

taken little notice of such language. Our motive is to prove, that if ever Britain look for friends in the U. States, it is not among the men, who at one time affected to be her advocates, that she will find them.

BEN. HARDIN.

The following is an extract from a speech delivered by this man on the repeal of the compensation law, which ought like the mark of Cain, to be written on his forehead.

He said, "HE HAD NEVER ASKED OF THE ETERNAL GOD FOR ADMISSION INTO HEAVEN; much less would he bow and cringe for a seat on this floor."

Is there a heart that beats with warm devotion to the principles of that religion which "brings peace on earth and good will to men," and does not thrill with horror at this insult on Eternal Majesty? Scarcely in the annals of French atheism or English infidelity can we produce an instance of impiety so daring. Sometimes on the bed of death, when despair had already lighted up the flames of hell within the victim's bosom, we have heard of language like this. But never amidst the blood and atheism of revolutionary France has a man come forward and in a sober moment declared himself too proud to ask a favor of the "Eternal God." Thus, Satan on the burning lake, when Heaven's thunders rolled around and wrapt him in sheets of flame, bade defiance to the thunderer's power and would forever burn in hell, rather than ask a favor of the Power Supreme!

Yet this the man whom the religious Monitor applauds or passes by, because he is a federalist; and heaps its accusations of irreligion on men who would shudder and recoil at even a *thought* so impious. That paper wishes by argument, by insinuation, and by forced constructions, to fix suspicions of infidelity on its neighbors, while with cold indifference or in utter silence it passes over these "damning" words which should consign at least one of its partizans to everlasting infamy.

And is that man a republican? Will he who braves his God, bow to the people's will or obey their voice? Would he not be a *tyrant* if he had the power?

We would be among the last to interpose with any man's religious opinions, and should not have touched upon this subject, had we not considered it a daring attack on the very foundation of society. Take away all reverence for the Deity, destroy the idea of future rewards and punishments, make man too proud to acknowledge his dependence on the God of nature, and where is moral obligation or the efficacy of an oath? Man would become the most savage of beasts, government would be dissolved, fruitful fields would become a barren waste and the whole world a bloody desolation.—These truths have ever been acknowledged by the wise and good even among the heathen, and Ben. Hardin of Kentucky is the first in-

stance of a weak mortal possessing a correct idea of infinite goodness and power, who has avowed himself too proud to bow at its throne in humble supplication.

But even *heathens* would detest and abhor such principles, what then ought to be the feelings of a christian? Is not one of the fundamental doctrines of our holy religion mildness and humility? Is not this virtue inculcated towards our fellow men? And is it not enforced with a double zeal towards the Almighty God?—Yes; it is that which entitles the christian, to the benefits of redeeming blood, which clothes him with the white robe, and will usher him into the presence of his saviour and his God amidst the songs of Angels and the smiles of Heaven. [Argus.]

To the well disposed people of Jefferson county, (Ind.) GENTLEMEN.

I have lately seen a scurrilous piece in the Indiana Republican, under the signature of a person who styles himself Simon Maggus! As he appears to be a person who does not merit a reply, I shall not direct an address to him. In vindication of this view of the man, I shall refer you to his 'creed' as stated by himself. I will also lay before you a political syllogism which I will submit to the scrutiny of the critic, to wit: That man who stands opposed to our republican government, which say that a majority shall bear rule, is a *federalist*.

2. Simon Maggus is opposed to a majority bearing rule.

3. Therefore, Simon Maggus is a *federalist*.

Yet as this piece is pleasing to a few, and grating to the feelings of many, I shall attempt to give you a few strictures on that *defamatory* production.

To a mind habituated to read, and believe the writings of the Old, and New Testaments, where we have so many instances of the dead being raised, it is not surprising for that mind to enquire, 'Has that old founder of the Gnostic heresy arose from the dead? But as we read of no instances of any being raised to life again, who have laid so many centuries in the grave, we cannot expect to see that impious heretic till the great rising day. However to a mind susceptible of ludicrous ideas, it would be a natural impression, 'That the news of our late election has reached the lower regions; that the result is highly displeasing to the leading characters of the place; and that Simon has been despatched from *Pandemonium*, to show their resentment for the treatment that some of their friends have received in the sequel of that conflict.'

But to be more serious. It is not difficult to see, that the person has made use of that name fictitiously, and under it conceals himself from the public. Under that name he offers himself a candidate for the next general assembly, and in order to recommend himself to the public, he declares himself to be one of an infamous character; that under that view,

and from what is past he contemplates a support from the people. The expression 'The result of the late election' &c. is too plain an insinuation to be mistook; that on the principle of a base character general M'Farland obtained his election. I would observe, that if he is a base character, it was not on that ground he was elected: but from a declaration of his innocence; and nothing has been made appear sufficient to criminate him in the eyes of the public: for the most weighty testimony preferred against him is nothing more than circumstantial; and when circumstances are balanced against circumstances, the people at large lose sight of guilt in him as it respects those things with which he stands charged. If it should be asked 'What circumstances are in general M'Farland's favor?' I answer first, the mode of taking testimony: Secondly, the persons engaged in taking testimony. First, taking testimony without previously notifying him of the thing intended. Secondly showing no disposition to take testimony in his favor. On the second circumstance, let it be noticed, that his most inveterate enemies, and those who were most on the alert on that occasion, a few months ago were among his warmest friends. The very men who are now engaged to injure his reputation, are the very men who not long since were caressing him in friendship. Yea I presume Simon Maggus himself, expressed a warm attachment to him. This change cannot be more rationally accounted for, than to suppose a change has taken place in general M'Farland for the better: for we are informed by Simon himself 'That all that can be said, in favor of justice, honesty, probity, and moral rectitude is a mere farce.' At the same time 'That his actions has been always regulated by his opinions.' Now if he were formerly so friendly to M'Farland, and now so opposed to him, upon what ground has this taken place? He is not charged with new matter, but all seem to be charges of long standing. Now if Simon is the man he tells us he is (which I expect none dispute) does not reason dictate, that if M'Farland were ever the bad man, it was in the time of that intimacy; that he is now reformed; that Simon conscious of the reformation, is roused into a spirit of persecution, and because the general is out of his power, he wreaks his spleen on those who gave him their support.

Thus we see the lengths to which Simon Maggus is led, by an unjustifiable revengeful temper. The scriptures tell us that 'revenge is sweet,' but I think it a sweetness too insipid for my taste, thus to vent my chagrin, and then timidly to keep my name a secret. Surely if any thing makes revenge sweet it is that the victim of my malice should know from whose hand he receives the blow. Of all the enemies that I have known to infest our country, there are none so terrific to me, as the man, who after he smiles in your face in public, will

retire and secret himself in a bush, smite you in the most vital part and then publish to the world 'It was Simon Maggus &c.'!! For my own part I do not feel my attachment to any political party so strong, as to induce me to enter the circle of debate: but when the cause of honesty, sincerity, and religion lies bleeding under the strokes of Simon's pen, and when encouraged by the indulgence of a protesting editor, duty impels me to undertake the suffering cause, and offer you my thoughts. Therefore, I do not consider that religion consists in an opinion of men, whether good or bad. A man may be a perfect saint; yet he may be an apostle, and at the same time he may consider Simon a good sincere man. Not every christian has the gift of discerning spirits. Under this view of the imperfection of human knowledge, a christian, or a christian minister may vote for a bad man without any impeachment of his piety.

If Simon Maggus is a preacher if he is a man of literary attainments; if he has been educated a doctor, or a lawyer, or any other *high finished blade*, I should be glad to hear him sermonize on the texts he has quoted. As a scripture is given by inspiration I should be gratified to know the primary, and spiritual sense of 'shunning every appearance of evil' is to vote with the minority. If this is the meaning, I would observe that a few votes taken from the majority, and added to minority would turn the scale the other way, which would constitute a crime. Then in order to be exempt from guilt on this ground we must petition our assembly to pass a law, that a minority shall elect their officers: if so probably Simon Maggus has as flattering prospects of being elected as any other man. But what meaning has the other text? 'doing justly' withdrawing our interest from general M'Farland. Is 'loving mercy' turning our suffrages to the support of Mr. Talbott? Is 'walking humbly with our maker' huzzaing round the town of Madison for Talbott? I must confess that my knowledge of theology is so superficial, that I know not how better to apply these texts to Simon's scheme of divinity.

I would not be understood to offer any insult to Mr. Talbott. He is a man I respect; but I am not thereby bound to respect no other man. I respect every man until something convinces me the man does not deserve respect. As the christian economy enjoins on its professors the exercise of charity. It is certainly more charity to suppose M'Farland's opposers to be mistaken and he innocent, than to condemn him as guilty on testimony that goes to prove nothing in point. Charity itself has never enjoined on its votaries to relinquish their privileges as citizens. It does not place them in a situation like so many slaves, incapable of acting only as moved by others. Therefore let us use our liberty as christians, and free men, regardless of