Eastern Shore REPUBLICAN STAR OR General Advertiser.

EASTON—(MARYLAND) Printed and Published every *Tuesday Morning*, by THOMAS PERRIN SMITH, Printer of the LAWS of the UNITED STATES.

[VOL. 6....9.] TUESDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 3, 1807. [NO. 10.....425]

THE TERMS OF THE *REPUBLICAN STAR* ARE TWO DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS per annum, payable half yearly IN ADVANCE: No paper can be discontinued until the same is paid for.

ADVERTISEMENTS ARE inserted *three weeks* for ONE DOLLAR, and continued *weekly*, for TWENTY FIVE CENTS per square.

FOR THE STAR.

MR. SMITH,

At this momentous crisis, when the columns of every paper should teem with calls, for displays of Patriotism; when every man should feel his soul alive to the interests of his country:—I say at such a crisis, it is almost an imposition upon your accommodating disposition to trouble you with a reply to the piece in your paper of the 6th instant, over the signature of "A Methodist:"—But its contents are so crude, and so perfectly contrary to what must have been the authors meaning, that I think it a duty I owe him as a *brother*, to present him with the following considerations. It shall not be my business to unchristian him, as he has me; neither shall I attempt to lessen in the esteem of the public, the eulogies, he has so profusely heaped upon himself, but rather pray these things to be, and remain his, until he shall return to his native dust.

The first thing I shall notice, is that part where he says I am "so lost to the principle of a christian, and descipline of the church." "The principle of a christian!" I call upon my brother to advert to any one expression contained in my piece, that would cause even a riffle to arise upon the mind of a man, who is in truth, a christian *in principle*. I shall no doubt be told, "you destroy your principle as a christian [illegible] man should be accursed who refuses to engage on the defensive, in behalf of his country," and should very probably have another Nelson quoted. If "a Methodist" will only be at the pains to look at the piece he contends with, he will there see these expressions—("sins against God and his country, and deserves the curse of both,") to be the expressions of that celebrated expositor, who uses that text, "cursed, &c." for the porposes therein mentioned; and these very expressions as drawn from that text, have been before an enlightened public for better than twenty years, and none have had the assurance to combat with this great Divine, who is none other than the reverend Samuel Davies, D. D. before our present champion rose, and broke in upon our dazzled sight, with his new flood of light!——

But so it is,——"Some drill and bore
The solid earth, and from the strata there
Extract a register, by which we learn,
That he who made it, and reveal'd its date
To Moses, was *mistaken* in its age!"

When first I read the sermon, preached by the above named *great*, and *good* man, from "cursed be he that doth the work of the Lord deceitfully; and cursed be he *that keepeth back his sword from blood*," I loved him as a brother, I revered him as a christian. I saw the flames of *Patriotism* burning round his honored head.

May *I never* be a christian, *if to be one*, I must crush that principle, that would in time of danger impel me to take an active part for the maintainence of the glorious and ineffable blessings we at present enjoy.

I am charged, not only with being "lost to the principle of a christian," but "to the discipline of the church." Here my church claims my assistance, and bids me for her *honor* declare, that there is not one article in her discipline that effects any one of her members in discharging the duties of an American citizen, in defending his religion, his property, his life. As a member of the methodist church, (formal as I am) I would enter a caveat against any member that would shrink behind the scene, and refuse to bear arms in defence of his country; and although I dont recollect that there is an article, that would disown him for such conduct, yet I am sure he would justly merit, and assuredly gain, the disapprobation of every honest-hearted methodist.

A gentleman of my acquaintance, whose religious character stands fair; whose opinion is nurtured by experience; and whose abilities, no sober man could question, a few days past, expressed himself to me thus: "No man should bear the name of a christian, who would refuse to fight for his country; and no man should claim American protections, who would not use his endeavours to protect himself." This gentleman is a Preacher of Righteousness;—an honor, an ornament to virtues cause.

My brother dwells upon *conscience*, and I am seriously afraid, (begging his pardon) that he knows very little of its *nature*, and *properties*.

What is conscience? I answer in short, it is an act of the soul, whereby it pronounces things good, or evil, according to the various prejudices the mind receives from education &c.—St. Paul therefore says—"*Take heed, lest the light which is in thee, be darkness.*"

I think it a matter easily proven that conscience was not designed as our exclusive guide; and I think as a proof of this, it can be shewn, that conscience has acted upon individuals so erroniously, as to cause them to commit actions in direct opposition to the word and will of God. And 1st, conscience was not designed as our exclusive guide: If conscience were designed as our exclusive guide, what need of a Revelation, by which the *hearts*, and *consciences* of men are to be tryed?

2dly, Conscience has acted upon individuals so erroniously, as to cause them to commit actions in direct opposition to the word, and will of God.

Was the stoning of Stephen to death, agreeable to the word, or will of God? And did not Paul actually consent to it?—And afterwards did he not declare he thought he was doing God service?

My brother must be satisfied that I did not set my conscience up as a guide, in general matters; but my conscience would make as good a guide as the conscience of any other man, if it dictated to me in all things, according to the revealed word of god. But if my conscience differed from a[illegible] [illegible] necessary to a [illegible] both by an infallible standard; this standard is the *Revelation of God to man.*

You will agree I suppose, that right and wrong are opposed to each other, and that if we differ on any given subject we can't both be *right?*

You say "the Quakers are conscientious in matters of war," I say the rest of the community, or the major part of them, and among them some quakers too, have an opposite conscientiousness: How now!—One must be right, the other must be wrong!—Now to reconcile these two contenders, we must have recourse to the rule, that is to try the *hearts* and *consciences* of men, together with its fellow traveller, viz. *Reason.*

The unreasonableness of the thing; how obvious!—God in his Providence blesses me with property, with domestic comforts. My neighbors envious disposition, moves him to attempt, not only a destruction of my property, but an attempt on my life—His actions evince the design of his heart. I wish for peace; I am *conscientious in matters of war:* What am I to do?—I must be still; see my all destroyed—my wife, my children groaning out their tortured souls in my presence, and finally receive the mortal stab myself, and go, I *must* say, under the frowns of my God to receive the reward of those who lay violent hands upon, and take their own lives: For this would be suicide beyond a question; and "no murderer hath eternal life," sayeth truth itself.—Therefore "*cursed* be he that doth the work of the Lord deceitfully; and *cursed* be he that *keepeth back* his sword from blood."

It will not do, we are bound by ties that are indissolluble to maintain our blessed rights: If we enjoy the blessings, God in his Providence hath bestowed upon us—we must defend them. Non-resistance wont do now—no, not even a profile likeness of it.—"*Come let us be up, and play the men for the people, and the Cities of our God; and the Lord do what seemeth him good.*" *Prophet Samuel.*

PHILANDER.

October 10th, 1807.

FROM THE AMERICAN CITIZEN.

Miranda, Ogden & Co.—Chance has thrown in our way certain *duplicates* and *triplicates* of letters addressed to General Miranda and Jonathan S. Smith, Esquire, signed "*Samuel G. Ogden.*"—They furnish ample proof of the guilt of Ogden and Smith, in violating the laws of the United States, by fitting out an expedition which was destined to invade the territory of a power then in amity with this country. When we speak of Ogden and Smith, we allude to col. Smith, and not "*Jonathan,*" Ogden's agent.

No principle on which the laws of nations are bottomed, is so universally admitted as that which prescribes to states the due observance of the utmost good faith towards countries with whom they are at peace. Under this principle, no enterprize, no project of invasion, can with propriety be suffered to be begun or carried on against friendly powers. If they are commenced, or proceeded in, it then becomes the duty of the government having jurisdiction to bring the offenders to trial and punishment, in order to atone to the nation, whose territory it is intended to invade, and to deter others from embarking in enterprizes of a similar nature.

The circumstances of general Miranda's expedition are generally known.—He came to the United States, furnished with British letters of credit or bills of exchange, and he arrived direct from England. He had before been an agent for Pitt, and the testimony of Thomas Pain proves that he had received the wages of iniquity. What Miranda did with the money that he raised on his letters or bills, is not known. It probably was expended on the expedition after it had reached the West Indies. Be that as it may, the adventurer was successful in finding dupes in New York, to second his intentions. Ogden and Smith, destitute alike of principle and of patriotism, and led on by views of extraordinary gain, combined to prepare the means for carrying Miranda's designs into effect. A profit of 200 per cent. was sufficient to make Ogden forget the laws of his country, and to risk the punishment justly due to his crime. What reward Smith was to have for his agency in the business does not from these letters appear. More cautious than Ogden, he seems to have conducted his correspondence with Miranda in cyphers, and we have not been [illegible] his hieroglyphics to get hold [illegible] There is little doubt but [illegible] reap a rich recompense in the case of success for his infamous interference. Infamous, in truth, it was; for he was at the time of his assisting Miranda, an officer of the government of the United States, and unquestionably sworn to support and maintain the laws of his country.

Bound to vindicate our good faith and to establish our innocence in the face of the world, the executive of this country caused the culprits to be prosecuted. Miranda had sailed, and was secure: But his accomplices, Smith and Ogden, were arrested and put upon their trial. By the flimsiness of the laws, the ingenious devices of their counsel, and the insufficiency of the testimony, the offenders escaped. Those who could have established their guilt completely, had all departed with Miranda; and the accused could not be compelled to criminate themselves. Escaped from merited punishment, Ogden boasts in these letters that he was "*honorably acquitted,*" and pours out his wrath against the President of the United States, Secretary Madison, and others. Miranda himself, on reading the expression, must have blushed for the baseness which, after violating the laws of the country, could attempt to impress *him* with the belief that Ogden and Smith thought they had been acting right: That baseness which attempted to deceive even Miranda, by instilling into him the tho't that "*all the independent citizens* of America were in his favor," and to charge upon the Spanish and French ministers that prosecution which the government of the United States were in good faith compelled to institute.

But had the Spanish minister urged the prosecution, it was his duty to do so, and our government were bound to attend to his representations. The French minister, if he interfered at all, must have done so as the friend of Spain. The history of Europe furnishes numerous instances of such remonstrances: and the diplomatic memoirs of the Earl of Stair, will shew that Great Britain has not only remonstrated against the French government's suffering expeditions to be fitted out against England in the ports of France, but her ambassadors have remonstrated in the most insolent style. The principle of good faith and the right to make representations on the judgment by ambassadors, is universally allowed; yet Ogden would fain argue that he was cruelly dealt with. Contemptible creature! The same letters that contain his whining, canting hypocritical declarations, stamp him as false to his country for the sake of money, and degraded below the meanest citizens.

In one part of these letters, Mr. Jefferson is stated as being secretly friendly to Miranda's enterprize. That the President should be the friend of freedom is not at all surprising: That he should have been favorably inclined to any feasible project for the emancipation of South America from a despotic yoke, is perfectly in character: But he knows too well his duty as chief magistrate, and is too wise and too virtuous to have connived at the preparations of an enterprize of the kind in any port of the United States; and his most bitter enemies have never been able to establish what they have so often and so maliciously asserted, to wit: that he was privy to fitting out the Leander. The President is the friend of liberty, but not the friend of bad faith.

Ogden would induce a belief that he, too, is the friend of liberty! He speaks of "Liberty and Patriotism," as if he revered the one or regarded the other. When he had violated the laws of a free country and was willing to plunge that country into a war with Spain, he bellowed loudly for Miranda and Liberty! Liberty of what kind? The liberty of pocketing 200 per cent. on a sum of 72,000 dollars: The liberty of sharing in the plunder of Caraccas—The liberty of being suffered to enrich himself on the spoils wrested from the subjects of Spain.—Such was the liberty cherished by Ogden and Smith. Their patriotism went no further than their pockets! To the violation of the laws of their own country, they added the crime of countenancing bloodshed and pillage. Miranda's first effort would have been to plunder, and his coadjutors would have come in for snacks.

But, it will be asked, was it not Miranda's intention to emancipate his countrymen? Who can believe that the British were concerned [illegible] The British letters or bills of credit brought by Miranda to New York; the confidence with which Ogden (who certainly knew the whole scheme) speaks of British aid in the undertaking; the commission bestowed upon Miranda by the English since his failure, and above all the testimony of Henry Dundas, (lord Melville) prove as strongly as the thing can be proved, that the British were at the bottom of the enterprize. And the presumption is, that Miranda was sent to this country by the English government for the purpose of fitting out his expedition in order to avoid suspicion, which would have been inevitably excited had he carried on his operations in England; and in order to give a better color to the pretext of setting the people of the Spanish Main free; for they would never have believed that Miranda came with that intention, had he proceeded avowedly under the authority of Great Britain. British policy is to subjugate and not to set free. The British nation, since it has been a nation, never emancipated any people from thraldom. They have subjugated and tyrannized over Ireland, over the people of India, and over every portion of the globe where they have gained a footing. Can it then be credited that they were to free the people of Caraccas? Their object was different. They wanted a foothold. They would then have established a commercial monopoly:—the unfortunate subject, from groaning upon the weight of Spanish oppression, would have signed in the trammels of British maritime restrictions.

But what are we to say of that government which pretends to complain of bad faith on the part of the Americans, whilst she attempts by her intrigues and her agents to involve us in war with a foreign power? A nation that adds hypocrisy to tyranny? a nation which, like a crocadile, affects to lament over the fate of those unfortunate countries which fall a prey to her artifices and rapacity; and whose government is equally skilled in glossing over the crimes of treachery and murder? Some future historian, free from the passions of these days, will "preserve the imperishable infamy of her name, and make it immortal."

Miranda once disgraced or discomfitted, the British would not interfere. The Lewises proved faithless to the adventurer, and he became embarrassed; part of his equipment was taken, and he failed entirely. The British who had prompted him to the undertaking, abandoned him as they do all their allies, in misfortune.

The reader is doubtless anxious by this time to come at the letters. We wish not longer to detain him from them: And shall only add, that every honest citizen must feel the deepest regret that there are men in the United States like Ogden and Smith—capable of any action, however flagitious, for the accumulation of wealth.

The letters were inclosed in a blank envelope, directed "*Jonathan S. Smith, Esq. Supercargo of the ship Leander, General Miranda's head quarters.*"

[TRIPLICATE.]

New-York, 28th July, 1806.

Dear Sir,

Without knowing where this may find you, I hazard the present, to inform, you, that the col. and myself have at length completely triumphed over the oppression of the government in the infamous prosecution they had entered against us, in consequence of the expedition of the Leander.

After a trial of 12 days, which has excited more sensibility and public feeling than has ever before been witnessed here, the independent jurors of our country last week brought in their verdict of *Not guilty*, and the col. and myself were honorably acquitted.

The government were no boubt driven to this unjust prosecution by the imperial mandates of the Spanish and French ministers, and now remain covered with disgrace at their shameful proceedings.

The people of America, with almost a unanimous voice, were in favor of the col. and myself—and wish the fullest success to Miranda in the cause of liberty. I am waiting with the greatest anxiety to learn of the sailing Barbadoes of Miranda's plan, on the 20th June, we have, I hope, will be of such a nature a if not definitive, will at least that you are in the full tide of success experiment. I write general Miranda this occason; I believe and know to be a man of integrity and honor, should he be successful, have not the least doubt but he will have faithfully fulfilled with you all his engagements to me. I count also with the greatest certainty on his addressing no other person here but myself for all future demands he may have to make from this country. No man can serve him better, and has a more cordial disposition in his favor.

I fear all the misfortunes that have already happened to you, are in a great measure owing to the bad and highly improper conduct of the two Lewises. I regret it most sincerely. They have, by their shameful conduct, lost all my confidence. You, I trust my dear Smith, will never forsake your post—and to Miranda and yourself, my hopes and wishes are now confided. As soon as I receive any certain accounts from you, I will write you more at length. I saw your brother George a few days since, and shewed him your letters—all well.

God bless you.

SAML. G. OGDEN.

Jonathan S. Smith, Esq.

[DUPLICATE.]

New-York, 6th September, 1806.

Dear Smith,

The foregoing is a copy of what I wrote you the 28th July, by the Chichester British frigate, via Barbadoes, which vessel has since put into Norfolk, having sprung a leak; and you will probably not receive the original until after you get this, which will be handed you by Mr. Robert Kennon, a young gentleman of respectable connections in Virginia, who goes out desirous of joining gen. Miranda.

I have received all your different letters previous to your departure from Trinidad; and the last report, the beginning of August, from Caraccas, say Miranda's squadron was at anchor off Coro; had taken possession of the town, &c. &c. This will, I hope, find you completely successful, and joined by large numbers of the inhabitants of Caraccas.

You seem to intimate in your letters, that it is necessary for me to invest you with more powers as to my affairs under your direction; and in order to effect a settlement with gen. Miranda.

The only engagement I have with the gen. is with his honor, in which I place ten times more reliance than on any written contract.

I have not the most distant idea in case of his success, but that he will comply in the most ample manner with all

(For the remainder see last page.)