supervisors, commissioners, trustees, inspectors, with a Superintendent at their head, as *jog along, confusedly, thorough the inextricable mazes of this clumsy unwieldy, immethodical, incondite* and *incongruous bill*, would certainly throw a *man of good health into a fever*, and we may reasonably suppose if our venerable ex-Presidents were so *extremely polite*, as to read such a bill, being *old, debilitated* and *indisposed* as they were, that the effect produced upon their minds was of such a deleterious nature, as to injure in a considerable manner, their bodily powers, and if not to cause immediate destruction, gradually to weaken them down, until the 4th of July when the Almighty God, in his infinite mercy, took them away from this troublesome world.

It has been for a long time, a matter of remark and regret, that great and learned men should be so careless, and inconsiderate in giving their recommendations to new schemes and innovations. Scarcely any thing can be invented or written, but it may, by some means or other, get some distinguished name attached to it.

Among those gentlemen who Mr. Teackle says have given their sanction to his scheme, I venture to assert, *there is not one who has devoted his attention closely enough to the political, territorial and financial situation of the state of Maryland, to pronounce confidently that the system of Public Instruction, proposed by Mr. Teackle*, is suited, in all the above respects, *to the present condition of Maryland.* Therefore, without throwing upon the wisdom or judgment of those learned and worthy gentlemen, the least reflection, perceptible to the acutest penetration of the most microscopic eye—of the most vigilantly suspicious, I feel free to affirm that, their opinion, predicated upon the lemma, that the political territorial and financial situation of the state of Maryland, would support such a system of Public Instruction, falls to naught, when the *lemma*, which supported it, is denied and proved to be false I have already exhibited, in my former essays, the absurdity of Mr. Teackles's calculation, and as a consequent inference from two of his own lemmata, proved, that the state of Maryland would require 2,000 districts, and that 600,000 dollars, would be the annual amount of the teachers salary. This, let it be well understood, is a direct and rational deduction from his own lemmata—first, that the state of Maryland consists of 10,000 square miles, and secondly, that 5 square miles are convenient subdivisions

Mr. Teackle and Mr. Maxcy, in their remarks accompanying the report of the committee of ways and means, *undervalued* all our expenditures, and *overvalued* all our receipts, revenues and resources, in order to get their favorite schemes carried into execution by the Legislature—the former, his bill for Primary Schools, and the latter, the bill for Internal Improvement, alias the great canal-bill.—Their motives for representing the state of our Treasury in such a flourishing situation appear upon the very face of the remarks, an extract from which Mr. Teackle takes, in order to prove the competency of our finances to support his system of public instruction. The extract goes on to state that, 'should the Legislature deem it proper to commence in earnest a system of general education, *or* of internal improvements, they will perceive that the means of paying interest upon such loans as may become necessary will not be wanting.' Messrs. Teackle and Maxcy, after all their turning and twisting found the treasury could not support *both schemes*, and each anxious to recommend his own bill to the notice of the Legislature, concluded to mention them both in the close of their remarks, not however without the disjunctive conjunction *or* between them. But when their bills come before the Legislature, they contrived some how or other, to kick out the *or* from between them—and slip in the copulative conjunction *and*, which was, no doubt much more accordant with the feelings of each. Thus the legislature, instead of adopting *one* of the proposed bills and rejecting the other, adopted the *one* and referred the other to the people. Consequently, if the people by a majority of their suffages at the next October election, shall adopt the other, in stead of the expense of the *one*, as contemplated in the extract above quoted, the state will be burdened with the intolerable tax of both.

I thought Mr. Teackle had exhausted his invention at Annapolis last winter, by endeavouring to exhibit to the legislature as favourable a prospect of our fiscal situation, as possible. But since Mr. Teackle's return, he has found even that prospect to be insufficient for the support of his scheme, and consequently his inventive genius was again put in action, and his quixotic imagination became enchanted with visions, of which rational men can form but a faint conception. The Great Cumberland Road and Grand Canal are figured out, by Mr. Teackle's disturbed brains, literally lined with grog-shops, taverns, villages, towns and cities, ready to pour immense heaps of revenue, into the lap of our treasury; the penitentiary and many other things, which have been a burden and a tax upon us, almost, if not quite, as long as we have had a being as a state, are to become either profitable, or cease to be expensive, and, by some means or other, I cant tell how, we are to receive tribute from Virginia and Pennsylvania. By the by, Mr Teackle has omitted one great possibility of increasing your revenue, viz. that in the digging of that great canal, under some of those huge Alleghany mountains, there may be found a *mine-of-gold*. I hope Mr. Teackle will take this under consideration, and let us know very soon, how much, according to his calculation, we may *reasonably* expect from this source.—May Heaven have mercy upon such a visionary and theoretical Politician! upon such a wild Legislator! Don Quixote was but a fool to him.

But even if I admit all his calculations of the increase of finances, and resources, he has not approached any like 600,000 dollars, which, I repeat emphatically, is the *unavoidable* expense, deducible from the two lemmata, above alluded to.

To conclude, the Knight of the School-bill, notwithstanding the knowledge and wisdom he may be said to possess, as Aristotle said of Calisthenes, he wants *common sense.*

With high respect,
An independent man,
PUBLICOLA.

Somerset co. Aug. 14.

For the Easton Gazette.

MR. GRAHAM,

I have occasionally passed a leisure hour in reading the essays of Mr. Teackle, "A Common Farmer" and "Publicola," on the subject of Primary Schools; and, if not much edified, have been much amused. My own opinion as to the policy of adopting Mr. Teackle's system of Primary Schools at this time, is of no moment, and it is therefore withheld; but I cannot refrain from tendering to that gentleman my sincere thanks, and heart felt gratitude, for the patriotic zeal with which he has taken up the subject—nor from expressing a hope that he and I may live to see adopted a system of schools adapted to the revenues of the State and commensurate with the wants of the people, alike honourable to Maryland and beneficial to her citizens.

My object, Sir, in addressing you, is simply to notice, and to endeavour to correct the vast difference between the writers above mentioned, as to their arithmetical calculations. Although they appear to reside in the same county, they certainly could not have learned their arithmetic from the same tutor, or else one has profited more by his tuition than have the others. Mr. Teackle supposes the "terrene superficies" of the State to be 10,000 square miles, and by a correct calculation makes the number of school districts, of 5 miles square each, to be 400—and if you will, as I have been induced to do, try your skill in figures, you will find Mr. Teackle's calculation, in this particular at least, true as that 2 and 2 make 4. "Publicola" and a "A Common Farmer" have charged Mr. Teackle with a blunder; but it is they who have blundered and stumbled too.

I have a "notion," at least I have been taught to believe, that there is some little difference between a *square mile* and a *mile square*—about as much as between a salt-box and a box of salt, or between a mill-stone and a stone mill—and in *this* difference consist the errors of "Publicola" and "A Common Farmer." I cannot think Mr. Teackle altogether right; though grant him his premises, and his conclusion is undoubtedly correct. He believes the "terrene superficies" to be only 10,000 square miles: now, the mean length of the State is said to be 130 miles, and the mean breadth 110 miles, I therefore "reckon" the superficies of Maryland to be 14,300 square miles, which I "calculate" will give 572 districts of 5 miles square each, (that is 25 square miles,) and which I "guess" will allow of a school within *two and a half miles* of the door of every man within each district in the state. If then 572 Schools were thus established, and the tutors, at a salary of 300 dollars each, were each teaching 50 children, there would be 28,600 pupils, at an annual expense to the state of 171,600 dollars, or 6 dollars for each pupil.

YANKEE.

For the Easton Gazette.

To the people of Somerset.

Among the many false and scandalous libels, of nameless writers, which have appeared in opposition to the *Primary Schools*, the last essay of *'Publicola'* is most pre-eminent—In his vain attempt to refute *lemata* which had been sanctioned by the Legislature, he avers, *falsely*, that the 'actual terrene superficies of Maryland is 14,000 square miles, *according to the geography of J. E. Worcester*'—In doing this he manifests an unpardonable ignorance of the meaning of the word *'terrene,'* or he has *willfully interpolated it to support a false and wanton statement*, as *no such word can be found in the book referred to*—And all the rest of his *assumptions are entirely gratuitous and exaggerated*—The substance of these remarks may be applied to your *'Common Farmer.'*

With all the care and consideration which the magnitude of the subject so well deserves, I have examined the law of Public Instruction—The reasoning of the report upon which it was founded, and the various expositions which have been offered in illustration; and *I have not discovered either ground for amendment—numerical errors, miscalculations, or erroneous estimates*—but on the contrary the *most thorough conviction* has thence resulted that this *fabric of munificence* will be more firmly fortified in the public estimation by the most rigid scrutiny and strict examination of its foundation, and intrinsic merit—I therefore appeal to a generous people with this inquiry.

Will you prefer the verbal assertions of interested persons unsupported by any proof, or the writings of those who are ashamed to avow their names to *facts established by official documents & sustained by the unerring test of long experience?* That you will respond in favour of your best policy, and true interest, cannot be doubted—This is anticipated by one of the

COMMON PEOPLE.

For the Easton Gazette.

MR. GRAHAM,

Your paper has, of late, been adorned with the lucubrations of two exceedingly wise writers, 'Publicola' and 'Common Farmer.' These formidable masters of the pen, these Bickerstaff nay Solomons, it would seem, in their own opinion, will be grievously disappointed, no doubt, if they find their precious essays have not already convinced the people of the Eastern Shore, that the proposed law for the establishment of Primary Schools, is the offspring of downright madness, and that its author and persevering advocate, Mr. Teackle, ought straightway to be confined within the walls of a Bedlam. I have no acquaintance with either of these great men; but so far as one may judge of them from their writings, they may I think, be described in the following manner.

'Publicola' is a man somewhat in the wane of life, of 'fair round belly,' pate half bald, a big, prominent, ruddyish nose, and a countenance that gruffly demands, 'Who but me, hey?—What are the rest of ye good for?' &c. He has a valuable estate, and his marvellous fondness for acquiring money, furnishes a vivid contrast to the grunting unwillingness with which he spends it. 'Common Farmer,' is a near neighbour and intimate friend of Publicola; he also has a good estate; & though neither bald nor pursy, is in all other great qualities, not very inferior to the other; though it has been said that Publicola frequently makes a kind of tool or *cat's paw* of him, and is his oracle in most matters of consequence. This last is partly a slander—but that it is not wholly so, will appear from the following account, which, though it may prove erroneous in some trivial circumstances, will not be found so, I think, in any of its more important details.

When the Primary School law made its appearance in the papers, Publicola, 'with spectacles on nose,' with eyes intent—his countenance warped and screwed into as many folds and wrinkles as the mouth of his tight drawn purse, perused, and re-perused the act, till, dim of sight, and tortured with the view of numerous imaginary demons in the form of collectors of school taxes, he burst into a paroxysm of rage and indignation, and, calling one of his servants, bade him speed with all diligence to let Mr. 'Common Farmer' know that he wished to see him in the shortest time possible. Agreeably to his request, this other Solomon made his appearance as soon as he could, that is to say, in the course of a couple of hours.

'Well neighbour,' quoth Publicola, as soon as the other had entered, and a word or two on the weather &c. had passed—'Well, neighbour, here's a fine affair for us, this school law of Teackle's the education of every body's children to be paid by a tax; and you and I, who are rich, will, if the thing goes down next October, be obliged to pay for Tom Chit's and Ben Blunt's our Overseer's—and not only for them, but like enough for Smut's the Blacksmith's and Lapstone's, the Shoemaker's and God knows who's!'

'All true,' replied Common Farmer—'I've been thinking of it—'twill take a round tax—and there'll be school houses to build, and books to buy, and stationary and fuel, and ——— and—the thing will never do indeed—it will never do—it will fleece us—make gentlemen of beggars and beggars of gentlemen—it must be written down, sir—*You* have handled a pen in your day, hey?'

'Yes, I've a knack in that way—and you too can drive a quill upon occasion—We must get up a string of essays that will do this Teackle's business for him—attack his private character—for we shall need to make use of every thing that can assist us in carrying our purpose'

'But then' returned Common Farmer, 'I am not so sanguine of our success—people discover a great apathy about the matter—the sound of $120,000 a year does not seem to frighten them, especially as a great part of it will not come directly out of their pockets'

'Pooh! 120,000!—'twill take more than that—at all events we must make it appear so.'

But 400 districts? the Devil! man—do you take Teackle's statements for truth! If you do I dont, or at least I *wont*—we must show that 4 times 400 will never answer ——— They neglected my geography when I was a boy for the sake of my Latin—I must set about studying it—we must make use of it as some people do of the Bible—twist it a little to suit our purposes, and by a plausible statement that we can make, we'll gull some of our readers, and as for the rest, they will perhaps be too busy in electioneering, to take much notice of us or to give themselves the trouble to expose our misrepresentations—or, what is full as likely—too hostile to the law, to wish to see it done.'

'Agreed!' quoth Common Farmer—and after some further confabulation, it was determined that the two friends should, on the morrow, 'gather themself together,' at the house of Publicola, and write such thundering essays, as should blow Teackle and the Primary School law both sky high—and be hang'd to them!

Promising, when I get time, to bestow some further notice upon these two sages, and their productions, I am Mr. Editor, yours,

CERVANTES.

Somerset co Aug. 15.

To the citizens of Caroline county.

FELLOW-CITIZENS,

On Thusday the 15th inst. there was a meeting at Denton, of the Committee elected for the purpose of selecting the 4th candidate to run for the next General Assembly of Maryland. For that appointment there were a number of gentlemen presented before that body, whose characters had to undergo a thorough examination in consequence of a resolution made by a very pious, religious, upright and *temperate* gentleman from the upper district committee, and by the by, who had a very sneaking ambition to become a candidate himself, which is a fact well known of him for several years past. This very pious gentleman who never evinced a propensity in his life to partake of the social glass by way of a salute to Bacchus, after he had displayed his Chesterfieldian style of address to the feelings of that honorable body upon the subject of immorality and intemperance, found that he had to undergo the same kind of examination, & discovering that he unfortunately lived in a glass house himself, which would not bear the slightest touch, endeavoured to fly the turf by stating that he had no disposition to be a candidate, but was advised to do so by a gentleman from Greensborough. When I heard of this declaration of his indisposition, it led me to believe that he entertains as little regard for the principles of truth as for morality and temperance. After discovering a very itching desire not to stand the test before the tribunal for investigation it drew from one of the members present a declaration which I presume was not very palatable to this would be law-giver. The declaration I presume he is perfectly acquainted with. It is a fact that will be admitted by some of the gentlemen charged, that they have partook of the flowing bowl, and did not go behind the curtain to do it; as their accuser has frequently done to deceive the public, in order to stand before them as a very moral and temperate character indeed. Now I would ask you my fellow citizens, in whom would you presume the crime to be the greatest, admitting the charge to be true, those gentlemen whom he charged, not professors of religion, but as the saying is, men of the world; or this very pious gentleman, who is endeavouring to blind the eyes of the world, by professing the principles of morality, religion and temperance, and having his name enrolled upon the records of the church, guilty of all the allegations he thought proper to prefer against his competitors, to secure his own appointment? While he was enumerating the evils of which he supposed those gentlemen guilty, I think he should not have passed over the sin of hypocrisy, a failing I am inclined to think peculiar with himself for he did express favourable sentiments towards one of the individuals prior to the meeting of the 12th inst. but what was his conduct in the committee room? He attempted to assail his character in the most wanton manner, to secure his own appointment, which proves him to be a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Sometimes when I reflect upon the gentleman's language in the committee room, I am inclined to think that he could not be very serious upon the matter, knowing his own guilt, but merely gave to them the language of the tongue, and not the sentiment of the heart; and while he was thus arguing, I think the committee would have done an act of retributive justice to those individuals, who were not there to defend themselves against his foul aspersions, by pointing at him the finger of contempt, and have told him that he was giving a complete delineation of his own character, and he should have heard the exclamation from every quarter—O shame where is thy blush! Quere. Did the committee from above act in strict conformity to the interest and will of the people when they supported from their body this J. J. of E. and did the gentleman think so, when he supported himself on two ballotings and would have done so on forty more?

If this gentleman had been taken up by the committee, and afterwards on the first Monday of October next should receive a majority of the votes of the county, do you believe he could draught a bill to obtain the passage of a common hog law?

JUSTICE.

August 19, 1826.

For the Easton Gazette.

MR. EDITOR,

I see in the Star and the Gazette of Easton, most angry and violent replies to the first publication of 'Common Sense"—Rage seems to predominate over all discretion, decency, and even sense, or certainly the authors or author of 'Plain Truth' and 'Marcus' must been goaded with guilty consciences in so promptly confessing themselves to be of the class of miserable politicians animadverted on by 'Common Sense.' If these two productions are from the same Author, he must be regarded as a true Janus faced politician, a two faced man, who astutely makes himself to appear a sort of jack of both sides to serve his purpose, and who, when time shall have unveiled his deformity, will appear, like the malefactor on the jibbet, suspended between both, unworthy of either, or if these pieces proceed from different authors, then is the conclusion irresistible, the proof clear, that it is a deep conspiracy between a *caucusite and a tenant federalist* to brave public sentiment, and an arrogant attempt to write down Common Sense, and may I not justly add, every thing like common honesty in Politics.—

If you have ranked yourself (I shall use the singular for convenience of phraise, as it is immaterial whether you are one or twenty) amongst the degraded politicians of the day, the men who pursue a course to be prepared to be in with all sides, the intemperance of your language proves any thing but integrity of views, and whilst you discover the desperate condition to which you are reduced, and the despicable cause on which you rest, you give the strongest evidence of enraged and mortified detection Adjust this matter with the world, I have nothing to say to it. In vulgarity of language or coarseness of abuse I cannot contend with you—I have no connection with the haunts of base born billingsgate or shameless profligacy to enable me to suit my phraise to a reply: it will be enough to shew the two publications to be rhapsodies of vindictive intemperance and irritated rancour, as destitute of truth as they are of chastity.

The publication in the Star seems to be the production of a maniac, who has escaped from his cell, irationally pouring forth nonsensical abuse; and if there is any thing like a lucid interval in it, it is in that part which corresponds with Marcus in the Gazette, which falsely accuses "Common Sense" of being the author of a test of approbation or disapprobation of the administration for Candidates for office. One answer will serve for both, as I give the same answer to all who ask the same question—If it is the fashion of those who ask this question occasionally to affect ignorance to cover blundering honesty, it shows some fibres of remorse that are not yet dead, which might furnish a gleam of hope in the desert waste of flagitiousness which has been exhibited to us. But facts are too prominent, too generally known to afford room for this unstable hope.

That any person should attempt to say or to insinuate that the author of "Common Sense" avowed this doctrine of trying men by their attachment to the administration or not, as a proper course, or as one originating with him, is proof of a systematic departure from all those obligations which are respected in a moral community. Is it not known that the Vice President is the head of opposition to the administration—Has not Mr. Maxcy (the intimate and bosom friend of the Vice President) avowed in his late publication declining a poll for Congress, that all future elections *would* turn upon the question, "are you for Mr. Adams or Gen. Jackson"—that the merits of the Candidates were to be discarded, & their attachment or not to the administration, was to become the test? And has he not with fidelity to the test, surrendered all to his competitor who, like himself, is an advocate for Gen. Jackson? Can you have better evidence of the fact than this, coming from a candid source of opposition? I would ask too it the doctrine is not avowed in many parts of the U. States by the friends of opposition alone? when you add to all this the vehemence used in Congress against the Administration and its friends last Session, and the numerous clubs and meetings and associations, lately published in all parts of our Country by the opposition, to put down the present Administration and to elect Gen Jackson—can you doubt from whom this test proceeded? And in consequence of the impropriety of this test, thus first put forth by opposition, 'Common Sense," deprecating that determination, says "as they have forced upon the friends of Administration, this criterion, the friends of Administration must go by it in self-defence,—if forced upon them they have no alternative—he then exemplifies the result by a call upon all candidates. But the allowance of *no equivocation* on the point, seems to sting, and is wittingly perverted by Marcus to mean, that "Common Sense" is the real advocate and suggester of this test, and that he wishes to bind every man by an obligation to support the Administration right or wrong in all matters, and on this subject Marcus rings his bells and swears most lustily. When a man really misunderstands where doubt may exist, you pardon the error or pity his stupidity—but where there is no ground to doubt, and you are wilfully misrepresented, in order to make a case out against you, no epithet is too harsh to stigmatise such deliberate profligacy. Marcus knew at the time he was writing this, that he had studied to make a misrepresentation to suit his own views, and that he was not giving either the sense or the meaning, or the intention of 'Common Sense.' The whole purport and intent of what 'Common Sense' has written on this subject is to dissuade from such a state of things, and to lament the violence of party to which it might lead—he has strongly remonstrated against reducing things to a party state; and yet 'Marcus,' in his farrago of wild abusive violence, wishes to make it appear that 'Common Sense' desires and is the projector of an Administration test as a passport to station, and that he is ardently anxious to produce party conflict—Now quote me one line in all 'Common Sense,' has written, to prove this, and I yield the point; if you do not, you plead guilty at bar, and the people, whenever they know you, will pass sentence on you.

Upon putting the question to any man, Are you for or against the Administration? and requiring a direct answer without equivocation, Yes or No, does that imply or mean, that if you answer yes, I am a friend to admistration, you are necessarily or at all bound to applaud every individual act, or to support that administration in any future bad or reprehensible conduct of which it may be guilty? Does such answer fairly and rationally preclude you from a free exercise of honest opinion in future in regard to the administration? Yet see how the furious, distorting Marcus has laboured to shut out this plain truth from our eyes, and to lead us to believe, that an admission by any one (when asked) without equivocation, that he is a friend to administration, is a surrender of all free will, a slavish addiction, a humiliating and servile surrender of independence, and a great deal more of such incoherent stuff. The right of opinion is continual; all our opinions are founded on the past and are, and must be, subject to conditions in future. For instance, suppose I knew Mr. Marcus, and because he appeared to behave well for some time and sought my friendship, I was to be friendly & social with him and speak well of him, and to serve him, would that unequivocal opinion and kindness oblige me to think and to speak well of him and to associate upon the same intimate terms after I became satisfied that he had long been a secret, insidious and plotting enemy of the man, who above all others he professed and wished to be considered the friend of, and was subsequently guilty of misdemeanors, not only that one who associates with gentlemen would disdain, but no man could tolerate or even palliate? Certainly not. When we

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11029-0349.jpg