root of the tree of our prosperity. Nor navigation, nor trade, nor vents for our crops, nor sales for our surplus imports, nor safety to our mariners will abide our submission to these doctrines, to these practices, to this new system of annoying her enemy and monopolizing commerce, adopted by G. Britain and the changing circle of her friends.—If she persists with her executive orders, and other injuries, the road which our respected government has already entered lies open before our eyes. It is the path of virtuous peace, for we are not wont to seek even Justice by the sword. Protection to *the industrious*, and indemnification to *the suffering*, at the expence of *the injuring*, is our wise, our moral and religious plan.

From the National Intelligencer.

"*On eagle's wings immortal scandals fly.*
Whilst virtuous actions are but born to die."

Although it is chimercial to suppose that party spirit will ever cease to exist in this country, or that the most virtuous and enlightened administration will ever be without its opponents, still at a *crisis* like the present, it might be expected that the *amor patriae* would have a preponderance over the *demon of faction*. The critical state of our foreign relations, which has been produced by causes and events which the Executive could not control, has nevertheless been seized with avidity by the *opposition party*, and has long been made the subject of *scurrilous and malignant* attacks on the President. A brief review, however, of the measures which have been pursued, since the change of administration (as respects our external concerns) will, I trust, be sufficient to convince every candid and unprejudiced person, that these denunciations against the Executive are base, illiberal and unfounded. On Mr. Jefferson's elevation to the executive chair, the U. S. were at peace with all the world, except the bashaw of Tripoli, who notwithstanding the presents which he had occasionlly received from the two former administrations, was committing depredations on our commerce in the Mediterranean. For the purpose of chastising this pirate, as well as for the protection of our commerce, a squadron was dispatched to the Mediterranean. The result of this spirited measure is well known. The bashaw, although in possession of 300 of our citizens, (which accident threw into his hands) was compelled to sue for peace; to relinquish all ideas of a tribute being paid him in future, and to restore our captive citizens for a trifling ransom.

Our dispute with Spain next merits attention. It is well known that during the late war, a number of American vessels were captured by French privateers, and carried into Spanish ports where they were condemned by French tribunals. The Executive with a view to indemnify our citizens for these losses, directed the minister of the U. S. at Madrid to open a negociation with the court of Spain, on the subject of these illegal condemnations. After various delays a convention was concluded (in 1802) whereby the Spanish government became responsible for the above mentioned losses sustained by American citizens in the ports of his catholic majesty. But before this convention was ratified, the Spanish intendant at New Orleans, by an arbitrary decree, prohibiting our citizens from using the port of New-Orleans as a place of deposit, a privilege which was secured to us by a former treaty with Spain.—About this time it was generally known that Spain had retro-ceded Louisianna to France, and from a desire to prevent having so formidable a power for a neighbour, as well as to obtain this valuable province (through which flows the Mississippi, the only outlet for the produce of our western country) a negociation was set on foot by the Executive, for the purpose of securing to the U. S. this important territory, in which he fortunately succeeded. The court of Spain, however, viewed this transaction with a jealous eye, and from that moment began to evince an unfriendly disposition towards the U. S. She has refused to ratify the convention of 1802, and has likewise withheld from us a small but valuable part of Louisianna, These and other acts of injustice have excited much indignation among our citizens. During the late session of Congress, it is well known, that some were in favor of an immediate declaration of war—A large majority, however, were for previously resorting to negociation, and an appropriation was made to enable the Executive to treat for the purchase of the Floridas, (that is, for such part thereof as we have no claim to) which if obtained would render our territories compact, and remove all future disputes respecting the boundaries of Louisianna. The Executive has accordingly opened a negociation with the courts of France and Spain on this interesting subject. Various causes have prevented this negociation from progressing as rapidly as the impatience of the public seems to requre; and although the result is still uncertain, a short delay cannot prove injurious to the U. S. as government has not neglected any measures within its power to place the frontiers in a state of defence; which precaution may be necessary, in case the negociation should terminate unfavorably.

The unjustifiable conduct of G. Britain in capturing our vessels and impressing our seamen, has not been viewed with indifference by the executive. Some time before the meeting of the late Congress, our worthy minister at the court of London, made spirited remonstrances against these outrages, and although they were ineffectual, it was not considered expedient by our national legislature to resort to hostile measures without another effort to obtain justice by negociation.—The indisposition of Mr. Fox, the British minister of foreign affairs, has retarded this negociation. Commissioners however have lately been appointed to treat with our ministers, and there is reason to believe that our differences with G. Britain will soon be amicably adjusted.

From the above statement of facts it must appear evident to every person (except those whose jaundiced eyes, view every measure of the Executive through a false medium) that the President has on all occasions supported with firmness and dignity the honor and interest of his country. Every virtuous and patriotic citizen of the U. S. is therefore called upon in the name of his country, to rally arround its constituted authorities, and should an appeal to arms be rendered necessary either to vindicate our rights or to avenge our wrongs, we we cannot fail of being victorious.

FRANKLIN.

From the National Intelligencer.

No. II.

Let us for a moment consider the various topics which have excited the public interest. With regard to Spain, they are her spoliations on our trade and her hostile menaces of aggression on our territorial rights. These are admitted on all hands to be in the highest degree aggravated, and to demand redress.—The government has adopted that course which in its opinion is best calculated to insure it. They have not resorted to war. Do you think that they should have resorted to that extreme measure? It is believed that you will not say they should. There are a few madmen who have recommended an appeal to the sword. But there is not a sober mind that has avowed its support of such a course. Admitting then this resort to be inexpedient, what remains? Nothing but negociation in one shape or other. Justice gave us a right to demand an indemnity for the spoliations committed on our commerce, and on account of the suspension of the right of deposite at New-Orleans; but did it give us reason to expect that our demands, unconnected with our circumstances, could be complied within any reasonable time? Had we not waited years in this expectation, and had it within this time even approached towards realization? So far from this being the case, a new source of difference arose in the mean time—the boundaries of Louisianna, involving a point of the very first consequences to both nations; a point too most imperiously requiring settlement, as on its issue depend not only the rights of our citizens, on the Mobille, but *apparently* the preservation of peace on the whole frontier.

On resorting to negociation all these subjects were necessarily put to issue. It became impossible to separate them. Policy, on our part, strongly required their union. We know that Spain, notwithstanding the fertility of her mines was poor, and that such was the pressing nature of her pecuniary wants, that there was scarcely a shadow of hope of obtaining money from her in compensation for her spoliations. Possessing, however, what we wanted, and what is intrinsically of no inconsiderable value, it occurred to our government that the most likely way of obtaining a *substantial* indemnity was to take territory instead of money from her. The advantages of this course were these: First, Spain not having money to spare, there existed no rational hope on our part of getting it: secondly, having territory of great importance to us and of little to herfelf, their existed a rational expectation of obtaining it on equitable terms: thirdly, by this course, the pride of Spain would be conciliated by receiving a nominal *quid pro quo*, instead of being placed in the degraded light of acknowledging that she had treated us with injustice by entering into a treaty confined to allowing us an indemnity for her spoliations: fourthly, a similar course had been most successfully pursued with France in the purchase of Louisianna; fifthly, by this course peace would be preserved not only for the present, but likewise for a long period to come, as it was probably contemplated as an important feature in the negociation to settle all subsisting differences on the subject of boundaries.

These are the measures, these are the views, which have put into motion the torrents of abuse which have for some time over whelmed the nation. They are founded in reason, and on that policy which ought forever to characterise a free and just nation. But, even supposing them not to be as good as some other measures which ought to have been pursued—though it is impossible to designate any other short of war—after they have been taken, when they are at this moment at that issue, on which the peace of the nation probably depends, does it become, or is it worthy of any honest American to use his exertions to render them abortive? Ought he not to submit to the will of his country, fairly and unequivocally manifested, however repugnant to his own opinion? What should we think of the officer, who called to a council of war, after his advice was overruled, should, notwithstanding, in the face of the enemy, tenaciously adhere to it in frustration of the plans of his superior? Whatever our opinion might be of his motives, he would not fail to expiate his offence by the forfeit of his life. And where is the difference between the moral turpitude of an action which, by producing the failure of our arms, prolongs an existing state of warfare, and one which, by inducing a failure of a depending negociation, actually causes a war that would not otherwise have existed?

But the word *tribute* is brought up before our imaginations in dread array. Of this in my next number.

TIMOLEON.

FOR THE REPUBLICAN STAR.

MR. SMITH,

AFTER reading the second Number of Polycarp, I could but admire the ease with which he appears to carry his point against so large a majority of the Protestant Churches:—However, it is clear he takes for granted, that which he should have proved. There is no dispute about the Constitution of the Church being fixed by Christ and his Apostles; at present the dispute is, what that Constitution was. How can we believe that Polycarp was serious in his description of it, when he unchurches all the Quakers as not being baptised! Nay, he excludes them from the faith, and consequently from Heaven, (for we are saved by grace through faith) because the sacrament is not administered in that community. But will Polycarp say that they are not a part of Christ's Church? that "the Good Shepherd" knows nothing of them, and that they are all ignorant of Christ?—Forbid it. What does he mean by saying, "I think it has been proved in my first No. that Christ and his Apostles fixed the ministry upon this plan?"—These were "three orders," I cannot find in either of the four Gospels where Christ has said so; therefore, I shall not believe it until I have chapter and verse for it. Nor does the Apostles speak of more than two orders—that the highest order is sometimes called Bishops, and sometimes Presbyters, as has been fully shewn both by the Observer and myself. It is trifling with the subject to tell us, that if "Philip the Deacon presumed to ordain, his ordination would be disclaimed." Pray who has ever said it would not? We have not thought of vindicating ordination by Deacons. But if St. Peter the *Presbyter* or *Elder* (see 1st Pet. 5. & 1st.) had undertaken to ordain, I presume it would have been allowed to be conformable to "The Constitution of the Church." And this is what we contend for—the validity of ordination by Presbyters—the validity of which Polycarp will never be able to shake.

What he means by a call to the ministry is hard to understand, unless he means that all who say they are called of God, are fools or enthusiasts, if not worse, if the call is not attended by miracles, as was St. Paul's. Did he not discover that, according to his notion, neither Timothy, Titus nor Apollos were called of God to preach the Gospel, seeing there was no miracles attended their call any more than those who are called of God at this day. But to what purpose is all that he has said on that subject? To none, unless he wishes to insinuate that the Protestant Episcopal Church is the only true Church, and consequently that there is no true ministry but such as are called by that Church. Is not this again renewing the old Popish doctrine, and saying this Church is infallible? However, we are not to be misled by this gentleman in this important point; we know there is no true ministry but such as the Great Bishop and Shepherd of our souls calls by his spirit and sends into his vineyard by his providence; and, being thus called by the Great Head of the Church, they only have a right, according to the true Constitution of the Church, to minister therein. And this view of the subject was confirmed by Polycarp himself, (whether he was sincere or insincere I leave that between himself & the Judge of-All) when he declared at his ordination, that he was "inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon him that office and ministry," though now he appears to consider it "visionary" and "enthusiastic" for a person to make any such pretensions at this time.

Indeed the method by which he attempts to prove a succession, is equally unintelligible with what he says of a call to the ministry. He tells us, that if a man "finds a visible Church, constituted on a certain plan, and that plan "the same that Christ and his Apostles "originally formed, (but he has not "told us where it was to be found) all "this will amount to so strong a presumption in favor of succession"—Alas! alas! are all those evidences which we have been promised from time to time, dwindled away into mere presumptions by which so large a majority of Protestants are to be unchurched? And the next pretended proof is no less frivolous; for we are told that "it has been the *doctrine* of *Episcopalians* ever since the days of the "Apostles, that none but Bishops had "a right to ordain." We would be glad to know if we are bound to believe it because Episcopalians have said so? or, may we not justly call for better proof? It is true, in those countries where they are established and have the civil sword at their command, by which they can force those doctrines down the throats of their adversaries, then bare assertions will pass for evidence; but in this country where truth is permitted to speak out, we look for more substantial proof than the bare say-so of Episcopalians; and so muah the more, as we know that it does not appear that any of the writers of the two first centuries say that Bishops only, as an order superior to Presbyters, had a right to ordain. If the contrary is made fairly to appear, we will give up the subject; otherwise, we must be allowed the liberty to say, that the doctrine in question began much later than the Apostles, and never till the Clergy formed the scheme of aggrandizing themselves. And how well they succeeded, the History of the Church testifies. So far then it seems nothing is done to satisfy the reader on the subject of succession.

What Polycarp says touching the difficulties in the succession at Rome, and of his having so completely reconciled it "with the doctrine of Protestants," is astonishing indeed. That he has not removed the difficulty respecting the four first Bishops of Rome, we all know, although he has introduced one of the most wild schemes to his aid that could possibly have been thought of, viz. That of setting St. Peter at the head of the Jews, and St. Paul at the head of the Gentiles; thereby making a schism in the Church between the Jews and Gentiles, to guard against which at Antioch, St. Paul *withstood Peter to the face*; but now, in order to patch up the succession, we are told that at Rome they agreed to split the Church between them. But what necessity for so doing, when we are told that the "Jews and Gentiles could not easily intercourse." Was this a sufficient cause for the Apostles to make schism in the Church? By no means—for Polycarp himself, in the Star of Aug. the 5th says, that in case a number of persons were "cast away "on a remote island, rather than make "a schism in the Church, they should "wait for some navigator to take them "off." Therefore, as his plan of removing the difficulty at Rome depends wholly on his supposed schism, we are left entirely destitute of any satisfactory evidence on the subject, and Polycarp has his work to do over again, notwithstanding his boast of having "so completely reconciled it"—not indeed to history, reason, scripture, or common sense, but to the doctrine of Protestants, and Churchmen are deprived of the consolation he speaks of.

This gentleman calls upon us to show when the succession was "broken."—We with much more propriety might call upon him to show that such a succession as he speaks of ever did exist; for we have already shewn above, that he has not yet removed the difficulty attending the succession of the four first Bishops of Rome, and consequently has not advanced one inch in the controversy. But, suppose he could have succeeded in that case, other obstacles of equal magnitude lay before him. For how could he reconcile the fifty one years of schism to the doctrine of uninterrupted succession of Bishops in the Church; but this, with all the other schisms of shorter duration, he wisely passes over in silence, and leaps from almost the beginning of christianity to the reformation: and indeed it was highly necessary for him to do so, in order to keep his scheme in any tolerable countenance; for I may say, "*who is sufficient for these things?*" who can remove the difficulty attending the uninterrupted succession in this place? When we have at Rome Popes, Urban the 5th, Boniface the 9th, Benedict the 12th; and in France at Avignon, Clement the 7th, Innocent the 7th, Gregory the 12th, John the 23d, and another Pope is created at Piso by the Cardinals of both sides, who took the name of Alexander the 5th. These Popes on all sides cursed and excommunicated their competitors; each protested against his opponent, and solemnly *vowed* that he was a pretender, and not a true but false Pope, and that he himself was the true successor of St. Peter, and Head of the Church; that all who did not believe and adhere to him were cursed of God and the Church. After this the Council of Constance began a fresh line of Popes, by electing Odor Colonna, who took the name of Martin the 5th. Now we wish those gentlemen who talk so positively about an uninterrupted succession, to tell us which of all those Popes was the true successor of St. Peter, or whether either of them was. Till we get satisfied on this head, we must believe that every unprejudiced person who reads the above will think that to talk seriously of an uninterrupted succession of Bishops from the Apostles to the present time, is absurd and must be the chimera of a disordered brain.

I would again ask, which of those Popes was the true successor of St. Peter? If it is said Urban, who was the first elected at Rome, we answer—No, it cannot be: he was a madman. "Urban fled to Genoa, whither he carried "five Cardinal prisoners, who designed "to commence a suit against him, but "he put them to death." And the scriptures say that no madman hath eternal life abiding in him: 1st John 3 & 15. Hence it follows, that Urban was not a minister of Christ; being destitute of the life of God in his own soul, he was disqualified to minister in holy things, unless we can believe that Jesus Christ, the Great Head of the Church, would send a Devil incarnate to preach his Gospel; to assert which, would be blasphemy. Not only so, but his preaching would be ineffectual; for the scriptures declare positively against it. See Psalms 50th and 10th. "*But unto the wicked God saith, what hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldest take my covenant into thy mouth.*" From hence it is clear if we take the Word of God for our guide, that wicked men cannot be the successors of the Holy Apostles. And this was the opinion of Wrikliff, the first English reformer.—His words, as given us by Dr. Dupin, are:—"That if the Pope is a reprobate, "(as all wicked ministers are) or a wicked man, and consequently a limb of "the Devil, he has no power over believers;" and consequently no officer in the Church of God, as we can form no idea of an officer without power.—This great man further tells us, "that no Pope ought to be acknowledged since Urban the fifth;" by which it is plain Wrikliff discovered a breach in the succession by the fifty one years schism, at the head of which Urban is placed as above mentioned. He also says of *confirmation*—"That Priests may administer it." And yet the pretended followers of this great Reformer tell us, that confirmation is exclusively confined to Bishops, as an order of Exclesiastical officers in the Church superior to Presbyters. And as to *orders*, he says:—"That there ought to be but two orders in the Church, that of Priests or Presbyters, and that of Deacons." If so, with what an ill grace do the followers of this wise and good man plead in favor of three (divine) orders! Is it not evident they must give up the first and greatest of the Reformers in the Church of England, or give up the doctrine of three orders.

But, sir, you may expect these observations will be passed in silence; or, if noticed at all, they will treat this honest Reformer as they have treated that great man, Bishop Hoadley, and say that he was "weak and inconsistent," only because he was too great to quibble when arguments failed him, and too honest to shut his eyes against the light which shone upon his mind from the modesty of the arguments used by Dr. Calamy against the uninterrupted succession.

I may now observe, from what has been said of the fifty one years schism, that numerous tribes of spurious Clergy must have found their way into the Church; yea, it is probable they were all such. We may suppose that a man must be thirty years of age before he could be consecrated a Bishop; if so, admitting him to be consecrated the year before the schism commenced, he would be eighty two years of age at the least;—an age to which but few arrive, especially such debauched men as the Clergy, at the period we are now speaking of, were. *(To be concluded in our next.)*

Forty Dollars Reward.

RANAWAY from the subscriber, living in Talbot county, on the 23d of last month, a negro girl named JUDAH, about 16 or 17 years of age; about 5 feet 3 inches high; rather of a bright color; smooth skin, with holes in her ears; if spoken to sharply she stammers a little; her clothing are two country linen shirts, one country linen petticoat, and one striped kersey jacket; it is likely she has other clothing with her which cannot be described; she also took with her one country made blanket. It is likely she may be lurking in the neighborhood, as I purchased her from Miss *Mary Ann Turbett Goldsborough*. Twenty dollars will be paid on delivery of said negro girl to the subscriber, if taken in the county; thirty dollars if taken up out of the county; and the above reward if taken up out of the state and delivered as above, with all reasonable expences.

WILLIAM PEARSON, junr
near Potts' Mill.

november 4, 1806. 3q

BLANKS FOR SALE AT THE STAR-OFFICE.