* sooner than the Senate.”—Same, vol. 327.

“*Sobriety, abstinence and severity, were never remarkable characteristics of democracy, or the democratic branch or mixture in any constitution; they have oftener been the characteristics of aristoc-*

racy and oligarchy. Athens in particular, was never conspicuous for these qualities, but on the contrary, from the first to the last of her *democratical constitution*, levity, gaiety, inconstancy, dissipation, intemperance, debauchery, and a dissolution of manners, were the prevailing characteristics of the whole nation."—Same, p. 344.

"Powerful and crafty *underminers* have no where such *rare sport*, as in a *simple democracy* or *single popular assembly*. No where, *not in the completest despotisms*, does human nature show itself so completely depraved, so nearly approaching an equal mixture of *brutality and devilism*, as in the last stages of such a *democracy*, and in the beginning of despotism which always succeeds it."—Same, p. 329.

Is there a parasite of the Holy Alliance, in any part of the continent of Europe, that could fulminate a more bitter tirade against popular government? *The people cannot be trusted*:—they will put the yoke on their own necks by giving the executive power to a king: they *will destroy the liberty of the press and of debate*;—with them, *corruption begins*. They are *vicious and debauched*, and terminate their government in a scene of "*brutality and devilism!!!*" Such were the lessons of *political instruction* given to the present Mr. John Q. Adams, when he was about 25 years old. But let us examine a few more extracts from the same work—to show the opinions of the tutor in relation to *popular election*.

"Every passion and prejudice of every voter will be applied to, every flattery and menace, every trick and bribe that can be bestowed, and will be accepted, will be used, and what is horrible to think of, that candidate or that agent who has fewest scruples, who will propagate lies and slanders with most confidence and secrecy, who will wheedle, flatter and cajole; who will debauch the people by treats, feasts and diversions, with the least hesitation, and *bribe* with the most impudent front, which can consist with hypocritical concealment, will draw in tools and worn out enemies, the fastest—unsullied honor, sterling integrity, real virtue, will stand a very unequal chance! Where vice, folly, impudence and knavery, have carried an election one year, they will acquire in the course of it fresh in-

fluence and power to succeed the next!"!!! vol. 3. p. 275.

Could there be more conclusive evidence, not only of Mr. Adams' preference of the monarchical system, but of his inveterate hatred of republican government? Not all the servile essays of the hired scribblers for despotic power, nor all the homilies on "the divine right of kings," can furnish within the same compass so many libels, or such evidence of depraved and embittered animosity, against popular institutions. When it shall be recollected that the man who entertained these opinions, and had thus boldly avowed them, was subsequently made President of the United States, and what a hair-breadth escape the American people made in the election of 1800, the patriot cannot help breathing forth a grateful thanksgiving to Providence. Other extracts may be given from the same work, to show Mr. Adams' preference for *an hereditary government*. "*A nobility must and will exist.*" "*Descent from certain parents and inheritance of certain houses, lands and other visible objects, (titles) will eternally have such an influence over the affections and imaginations of the people, as no arts and institutions will control; time will come, if it is not now, that these circumstances will have more influence over great numbers of minds than any consideration of virtue and talents, and whatever influences numbers is of great moment in popular governments and in all elections.*" vol. 3. p. 377.

Thus Mr. Adams contrived a pretext for the establishment of a *political nobility* who should be *hereditary*, and by the glare of their *pedigree* and *fortune*, dazzle the people, and counteract the "*horrible*" evils of an uncontrolled popular election. "Go into New England," says he, "and you will find that the office of justice of the peace, and even the place of Representative which has ever depended on the fresh election of the people, has generally descended from *generation to generation* in three or four families at most." (vol. 1. p. 115.) And for this reason, he would infer, that to establish an *hereditary system* in the *constitution* would only be conforming to the practice and disposition of the people—whom, in another place, when he wanted to weaken public attachment to popular elections, he had so outrageously scandalized.

It may seem superfluous to add to the extracts already given, but I cannot forbear to present a few more.

“There is not,” says he, “in the *whole Roman history so happy a period as this under their kings*; the nation was formed, their morality, their religion, their maxims, their government, were all established under *their kings*—the nation was defended against numerous warlike nations of enemies; in short, *Rome was never so well governed or so happy*” Vol. 3. p. 505.

“I only contend that the English constitution is, in theory, the *most stupendous fabric of human invention*.” vol. 1. p. 70.

“In future ages, if the present states become a great nation, their own feelings and good sense will dictate to them what to do; *they may make transitions to a nearer resemblance of the British constitution*.” Same, p. 71.

“It (the aristocracy) is a body of men which contains the *greatest collection of virtue and character*, in a free government; is the *brightest ornament and glory of the nation*; and may always be made the *greatest blessing of society*, if it be JUDICIOUSLY MANAGED IN THE CONSTITUTION.” Same vol. p. 116.

“This *hazardous experiment* (election of their first magistrate) the Americans have tried; and if elections are soberly made, it *may answer* very well; but if parties, factions, drunkenness, bribes, armies, and delirium come in, *as they always have done sooner or later*, to embroil and decide every thing, the people must again have recourse to conventions, and find a remedy for this “hazardous experiment.” “Neither philosophy nor policy has yet discovered any other cure, than by prolonging the duration of the first Magistrate and Senators. The evil may be lessened and postponed by elections for longer periods of years, TILL THEY BECOME FOR LIFE, and if this is not found an adequate remedy, there will remain no other but to MAKE THEM HEREDITARY. The delicacy or the dread of unpopularity that should induce any man to conceal THIS IMPORTANT TRUTH from the full view of the people, would be a weakness, if not a vice.” Vol. 3. p. 296.

“Mankind have universally discovered that chance was preferable to a *corrupt choice*, and have trusted *Providence* rather than themselves. First Magistrates and Senators had better be made heredi-

tary at once, than that the people should be universally debauched and bribed.”— Vol. 3. p. 283.

“Thank Heaven, Americans understand; and if the time shall come, *as it is very possible it may, when hereditary descent shall become a less evil than annual fraud and violence*, such a convention may still prevent the first magistrate from becoming absolute, *as well as hereditary*.”— Same, p. 282.

It is impossible by any comment to elucidate the principles of Mr. Adams more satisfactorily than it is done in these texts: that he would have made an *hereditary government* for the United States, compounded of *monarchy and aristocracy*, without any mixture of democracy, is most unquestionable, and we have further evidence, that he subsequently maintained the same principles, and continued to urge them wherever he thought he could make an impression. When Vice President, he opened a correspondence with the great champion of democracy, Samuel Adams, in which he still insisted upon the necessity of a *nobility branch* to the government. The latter observed that the form of government most conducive to human happiness, was indicated by “*the natural love of liberty implanted in the human heart*; to which the Vice President sneeringly replied, that the “natural love of liberty was also implanted in the breast of a WOLF.” No sooner was Mr. Adams seated in the Presidential chair, than he exerted the whole power of his administration to establish his favorite doctrines. Offices were given to none but the advocates of his doctrines, and every republican whig, no matter how exalted his talents or virtues, was proscribed. A political badge, the black cockade, was introduced, by which the partisans of the faith could be known: he openly declared while in the Presidential chair, to Mr. Taylor of Virginia and Mr. Langdon of New Hampshire, that “*he hoped or expected to see the day when Mr. Taylor and his friend Mr. Giles would be convinced that the people of America would not be happy without AN HEREDITARY CHIEF MAGISTRATE AND SENATE, OR AT LEAST FOR LIFE.*”

This declaration is verified by Mr. Langdon, in a letter addressed to Samuel Ringold, of New Hampshire, dated Portsmouth, October 10, 1800.—But he had more powerful instruments than argu-

ments, dogmas and insidious criticisms: he had the whole patronage of the govt. of the U. S. in his hand. The legislative power was employed to muzzle the press and stop the freedom of discussion, in violation of the most sacred provision of the constitution; and editors of newspapers were punished by fine and imprisonment for scrutinizing the conduct of public men. This great rampart of liberty broken down, and the constitution undermined, there remained no sufficient barrier to consolidation and the establishment of privileged orders, *offices for life*, and even *hereditary succession*. In all human probability, the reelection of Mr. Adams would have accomplished all he wished in this respect. It was clearly seen, that nothing but a great political revolution could replace the government on its original and true foundation, and preserve the republic! The mighty work was undertaken by the virtuous patriots of the day, by the republican whigs of the revolution.—They were denounced by the dependants, expectants, and hirelings of power under Mr. Adams, as a “factions opposition,” “disorganizers,” “enemies to law, order, and religion;” in a word, as “*Jacobins*” and “*Democrats*;” which appellations were intended to designate the abettors of every vice which the author of the “*defence*” had characterized as the concomitants of popular government. The struggle was a fearful one on the part of the republicans, and against vast odds; the administration had sought with some success to identify themselves with the Government itself, and hence it assumed the name of *federalism*, as a mask in its warfare for *Monarchy*, and thousands who deprecated its course, apprehended that a change of rulers would overthrow the government, and produce a scene of anarchy and civil commotion.—Mr. Adams was contending not merely for another four years, but for the practical establishment of his doctrine and the maintenance of a chief magistracy “*at least for life*.”—But the principles of free government triumphed, the great “*Islam*” of monarchy was overthrown, and left the seat of government like a deposed King, who feared that the loss of power would be followed by the loss of his head. The accumulated machinery and trappings of latent monarchy were dissipated by his successor, and the government being restored to its original design, moved smoothly on, cultri-

vating and promoting the interest of the people for whom it was made. Mr. Adams retained however, all his monarchical heresies, and to these was now added an increased hostility to every thing that pertained to democracy and the popular system. The immortal Jefferson was for some time the object of his invective. “I shudder,” said he in one of his letters to Cunningham, “at the calamities which I fear his “conduct is preparing for his country, “from a mean thirst for popularity, an “inordinate ambition, and a want of sincerity.”

It appears, then, that from the first dawn of independence, while a minister at the court of St. James, through the successive public stations to which he was called, in the chief magistracy of the United States, and after his retirement, when all his vague and false theories had been proved erroneous by experience, he inflexibly maintained and inculcated his monarchical principles. Such was the political creed of the Instructor of JOHN Q. ADAMS! Let us now ascertain, if practicable, what effect the instruction of such a school has produced upon his mind: whether he has been an apt disciple of, or at any time proved recreant to, this imposing authority.

The first account of his education is to be found in the secret journal of the Old Congress, vol. 2, p. 312, in the following words: “The Committee, consisting of Mr. Forbes, Mr. Mathews, and Mr. Houston, to whom was referred a report of the commissioners of accounts of the 25th October, 1779, on the accounts of the Hon. John Adams, late one of the commissioners of the United States to the court of Versailles, report: That they do not find any vote or proceeding of Congress, nor are they informed of any general or received custom on which the charge of monies for the education of the accountant’s son, can be admitted; and though the same is inconsiderable, they are of opinion it ought to be rejected, that a precedent be not established.” The younger Mr. Adams could not certainly be responsible for this transaction, but it is given as an interesting fact in the family history. Nor could he be responsible for his foreign education and early introduction to the splendor of European courts, nor for the political lessons inculcated by his parent; while these have given the cast and direction of his mind,

which now so deeply interest the American people. The first work from the pen of Mr. Adams the younger, which seems to have developed his political principles, was written in 1793, at an early period of the French revolution. The overthrow of the French despotism, and the substitution of a government having the appearance of more freedom, was hailed by the friends of liberty throughout the world, and most especially in the United States, with a feeling of universal joy; none but monarchists deplored the event, and what is remarkable, none deplored it more than the monarchists of the United States. Very few of these, however, had betrayed their feelings so early as 1793; and yet we find Mr. Adams enlisted with so much zeal against the republicans of France, that he engaged in controverting the doctrines of one of the most efficient and popular writers of our revolution against the principles of monarchy. The well known series of papers under the signature of *Publicola*, was the offspring of this labour. They were written in defence of royalty, against the doctrines of the Rights of Man. These papers breathe in almost every line, a disguised hostility to republican principles, and the same devotion to monarchy which is found in the writings of his father, and also the same animosity to the great republican leader of that day: Mr. Jefferson is stigmatized as the *Islam of Democracy*, and his favorable opinion of the *Rights of Man* is criticised with a censorious ardour better fitting a parasite of George the third, or of Louis the sixteenth, than the citizen of a nation but just emancipated from the yoke of a kingly government, and which had staked all its hopes upon a government, the very opposite of monarchy.

Time and space will not permit many quotations from this work. A few will suffice to prove its character and its coincidence of design with that of the author of the *Defence of the American Constitution*, written in 1787. The elder Adams said, that "the British Constitution was the most stupendous fabric of human invention;" the younger Adams said in his *Publicola*, that "the British Constitution was the admiration of the world!" The expression merely varied to avoid plagiarism. The latter further remarks, that "the people of England have delegated their whole power to the king, lords, and commons," and then adds: "that the

power of the people ought to be delegated for their benefit!" Such is his account of the Constitution which is the "admiration of the world," and such his opinion of the capacity of the people for self-government. He virtually asserts the doctrine, that "the people are their own worst enemies," and that all power should be given up by them, and removed as far from their reach as possible. In the same work he declares that "it is not the *mechanical horror* against the name of king or aristocracy, nor the *physical antipathy* to the sound of an extravagant title, nor the *sight of an innocent ribband*, that can authorize a people to lay violent hands on the constitution which protects their rights and guards their liberties." The constitution of the old French government, with its innocent ribbands, and Bastiles, and *lettres-de-cachet*, seemed to have inspired the veneration of our young author, who, according to Mr. Jonathan Roberts, had "always been a republican in the true sense of that term!"

From about this period Mr. J. Q. Adams was employed on a Foreign Mission, which Mr. Roberts has been instructed to say, was in consequence of the recommendation of Mr. Jefferson, the *Islam of democracy*, who it seems was so well pleased with Mr. Adams' monarchial doctrines in *Publicola*, his attack upon the *Rights of Man*, and lastly the violent assault upon his own public conduct and principles, that he would insist upon requiring him with a foreign mission!!

While abroad in Prussia, Mr. Adams wrote his *SILESIA LETTERS*. The shrewd editors of the *Edinburgh Review*, thus speak of this work—vol. 5, page 182: "Mr. Adams has many recollections of his native country, but his feelings about it more resemble the loyal acquiescence of a subject, than the personal interest and ardor of a republican."

If Mr. Adams had felt the "ardor of a republican," it would have been impossible for him to have concealed his feelings, when writing in a foreign country, where every thing around him relating to human happiness and civil liberty, when contrasted with those subjects in his own country, could not fail to animate him with proud gratulation.

Not long after his return from Prussia, we find him again in his native state, adopted as the leader of the fallen party in New England. Having failed in an

election to Congress against the republican candidate, he was taken up for the senate in 1803, and after several ballots chosen by the exact number of votes necessary to a choice, against the republican candidate. (T. S. Skinner.) At the succeeding session, Mr. Pickering was associated with him, being elected by the same party.—At this period the two great parties, republican and federal, were as much at variance as at any period of our history, and I take it for granted that he was then acting in good faith with the people who elected him to the Senate. His votes all indicate the most decided opposition to the measures of Mr. Jefferson's administration, and a very marked personal hostility to that great man was evinced in his doggerel satires in the Monthly Anthology.—In obedience to the jealous feelings of the eastern federalists, he *opposed* every measure for the introduction of Louisiana into the Union; he even voted against paying the militia who had been ordered out by law to receive possession of the country; and moreover maintained his monarchical principles in every vote upon the organization of the government of that territory:—he voted for a landed property qualification to every elector as a condition for his right of suffrage; he refused to pay respect to the memory of the great republican leader in Massachusetts, Samuel Adams, as will be seen by a reference to the Senate Journal, October, 1803.

These Journals abound with votes in uniform concert against the republican majority of the Senate. If Mr. Adams was then "a republican in the true meaning of that term," so was Timothy Pickering, and so were the Daggets and Griswolds, and Quincys, and Otis's and every body that was struggling to overthrow Mr. Jefferson's administration.

The private correspondence of the Ex-President with Mr. Cunningham, commencing in Nov. 1803, furnishes an unerring guide to mark the progress of the political changes in the conduct of *both father and son*. In January, 1804, the elder Adams, then still indulging his hostility to democracy, offers to furnish Mr. Cunningham anecdotes from his memory "to develop the true character of the salt mountain philosopher," (Mr. Jefferson.)

In a letter dated Feb. 24, 1804, he maintains the doctrine laid down in his "defence," viz. that "rank and wealth

are just principles of precedence in a republic"—and adds, that "If a family which has been high in office, and splendid in wealth, fall into decay from profligacy, folly, vice, or misfortune, they generally turn democrats, and court the lowest of the people with an ardor, an art, a skill, and consequently with a success, which no vulgar democrat can attain." "In theory," says he "all governments profess to regard merit alone, but in practice, democratical governments certainly regard it as little as any."

In a subsequent letter, dated March 15th, 1804, he observes to his correspondent thus: "You say the awful spirit of democracy is in great progress." I believe it, and I know something of the nature of it. It is a young rake who thinks himself very handsome and well made, and who has little faith in female virtue: when the people once admit his courtship, and permit him the least familiarity, they soon find themselves in the condition of the poor girl who told her own story in this affecting style:

"The next day he grew a little bolder—but promised me marriage. The next day—he began to be enterprising; but the next day—oh sir, he got me with child."

Democracy is *Lovlace*, and the people are *Clarissa*; the *artful villain* will pursue the innocent lovely girl to her ruin and her death."

"The federalists appear to me to be very inattentive to the public events as well as character." The letter from which these extracts are taken, teems with hostility to prominent republicans in New England, and elsewhere, and is pure orthodox federalism as to men and measures and principles.—During this period the son, as had been observed, was acting in full concert at *Washington*; for whose advancement the father appears to have been most deeply interested, which was the chief object of his correspondence with Cunningham. There is a chasm in the correspondence, however, from 1804 to 1808, and before we return to it, it may be as well to notice some incidents in relation to the political progress of the *younger Adams*.

There is no evidence of any disposition on his part to secede from his federal friends until some time in 1807: In the spring of that year, "he presided (says

(the Boston Statesman) at a federal caucus which nominated Caleb Strong for Governor, and Christopher Gore and Harrison G. Otis for Senators of Massachusetts"!!!

"About the same time at the table of an illustrious citizen, now no more, he lamented the fearful progress of the democratic party and of its principles, and declared that he had long meditated the subject, and had become convinced that the only method, by which the democratic party could be destroyed, was by joining with it, and urging it on with the utmost energy to the completion of its views, whereby the result would prove so ridiculous, and so ruinous to the country, that the people would be led to despise the principles and to condemn the effects of democratic policy, and then said he, WE MAY HAVE A FORM OF GOVERNMENT BETTER SUITED TO THE GENIUS AND DISPOSITION OF OUR COUNTRY, THAN OUR PRESENT CONSTITUTION."

This charge, says a writer in the United States, Telegraph, was attempted to be denied in the National Journal, (a paper established by Mr. Adams, to promote his election, and mainly edited by him,) and the Statesman and other papers which had repeated this charge were called upon for their authority about the time the battle was over." Horatio Townsend, Esq. a gentleman of character, the Clerk of the Judicial Court of the state for the county of Norfolk, and the neighbor and friend of Mr. Adams, was named as one who had heard these declarations, and had often repeated them. It was also stated by the editors of the Statesman, that they had been informed that these declarations were made at the table of the late Chief Justice Parsons, then the great leader of the federal party in Massachusetts." Mr. Townsend was a friend of Mr. Adams, disposed to do every thing which in conscience he could do to help his cause, and he gives his certificate and affidavit as follows.

DEDHAM, NOV. 6, 1824.

I, Horatio Townsend, Clerk of the Supreme Judicial Court, and of the Court of Common Pleas, &c. for this county, having this day heard read to me, the article in the American Statesman and City Register of this date, headed "Explanatory," hereby make solemn oath that I have no recollection of ever having dined at the table of the Honorable Theophilus

Parsons, in company with Mr. John Q. Adams, nor do I believe, that I ever met Mr. Adams in company with the late Chief Justice Parsons, at any time subsequent to my leaving Mr. Parsons' office as a student in the spring of 1783.

HORATIO TOWNSEND.

This very singular defence was relied upon, and is the only answer given, to refute the charge. It was of no importance when the conversation occurred, and yet Mr. Townsend, the witness and friend of Mr. Adams, only proves that it could not have occurred at Chief Justice Parsons in his presence—he says not one word as to the fact in dispute, the denial of which, he, as a man of intelligence, well knew would have been infinitely better evidence than to have disproved fifty locations of the conversation. So far from weakening the truth of the charge, the affidavit of Mr. Townsend, without any further evidence, gives it additional strength, and leaves the only material fact to be irresistibly inferred. But let us see what two other respectable witnesses have stated—viz. John B. Derby, Esq. Counsellor at Law of Norfolk, and son-in-law of Mr. Townsend, and James Richardson, Esq. Counsellor at Law of the same county.

AFFIDAVIT.

I, John B. Derby, of Dedham, late of Medfield, in the county of Norfolk, of lawful age, testify and say, that one evening in the summer of 1820, being at the house of Horatio Townsend, Esq. of Dedham, conversing with said Townsend on the political character of J. Q. Adams, and objecting to Mr. Adams on the ground of his desertion of federal principles; said Townsend asserted that Mr. Adams *was in heart a federalist*, although acting with the democratic party, and for proof thereof, stated that he, Mr. Townsend, being many years before in company with Mr. Adams, and other distinguished federalists, previous to Mr. Adams' political conversion, [I think at the late Chief Justice Parsons,] Mr. Adams, speaking of the increasing power of the democratic party, used in substance the expressions attributed to him by the author of "one of the people," published in the Statesman of July last. Afterwards, in the Spring, I think, of 1822, the said Townsend being at my house in Medfield, on my again introducing the discussion of the same sub-

ject, repeated to me the same declarations of Mr. Adams in similar language—that John Quincy Adams made such observations, I do not know, but I was constrained to believe that he made them by the frequent and confident assertions of Mr. Townsend. That Mr. Townsend said in substance what I have here stated, is confirmed by the Hon. James Richardson, who says that he immediately recollected having heard Mr. Townsend so express himself in conversation once at said Townsend's house, and also at his office, and that it occurred to him before he knew that he was designated as one of those to whom the above statements of Mr. Townsend were addressed.

(Signed) JOHN B. DERBY.

Norfolk, ss: November 8th, 1824.

Then the above named John B. Derby declared on oath that the above statement subscribed by him was true.

(Signed)

ERASMUS WORTHINGTON.

Justice of the Peace.

On the back of the affidavit is the following certificate:—

I have read the part of the within affidavit which relates to myself, and declare it to be substantially true.

(Signed)

JAMES RICHARDSON.

This evidence, which remains uncontradicted and unexplained, is of itself conclusive of the fact charged in the Bucks county resolutions, and of an offence even much more odious—not merely that he was insincere in his conversion, and used it to gain power, but that he meditated such a purpose with a view to the prostration of the democratic party in the United States, by means the most unworthy that could have been imagined in the worst days of the Hartford Convention.

This declaration was obviously made for the purpose of being secretly communicated to certain of his old political friends, with a view to avert their indignation against him for his apparent desertion of their ranks. Some were in the secret of his movements, and exulted in his elevation to the Presidency, before his public assurances were given; hence said Josiah Quincy, when he heard of the election of 1825, "those who fell with the first Adams have risen with the second."

In the session of 1807-8, the grand movement upon the democratic party was

made by Mr. Adams. The only authentic account of it is to be had from Mr. Randolph's speech delivered in the Senate the day before he went to the field with Mr. Clay, and which he expressed a particular desire to have published in the event of his falling in that combat. The speech has never been published, and it is believed the reporters do not intend to publish it; many hundreds of persons were present when it was delivered, and it is impossible that the facts stated can be materially mistaken.

Mr. Randolph read a letter from a gentleman in Virginia, detailing the facts as he had them from Mr. Giles, substantially as follows, viz.

That Mr. Giles and Mr. Adams were members of the same committee; that they sometimes rode together in the same carriage; that Mr. Adams became serious, anxious, and seemed weighed down with care for some time; when he at length told Mr. Giles, that he had a matter of great importance which he thought it his duty to relate to Mr. Jefferson, then president; but did not know how to approach him, and desired Mr. Giles to make the communication. The latter encouraged him to do it himself, which he did. Mr. Adams informed Mr. Jefferson, "that the Federalists of New England were plotting with the government of Canada a treasonable secession from the Union—that their schemes had been disclosed to him—that he had once believed them to be patriotic, but could no longer act in concert with them." Mr. Jefferson relied on his honor and believed the statement. Mr. Adams gave in his adhesion to the executive, and was ready from that time forward, as he openly declared in Senate, to "act without deliberation" in favor of whatever he recommended.

I forbear any comment upon these facts, further than to observe, that if the charge was true, how does Mr. Adams reconcile his present intimate association with the very men he then so solemnly denounced as plotting treason against his country? And if it was not true, I leave to others to find language to express the atrociousness of the calumny. The events of 1813-14 furnish a much clearer development of the views of certain men in New England, which I shall have occasion to refer to hereafter.

We have now arrived at the period

when the Cunningham correspondence recommenced. The ex-president, whose feelings appear throughout to have been in perfect unison with those of his son, ceases to pour out invectives against Mr. Jefferson and democracy: speaks of the "federalists administering their nauseous oil," "to excite a momentary flash"—"in his old lamp" before it expires:—defends his old measures; abuses Hamilton; thinks "Pinckney can never rise to the chair," and that "he ought never to have been nominated for it:" eulogizes the conduct of his son as "able, upright, candid, impartial, and independent:" "applauds and admires" his letter to Otis, but thinks "he would have been more politic if he had declined the invitation to the caucus," which nominated Mr. Madison: considers "the policy of a limitation to the embargo a nice question:" says "the Federalists by their intollerance have gone far towards justifying Mr. Jefferson for his:" that "our government is for ever to be a party government, and the only hope is, that in the game of leap frog, once in eight or 12 years, the party of the *Outs*, will leap over the heads of the *Ins*," and that he would "nearly as soon see one party absolute and unchecked as the other!" Such are the views of the first letter to Cunningham after Mr. J. Q. Adams' adherence to the administration at Washington. Mr. Cunningham was engaged in preparing the way with his pen for the advancement of Mr. J. Q. Adams to the presidency, and although he writes well, and with all the feeling of a partisan engaged in what he believes to be a good cause, seems not to have been very quick-sighted in discovering the particular motive for the change of tone in the ex-president's letter. Cunningham proposes to attack Mr. Jefferson. Mr. Adams does not respond to this part of his plan, but adverts to the measures of Washington's administration, in which he had taken part, and to his opinion of his son's talents, and furnishes Mr. Cunningham with a copy of a commendatory letter from Washington to himself, written Feb. 20, 1797. This letter has lately gone the rounds through all the administration papers, and therefore deserves some notice. It will be recollected that Mr. Adams was elected in the fall of 1796, by a small majority over Mr. Jefferson. On the 2d Wednesday in February, the votes were ascertained in the presence of both houses,

this time and the 20th, it appears from President Washington's letter, that Mr. Adams sent him a paper written by his son J. Q. Adams, accompanied by a suggestion of some *delicate* doubts of the propriety of promoting him. Mr. Adams was not invested with the executive authority until the 4th of March following, but the aggrandizement of his family seemed to have been an early and primary consideration; and the sanction of President Washington was thus eagerly and cunningly sought, at the first and most propitious moment to promote his future plans for a family inheritance.

This object, although frustrated by the election of 1800, and for some time after regarded as hopeless, now, viz. in 1808, began to revive, and from that time forward the "illustrious family" which had fallen "into decay," "turn democrats, and court the lowest of the people, with an ardor, an art, and a skill, and consequently with a success, which no vulgar democrat can attain."

Gore and Pickman* were denounced as the "sons of refugees," Lloyd as the "son of a Tory," Hamilton was an "intriguer," Pickering a *weak, vain, vindictive, and dishonest man*. The Tories who had been all in all at the election of 1800, (insomuch that the whig federalists could no more celebrate the 4th of July in many parts of the Union, than the Administration democrats can celebrate the 8th of January now,) were to be put down, and Mr. Adams, who had lost sight of the revolution and its principles, from the moment he began to write his "defence" down to his son's adherence, in 1807, now became all alive to Whiggism and the principles of the Revolution, and said, "that the portrait of Washington ought not to shove aside the portraits of John Hancock and Samuel Adams in Faneuil Hall," viz. the same Samuel Adams whom J. Q. Adams not long before refused by his vote in the Senate to pay respect to the memory of, by wearing crape on his arm. As his hopes for his son revived, he received new life and vigor, and at the age of 74 boldly enters upon the arena as a political gladiator, and with "the enthusiasm of 40" attempts to "ride the whirlwind," which he had before said "would be delirium."

He informs Mr. Cunningham in his letter of December, 1808, "in confidence, that considerable pains had been taken to per-

suade his friend J. Q. Adams to consent to be run, (for Governor of Massachusetts) by the Republicans; but he (was) utterly averse to it—and so am I,” said the father in perfect concert—“for various reasons—1. The office, though a precious stone, is but a carbuncle shining in the dark;” “he would stand in competition with Mr. Lincoln, which would divide the republican interest, and “it would produce an eternal separation between him and the federalists,” “with little prospect of doing any good, or acquiring any honor, or receiving any profit.” The policy was to move more gradually, get hold of the Republicans, but not to let go of the Federalists. Did this look like a sincere conversion to republicanism? Was it not a politic movement to keep an anchor upon both parties, ready as occasion might serve to slip the one and warp up on the other.”

After all the exertion by the father, in writing volumes for the papers, traducing the men with whom he had acted when in power, and “courting the people” with “more art” than was attainable by a plain “vulgar democrat,” his son only received an appointment as Minister to Russia. This was a severe blow; he wanted the State Department under the new administration of Mr. Madison, but he “was banished because he was too just!”—From this time, hope was clouded, but not abandoned.

The ex-president constantly relied with full faith on his old maxims; and one laid down in the 3d volume of his “defence,” page 278, London edition, seems to have preserved and inspired his hope at this period—he there says, that “Continuation of power in the same persons and families, will as certainly take place in a simple democracy, or a democracy by representation, as in hereditary aristocracy, or monarchy.—The continuation will be certain, but it will be accomplished by corruption, which is worse than a continuation by birth, and if corruption cannot effect the continuation, sedition and rebellion will be resorted to; for a degraded, disappointed, rich and illustrious family, would, at any time, annihilate *Heaven and Earth*, if it could, rather than fail of carrying its point.”—His abjuration of the party, and abuse of the men with whom he fell in 1800; his letters charging them with being the “calves of John Bull,” “British bears and tory tigers,” his syn-

pathy for “the poor democrats,” and the whole of his essays in the Boston Patriot, seem indeed like an attempt to move “Heaven and Earth” to “effect the continuation” of power—but my sons, said he in his letter of the 22d June, 1809, “were delighted that I had taken the subject up.” The degraded, disappointed, and illustrious family, was all in motion for “carrying its point.” Still hope was clouded, “Aristides is banished because he is too just; he will not leave an honest or abler man behind him.” “I hope, (said the father,) his absence will not be long,” and in the mean time he carries on the work, which had previously so “delighted” his sons.

The plan of operation was for the father to fight the battle, and prepare the public mind for the admission of the son into the republican ranks, without exposing him in action; but the progress of their joint efforts had not kept pace with their expectations; the banishment of *Aristides* was a sore postponement of the fruition of their labors.

The son evidently left the country for Russia, brooding feelings of disappointment and vexation, which we find fully matured in his famous letter to Levi^r Harris,* recently made public.

A brief history of this letter is as follows: Mr. Adams was Minister resident at St. Petersburg, where Harris was Consul General; a very cordial and friendly intercourse was kept up between them at St. Petersburg, and when Mr. Adams left that place for Ghent, he appointed Mr. Harris Charge des Affaires in his room. He confided in him as the protector of his family, had written him many confidential letters, and among these the famous letter from Ghent. Harris was afterwards accused of official corruption while Consul General, and Mr. Adams, then Secretary of State, backed the accusation by zealously embarking in it, and becoming the principal witness against him; his testimony, all relating to facts within his knowledge while at St. Petersburg, and before he made Harris Charge des Affaires, and subsequent to which he maintained this very friendly official and confidential personal intercourse with him, and wrote the letter alluded to, which came out on the trial.

It should be observed, that this letter

* See Appendix.

* See Canningham's Letter.

was written while Mr. Adams was employed in the Ghent negotiation, and it was no doubt inspected by the British commissioners, who had such ascendancy in the Netherlands as to have commanded complete access to the Post office, and the aid of those who make a trade of opening letters, imitating seals on paper, and counterfeiting envelopes, &c.; but this was only a defect in the discretion of the *diplomatist*; it *might have* done serious injury, but it did not. The sin of this letter lies deeper; it goes to the *heart of the man*. It evinces great confidence in, and friendship for, Mr. Harris, at a time when, as Mr. Adams has since sworn, he had notes upon his diary of Harris's official corruption. I will not name the alternative of this dilemma. But the sin lies *still deeper*; it goes to the CHARACTER AND PRINCIPLES OF THE AMERICAN CITIZEN. His country involved in war, *he* employed in a high confidential station of the government, located in a foreign land, surrounded by those whose feelings were all against us, looks back upon the land of his nativity, sees it invaded by a most formidable force, collected "to crush us at a blow," the battles of Niagara, the victory of Plattsburgh, the triumph of Lake Champlain, and the glorious defence of Baltimore, excite not the smallest appearance of gratification, much less the enthusiastic exultation which no patriotic mind could have suppressed: Not only is there an utter destitution of any glow of patriotism or national pride, which such events must have inspired in the breast of any real American, but he takes some pains to depreciate their character and value—and most especially those battles wherein the militia had been distinguished for their gallantry. That of Plattsburgh and Baltimore, are disposed of with the same sneer—even the prowess of the enemy is underrated, to give point to his slur against the American Militia—not content with degrading those who fought so bravely at Baltimore and Plattsburgh, he assails the character of the whole body.

"The firebrand Cockburn," says he, "has kept the rawest of our militia in countenance by his expertness in the art of running away."—The simple meaning of which is, that the cowardice of the "rawest" of our militia was only surpassed by the cowardice of the enemy; in other words, that our militia were too expert in the art of running away to fight an enemy

that was even more expert in that art than they! Could any form of expression be devised more defamatory and slanderous of the character of his countrymen, than is contained in these few words?—But not content with this, he next assails *both the political parties* of the country, including every body *but the Adams family*, and even the form and character of the government itself—"a weak and penurious government, with but five frigates for a navy and scarcely five regiments for an army!" This denunciation implicated the administration and the whole party in power, as well as the Government, and as to the army contained a most unwarrantable misrepresentation; it then consisted of forty regiments: and provision had been made for filling the ranks at more expense than was ever incurred for the same object by any other government. "One half the nation sold to the enemy!" what a piece of information for the British commissioners! and how wickedly false! The only serious disaffection existed among a few of those whom Mr. Adams had so much dreaded an "eternal separation" from in 1808, and whom he is now so closely united with! "Sold to the enemy!" What a monstrous slander of the great body of federalists in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, &c.

But the whole letter was conceived in the same temper that his father indulged in for some time before towards both parties; his sound "talents and integrity" had been "insulted" by one party, and were "neglected" by the other. "The two factions have conspired together," said he in his letter of 22d February, 1809, "to smother all my glory"—"our parties at present," said he, "resemble two ladies of easy virtue, in whose quarrels and scoldings, one reproaches the other, with her weakness with a lover the last night, and the other retorts you are worse than I, for you committed adultery the night before, and put horns upon your husband—unfortunately there is too much truth in both. Neither party, however, in the insolence of their rage, can avoid throwing out something in honor of John Adams."

Such was the strain of the father, when he found that his son could not be Secretary of State; that "Mr. Giles, Mr. Monroe, Mr. Pope, Mr. Mitchell, and Mr.

* See Cunninghams' Letter.

twenty others would be more likely."— He most cordially hated both parties, and his hatred increased in a duplicate ratio with the declension of his hopes for the advancement of his son.—Determined, however, "to move heaven and earth rather than fail of carrying his point," "he declares that he will not die for nothing," and "his pen shall go as long as his fingers can hold it!"—But Mr. J. Q. Adams was banished to St. Petersburg "because he was too just!" the family were mortified, the son went off in a sullen mood, which he had been brooding over for several years, when he was ordered to Ghent; but that mission appeared hopeless; the British Ministers had given in their sine qua non, and our heir of the "illustrious family" "in decay," fancied he saw in the "signs of the times" something that promised at least some revenge for the *insults and neglect* he had experienced, and possibly in his mind's eye beheld the germ of some new coalitions that would resuscitate their hopes, and verify his father's oracular declaration in the 3d vol. of the "defence," viz. that "there will be a continuation of power in the same families as certainly in a democracy as in an hereditary aristocracy," which "will be accomplished by corruption," or if not, "by sedition and rebellion." Some expectation of this sort must have filled his mind when he wrote the hypocritical, cold, heartless and treasonable letter to Harris.—He was so wrapt up in his own ambitious hopes, and chagrined by his insults and neglects, that he evidently thought of nothing but condemning all the people in the United States, except his own family. This letter, in all its aspects, is a most important document:—it affords an unerring guide to discover the true political character of Mr. J. Q. Adams. But we must pass on.

Upon the accession of Mr. Monroe to the Presidency, Mr. Adams was brought into the State Department. One of his first acts having relation to the politics of New England, was the appointment of Benjamin Russell, editor of the Boston Centinel, to print the laws of the United States. The former public printer had been a firm and undeviating republican and supporter of the administrations of Jefferson and Madison, and of the country in the late war with England;—he had never wavered under the most appalling frowns of the faction that had then raised

"the standard of moral treason on the confines of the constitution." A few extracts from the Centinel will show its character at the same time.

We have already mentioned the hostility of Mr. Adams to the purchase of Louisiana and its adoption into the Union. The Boston Centinel for 1813, when war existed with Great Britain, renewed the complaints against the administration for that measure. It was the sore grievance of New England, destructive of the political power of Massachusetts, and of "the influence in the councils of the nation to which she was so justly entitled."

It was resolved by the same Massachusetts legislature which organized the Hartford Convention, that "the act for the admission of Louisiana into the Union, &c. is a violation of the constitution of the United States." Mr. Adams held the same opinions in 1804, and reiterated them in 1823. This was one of the pillars on which the opposition of 1813 rested for their justification. The toasts of the 4th of July, with which the Centinel abounds, indicate the character of the men and of the times. A few extracts will sufficiently exemplify:—

Boston Centinel, July 6, 1814.

"THE FEDERALISTS OF THE UNITED STATES:—called a contemptible minority, but like the Cossacks of the Don, rendered formidable by circumstances."

THE LOANS—may those who aid in the prosecution of an unjust war, receive exchequer bills, payable in *Elba*."

THE TREE OF LIBERTY:—let superfluous branches be lopped away, that fruitful boughs may live.

THE FRENCH CITIZENS, THOMAS JEFFERSON AND JAMES MADISON, fellow disciples of the same school, and fellow laborers in the same cause with their friend, "the imperial butcher of the human race."

In the month of October following, a committee of the House of Representatives on the Governor's message, report resolutions to raise 10,000 men, and accept the service of any volunteers to march to any part of the commonwealth, and in addition thereto, the following resolution, viz:

"That—persons be appointed as delegates from this legislature to meet and confer with delegates from the States of New England, or any of them, upon the subject of their public grievances and concerns, and upon the best means of

preserving our resources, and of defence against the enemy, and to devise and suggest for adoption, by those respective States, such measures as they may deem expedient, and also to take measures, if they shall think proper, for procuring a convention of delegates from all the United States, in order to revise the constitution thereof, and more effectually to secure the support and attachment of all the people, by placing all upon the basis of fair representation." This resolution was adopted, 260 to 90—and the Boston Centinel, Nov. 9, 1814, in noticing the appointment of delegates from Connecticut, calls it the *2d pillar*, and the appointment by Rhode Island is called the *3d pillar*, &c. &c.—In discussing the objects of the proposed convention at Hartford, Mr. Russell introduces the following remarks:

"To the cry of *disunion and separation* of the states, there is a very plain and obvious answer; *the states are already separated, the bond of union is already broken;—broken by you, Mr. Madison, and the short-sighted selfish politicians who compose your councils; all that we see in them and in you, are the convulsions which precede dissolution.* The New England delegates may aid in the arrangement of the succession, but they cannot, if they would, arrest the progress of the death."

"The convention must report to their constituents on the subject of peace or war—and if they find war is to continue, it is to be hoped that they will recommend that *no men or money shall be permitted to go out of New England, until the militia expenses already incurred are reimbursed; nor until the most ample provision is made for the defence of the New England States, during the continuance of the war; they will be justified before God and man for so doing.*

"If the New England states determine to pay no money, and send forth no men, while the war continues, until their own defence is provided for, they may save themselves."

"It is to be hoped that the convention will see fit to propose a more general convention of the States, including *all North of the Potomac*, for the purpose of forming a new confederation, grounded on experience; without, however, excluding the Southern Atlantic states. We always did feel, and we continue to feel, that

the Northern States and Southern Atlantic states, have a community of interests and a natural dependence on each other."

In the Centinel of the 7th December, 1814, it is said, "there are men who know that our troubles are not *the offspring of this war alone, and will not die with it.*"

December 10, 1814:—"We must demand that no new states with feelings and sentiments foreign to our own, shall be cut out of the distant wilds and admitted into the union."

Again:—"Those who startle at the danger of a separation, tell us that the soil of New England is hard and sterile, &c. Do these men forget what national energy can do for a people? Have they not read of Holland? Do they not remember that it threw off the yoke of Spain, (our Virginia,) and its chapels became churches, and its poor men's cottages princes' palaces?"

In the Centinel of the 17th December.—

"Our course is so easy, and plain, that I know not how the most timid can pause at the entrance upon it. It gives us the start of the Southern states, find employment for our impoverished mechanics, brings revenue to our treasury, spreads activity and wealth through the country. A PEACE WITH ENGLAND FOR A SINGLE YEAR, WOULD BRING EVERY STATE EAST OF VIRGINIA INTO OUR CONFEDERACY."

"A strict neutrality will give only temporary relief. It leaves government to make peace for us, and with that peace, such as it will be, it holds us in their power."

"It will then be too late to demand alterations in the representation and security to our rights as the only conditions upon which we will adhere to, the Union."

"It is said that to make a treaty of commerce with the enemy is to violate the constitution and sever the Union; are they not both already virtually destroyed? or in what stage of existence would we be, should we declare a neutrality, or even withhold taxes and men? Let us leave it to the schools to put this question to rest, while we are guarding the honor and independence of New England."

"By a commercial treaty with England, which shall provide for the admission of such States as may wish to come into it, and which shall prohibit England from making a treaty with the South and West, which does not grant as at least equal privileges with herself, our com-

“merce will be secured, OUR STANDING
“IN THE NATION RAISED TO ITS PROPER
“LEVEL. If peace leaves us at the mercy
“of the Western States, we may dream of
“freedom, but we shall be in bonds.”

“We must no longer suffer our liberties to be made the sport of theorists, the subjects of speculation of men of cold hearts and muddy understandings: neither allow that region of the west which was a wilderness when New England wrought the Independence of America, to wrest from us those blessings which we permitted them to share.”

It would require volumes to contain all that might be quoted of the same character from the papers of New England, which were the mere outlets from the grand reservoir, the Boston Centinel. How exactly do these sentiments accord with those expressed in the letter to Harris, in relation to the respect felt for our government!—But the chief purpose of presenting these quotations is to show, that in 1814, there was a real conspiracy organized to sever the Union, and in time of a *foreign war* to commence a *civil war*, deluge our country with the blood of brother's spilled by brother's hands, spread desolation over this fair land, and blot out of existence the only sanctuary of free principles in the universe. Such was the conspiracy during the late war for obtaining influence and power over the nation, and the Boston Centinel was their grand organ and most effective agent.

These things happened in 1813–14–15—Mr. Adams came into the State Department actively in September 1817, and one of his first POLITICAL ACTS was, to constitute this very Boston Centinel, by special favor, the organ of the government of the United States to promulgate its official proceedings to the American people! and this, too, at the expense of the patriotic editor of another paper who had labored during that perilous period for his country and for liberty.

The employment to promulgate the laws and other acts of the government, was chiefly valuable as an evidence of the approbation and confidence of the administration, and in this respect grateful to the feelings of a patriotic citizen who had done much service for the country—but it was snatched from him by the calculating and cold ingratitude of Mr. Adams, and given as an evidence of his sympathetic affection for the New England conspira-

tors, just emerging from sedition and rebellion against their country.

It is not the peculium given for this service that can be regarded, but when the faithful are degraded by a withdrawal of confidence, and the wicked are rewarded by special marks of it, there must be something “*rotten in Denmark*.” We have seen one illustrious and decayed family struggling for a continuation of power by “turning democrats,” or rather demagogues, and others in the last resort recommending open “rebellion,” and ready to annihilate heaven and earth “rather than fail of carrying their point,” and both successfully rising into power and authority over the heads of the best of patriots and most faithful public benefactors.

Many other intervening incidents of the same character might be noticed; but let us pass on to the inauguration.—It was not my purpose to discuss the election, in this place; let it suffice to say, we now find “the continuation of power in the same family,” and in this “continuation” accomplished “by corruption,” as predicted by Mr. John Adams in 1789, and which, with no slight opportunity of knowing the truth, I do most religiously believe was the fact. Mr. Adams ascends the inaugural chair, and proclaims a general amnesty for all political offences, and more especially to those who had so lately been “sold to the enemy by their prejudices and their ignorance.” Associated with his bitterest foe, in the administration, his republican friends, by whose indulgence he had been tolerated in their ranks for several years, find nothing but chilling repulses in his speech, and more especially in his first acts. Rufus King was his first appointment (out of the Cabinet,) the prime mover of the organized resistance to the government during the war, and the father of the system of operation afterwards adopted by the Hartford Convention! These facts have been denied; but let the public journals and records of the day be referred to.—I have before me a pamphlet written by H. G. Otis, in defence of the Hartford Convention, which he excuses mainly on the ground that other and similar measures were adopted in other parts of the United States not less reprehensible than those by the New England States. That which evinces the strongest similitude was a meeting held in New York in the month of August,

1812. Rufus King was one of the committee who drew up the following resolutions, viz:

“That we are irresistibly drawn to the conclusion, that the American people will, under the name and form of an alliance, be submitted to the will and power of the French Emperor.”

“That in this view of the subject, the question of peace or war involves all that is dear and valuable to man on this side the grave! We are therefore under the dire necessity of declaring, that we have no confidence in the men who have brought us to this perilous condition.” They further resolved, “That representatives be chosen in the several countries—discreet men—friends of peace. The representatives can correspond or confer with each other, and co-operate with the friends of peace in our sister states, in devising and pursuing such constitutional measures as may secure our independence and preserve our union, both of which are endangered by the present war.” Such was the measure which led the way for the conspirators in Massachusetts to organize two years afterwards their convention of state delegates at Hartford—That the prime mover in New York and the prime agent and organ in Boston, should have been the first to receive the marks of special favor from Mr. John Q. Adams, is abundant proof that his democracy has been merely affected.

But it is not from all that we have exhibited merely, nor from his attachment to the most obnoxious of the federal leaders in the Reign of Terror, and in the days of the New England Conspiracy, that the insincerity of Mr. Adams’ sudden conversion to republicanism is to be inferred:—We perceive it, in the licentious exercise of his patronage, prostituted from its design of promoting the public good to the purposes of mercenary reward to the worst of men for political services.—We perceive the very doctrine avowed in his “*Publicola*,” re-asserted in his first message to Congress;—in the former, it is alleged that “all power ought to be delegated by the people, for their own benefit,” and in the latter, that “the representative should not be palsied by the will of his constituents:”—We perceive all the old doctrines of implied powers repeated and even surpassed:—We see unnecessary embassies got up, to establish political connections with other countries, contrary

to the advice and policy of Washington and Jefferson:—We see him and the principal functionaries of his cabinet, whose duty it is to attend to the public concerns, engaged in traversing the union like electioneering demagogues, attending festivals and barbecues, making stump speeches, and striving to court the people to their favour:—We see the President, through his friends in Congress, opposing such an alteration of the constitution as would give the people the power of electing their chief Magistrate, and this in direct violation of pledges publicly tendered to the nation before his election:—And we see in operation a demoralizing system of misleading the people through the influence of mercenary and corrupt editors of newspapers.—Who then can doubt that John Q. Adams never has been, nor is now, worthy to be trusted as a republican? Who can avoid thinking, that the safety of our country, and the future destiny of free institutions, demand at the hands of the American People, that his ill-gotten power should be taken from him, according to the form of a constitution whose spirit he has violated?

It may be remarked, in conclusion, that much more has been shown, than was necessary to the justification of the Doylestown resolution. That resolution was in its phraseology and spirit tempered with a moderation and a scrupulous regard to truth, suited to the magnitude and solemnity of the subject. Have we not proved, incontestibly, that “Mr. Adams affected to become a republican in 1807,” merely to answer the purposes of his own vile ambition? Have we not disproved the sycophantic and disingenuous allegation of Jonathan Roberts, that “Mr. Adams was always a republican, in the true sense of that term?”

Our appeal is to THE PEOPLE, whose answer, we confidently predict, will, a second time, vindicate the principles of democracy, and drive back into private life the man whom popular suffrages never would have drawn from it.

APPENDIX.

Letter of John Quincy Adams, addressed to Levitt Harris, Esq. Charge d’ Affaires of the United States, St. Petersburg.

Ghent, 16th November, 1814.

DEAR SIR,

I have just now the pleasure of receiv-

ing your favor of 14-26 October, and am happy to learn from yourself, the confirmation of your recovery; of which, and of your illness, I had a few days since been informed by a letter from my wife.

Near the close of the month of August, it was our expectation that the negotiation here would have terminated in a very few days. It soon after became apparent that the intention of the British government was to keep it open, and to shape its demands according to the course of events in Europe and in America. The policy still continues to pervade the British Cabinet. Nothing decisive is yet known to them to have occurred either at Vienna, or in the other hemisphere, and accordingly they temporize still. Unless something should happen to fix their wavering pretensions and purposes, it will belong to the American government alone to bring our business to a point. This on their part would certainly be an honorable and spirited course of conduct, and I should have no doubt of its being pursued, if THE DESIRE OF PEACE WERE NOT PARAMOUNT TO EVERY OTHER CONSIDERATION.

The occurrences of the war in America have been of a diversified nature. Success and defeat have alternately attended the arms of both belligerents, and hitherto have left them nearly where they were at the commencement of the campaign. It has been on our part merely defensive, with the single exception of the taking of Fort Erie, with which it began. The battles of Chippewa and of Bridgewater—the defence of Fort Erie on the 15th of August, and the naval action upon Lake Champlain on the 11th of September, have redounded to our glory as well as to our advantage—while the loss of Washington, the capitulations of Alexandria and of Washington County, Massachusetts, and of Nantucket, have been more disgraceful to us than injurious. THE DEFENCE OF BALTIMORE HAS GIVEN US LITTLE MORE TO BE PROUD OF THAN THE DEMONSTRATION AGAINST IT HAS AFFORDED TO OUR ENEMY. PREVOST'S RETREAT FROM PLATTSBURG HAS BEEN MORE DISGRACEFUL TO THEM THAN HONORABLE TO US, AND WELLINGTON'S VETERANS, THE FIRE-EATER BRISBANE, AND THE FIRE-BRAND COCKBURN, HAVE KEPT THE RAWEST OF OUR MILITIA IN COUNTENANCE, BY THEIR EXPERTNESS IN THE ART OF RUNNING AWAY. The

general issue of the campaign is yet to come; and THERE IS TOO MUCH REASON TO APPREHEND THAT IT WILL BE UNFAVORABLE TO OUR SIDE.

Left, by a concurrence of circumstances unexampled in the annals of the world, to struggle alone and friendless against THE WHOLE COLOSSAL POWER OF GREAT BRITAIN—fighting in reality against her for the cause of all Europe, with all Europe coldly looking on, basely bound not to raise in our favor a helping hand, secretly wishing us success, and not daring so much as to cheer us in the strife, what could be expected from the first furies of this unequal conflict, but disaster and discomfiture to us. DIVIDED AMONG OURSELVES MORE IN PASSIONS THAN INTEREST, WITH HALF THE NATION SOLD BY THEIR PREJUDICES AND THEIR IGNORANCE TO OUR ENEMY, WITH A FEEBLE AND PENURIOUS GOVERNMENT, WITH FIVE FRIGATES FOR A NAVY, AND SCARCELY FIVE EFFICIENT REGIMENTS FOR AN ARMY, HOW CAN IT BE EXPECTED THAT WE SHOULD RESIST THE MASS OF FORCE WHICH THAT GIGANTIC POWER HAS COLLECTED TO CRUSH US AT A BLOW?

This too is the moment which he has chosen to break through all the laws of war acknowledged and respected by civilized nations. Under the false pretence of retaliation, Cochrane has formally declared the determination to destroy and lay waste all the towns on the sea coast which may be assailable. The ordinary horrors of war are mildness and mercy in comparison with what British vengeance and malice have denounced upon us. We must go through it all—I trust in God we shall rise in triumph over it all:—but the first shock is the most terrible part of the process, and it is that which we are now enduring.

The Transit will probably sail about the beginning of next month from Bordeaux. Your despatches by Mr. Forbes will go in her, if we get them in time. I have heard nothing from Count Nesselrode. The Congress at Vienna has scarcely yet opened:—but all the important arrangements are made, and there is no doubt that the termination will be pacific.

I am, with high regard and consideration, dear Sir, your very humble and obedient servant,

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.