



CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION

csac.history.wisc.edu > Document Collections > Popular Culture and Ratification > The Use of Ad Hominem Attacks During the Ratification Debates > Attacks on Antifederalists

Junius

Massachusetts Gazette, 25 January 1788 (excerpts)

To AGRIPPA.—Concluded.

. . . anti-federalists . . . glory in the principles of Shayism. You say, sir, that the men who framed the old confederation are against the new plan of government. . . . You say, that you appeal to any man of unbiassed judgment, whether his feelings tell him, that there is any danger at all in rejecting the new plan. You further say, that you ask not the palsied or the jaundiced, nor men troubled with bilious or nervous affections, for they can see danger in every thing. It is then plain, sir, that you do not address your question to those of your own stamp, for they are the men who see with jaundiced eyes, and shake, as it troubled with the palsy, at the idea of vesting an efficient power in a federal head, to promote their own prosperity and happiness. Antifederalists are the men who are troubled with bilious and nervous affections, and had you made your appeal to them, you might have expected an affirmative answer to your question. But, sir, if you appeal to the good sense of enlightened and liberal minds, your question will most certainly be answered in the negative. The illustrious WASHINGTON, (whose character as well as others of the convention, in some of your publications, you censured, infamously censured)³ has recently given it as his opinion, that anarchy will follow the rejection of the federal constitution. The distance, you say, from the seat of government, will make it extremely difficult for the constituents to get information of the conduct of their representative. This assertion is puerile and weak, and you must have inserted it barely with the view of lengthening out your absurd harrangue. . . . If, however, such a thing should happen, as that the conduct of a representative should be misrepresented, it is hoped, on his return home if he should find an assembly of the people convened for any particular purpose, and his town have not thought him an object worthy to represent them in that assembly, that he will not pitifully sneak in and accept of a seat in it, when a majority of the sensible and honest part of the assembly view him in a most contemptible light, though for various reasons, a greater number of hands may be held up to invite him, than otherwise. We shall, in our elections, you say, have all the intrigue, cabals and bribery practised, which are usual at elections in Great-Britain. This is a bugbear of your own begetting, a mere chimera of your fanatick brain, without reason or probability to support it. However ripe you may be, sir, for caballing, intriguing and bribery, it is hoped your colleagues are few.

You tell us, if we accept of the constitution, we shall be bought and sold again—and that to accept it under an idea that we can amend it, is sporting with fire-brands, arrows and death, and an hundred other absurdities, founded on your own crazy imagination; your productions are

a jumble of words, which convey ideas foreign to the subject you pretend to discuss, and are even a disgrace to the cause you try to support. Your opinion is as fickle as the wind, and liable to be changed by one w—n as well as another. . . .

CITE AS: *The Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution*, ed. John P. Kaminski, et al, Ratification by the States, Volume V: Massachusetts, No. 2, (Madison, Wis.: Wisconsin Historical Society Press, 1998), 799-802