

# CAROLINA CENTINEL.

VOLUME II.]

NEWBERN, N. C. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1819.

[NUMBER 86.]

## TERMS.

THE CAROLINA CENTINEL IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

JOHN I. PASTEUR,

At THREE DOLLARS per annum, one-third payable in advance.

No paper will be discontinued until all arrearages are paid up, except at the option of the publisher.

ADVERTISEMENTS inserted at 50 cents per square the first week, and 25 cents a square for each succeeding insertion.

FROM THE PHILADELPHIA UNION.

The Quarterly Review vs. The U. States.

In the 41st number of the Quarterly Review, published in May last, we have noticed of "Bristed's Resources of the United States," and "Fearon's Sketches of America." The Reviewers have seized upon these occasions to vent their spleen and malignity against this country; and, although there is little more than a repetition of old calumnies, seasoned with new and increasing spite, there is perhaps a greater display of pretension and ignorance than even these modest gentlemen have before ventured to exhibit. They began with some stories, picked up, I suppose, if they ever happened, in the western country, of boxing matches, and duels, and frauds at elections. Now, one would imagine that these are topics, of all others, an Englishman would avoid, as the first is the favorite amusement of the greatest men in the kingdom; the second of daily occurrence, with both Lords and Commons; and the third carried to the most scandalous excess, as is proved by the records of the courts of justice, and not by the gossiping tales of book-making travelers. Our Reviewers then become learned and profound; they talk of "judges chosen by the populace"—a thing unknown in this country—of their being appointed for a short period, removable at the will of the popular and local assembly—which is untrue of all the judges under the federal government, and of by far a greater part of those appointed by the state authorities. There it is broadly stated that in "America a man cannot fill the office of a judge after he has attained the age of sixty"—and these learned critics and statesmen do not know the difference between the state of New-York, where such a provision does exist, and the United States of America, where it does not, neither in relation to the general or state governments, with the exception mentioned. But they are thus ignorant, not only of the institutions and laws of this country, but of their own also; mark the following: "that crimes committed in one part of the U. States should not be punishable in another, we could not have believed, without the authority before us." And it is then stated, that if a man kills another in New-York, and crosses a ferry into New-Jersey, "he may escape punishment altogether." And perhaps these learned jurists will not believe the authority of Sir W. Blackstone, that crimes committed in one county of England cannot be punished in another, and may therefore, most wisely conclude, that a murderer, by passing an imaginary line, may escape punishment altogether. Now, a trial by jurors of the neighborhood, that is, of the county where the fact is committed, has always been thought an excellence of the English criminal law; and these Reviewers are the first to discern that the consequence of it is an escape from punishment. The facility of transferring an offender from one state to another, for trial, is, both in theory and practice, quite as great in this country, as to take them from one county to another in England. Our ferries are as easily crossed as the dividing lines of English counties. From these premises, a sweeping condemnation is pronounced against our judges and lawyers; the first are without "weight or dignity;" and the last have nothing to exercise but wit or violence, "towards those of their profession, whom the populace have degraded to the bench."

We have the testimony of Lord Mansfield to the learning and ability of the courts of Pennsylvania; and the reports of adjudged cases in the federal and state courts, since that period, are amply sufficient to place our bar and bench on a footing with those of Great Britain. But this is a sort of reading Reviewers have not time to engage in or ability to comprehend. A book of travels is more upon a level with their wit and acquirements, and the highest authority to which they appeal.

We come now to a charge of a more serious import, & more prominent importance than any other in this article. Affirming that the law is the repository of American talents, "which, however

does not find its way to the bench, but is directed to intrigues for offices of State," our Reviewers reason thus profoundly: "hence the bar is the school in which their statesmen have been educated, and hence they have learned all those low practices of vulgar chicanery, which are easily imbibed in a profession that reaches acuteness, but is not sufficiently elevated to inspire integrity." By the bye, the most eminent statesmen of England have been educated in the same profession. But, to our own case. Our "statesmen have learned all the low practices of vulgar chicanery"—and no other merit is allowed them. I again appeal, in refutation of this calumny, to facts and documents of public notoriety; to the testimony of *Englishmen*, in comparison with whom these Quarterly Reviewers are but insects of a moment. Turn back to the various state papers published at the commencement, and during the period of our Revolutionary war, drawn by statesmen who were American lawyers—have they ever been exceeded in force of argument, in perspicuity of diction and arrangement, or in dignity of expression? If these critics can lay down the catch-penny travels, and popular poems of the day, to take up papers of this description, let them look into the volumes of the Annual Register for the proof this representation of American state papers. But, if this task should be thought too laborious for these gentlemen authors, I will refer them to the speeches of Chatham, Burke, Fox, &c. &c. for eulogies equally splendid, liberal and just; or those compositions which are declared not to be surpassed, in *dignity*, as well as argument, by any similar productions, ancient or modern, England not excepted. And yet the authors of such papers have learned nothing but "low practices of vulgar chicanery." We will proceed to a later period. During the administration of President Washington, the revolution of France, with the wars in Europe consequent to it, introduced a system of outrage upon neutral rights, which brought our government into a very sharp collision with both England and France. The correspondence between our cabinet and the ministers of these powers embraced a consideration of the most extensive and intricate questions of national law. To that correspondence I confidently appeal for the ability, learning, and integrity of American statesmen: and let the most prejudiced say, whether they exhibit nothing but the "practices of vulgar chicanery." There is no inferiority of learning, talent, or integrity, to their adversaries in the contest; and there is much superiority in the argument.

We will now advert to a third occasion, on which our American statesmen came in conflict with those of England. I refer to the late negotiations at Ghent. Appealing again to the published documents, as the best evidence of the abilities of the respective negotiators, I will add the opinion of the Marquis of Wellesley, the idol of the Quarterly Reviewers, and unquestionably a man of most comprehensive genius and acquirements. He declared, in his place, in the House of Lords, that he was at a loss to account for the astonishing superiority of the American Commissioners in the negotiations and correspondence at Ghent. We must not forget, now, that the British Commissioners were so near at home as to be able to obtain, and actually to receive, the advice and assistance of the British ministry, on all difficult points. We may now dismiss the charge of "vulgar chicanery," upon our statesmen; having most abundantly shown it to be nothing better than vulgar abuse, founded on extreme ignorance or wilful misrepresentation. The assertion that no lawyers go to Congress, but those whose practice is so little, that the pay of six dollars a day is a sufficient inducement for them to abandon their homes, and live at a cheap boarding house in Washington, is equally silly and untrue. The journals of Congress will show the names of the most eminent lawyers of this, or any country, enrolled as its members.—Madison, Ames Bayard, Dexter, Stockton, Ross, are but mentioned out of a hundred that might be enumerated.—Mr. Bayard being one of the commissioners who exhibited such an astonishing superiority over the whole talents and learning of the British cabinet, backing their redoubtable commissioners.

The observations of the Reviewers upon the state of religion and education, in this country, would require more space and time than I can give to them now; besides, they are more matters of opinion than facts susceptible of direct evidence; and, therefore, I leave them, and proceed to other topics. In proof of the "leprosy of wickedness and crime" that has stained our people, it is said, that, in New-York, there are "three thousand

houses licensed to sell spirituous liquors," whilst "in London, with more than ten times its population, the number scarcely exceeds four thousand." A word of explanation exposes the pitiful fallacy and equivocation of this statement. Thus, the three thousand houses in New-York, include all the grocers and retailers of liquors, as well as the tavern keepers; whereas, the latter only are reckoned in the four thousand in London. Nobody is stupid enough to believe either that there are three thousand licensed tavern keepers in the city of New-York or that there are but four thousand persons who sell spirituous liquors in London.

The prophecy, that, "in a few generations, the negro race will exceed the white, in all except the eastern states," has about as much probability in it, as there is truth in the assertion, that the number of slaves in the United States is now more than two millions; and that the black population constitutes more than one fourth part of the whole. Does the author of such assertions imagine there are no authentic documents to refer to, to test his truth? or does he presume that the people of Great Britain will believe them without examination or proof? At the census taken in 1810, the whole slave population was 1,191,364—not greatly exceeding the paupers of England actually chargeable upon the public; and, however, our negroes may be, "weakness and not strength," their labor must still count for something in the national wealth, while the million of paupers who feed on the labor and industry of others in England, are exhausting its national strength, and have become a source of more immediate and menacing danger than all our negroes. When the slaves amounted to 1,191,364, the whole population was 7,239,903, and no fair estimate of the free black population can make the whole equal to one fourth of the white. In 1810, the white population was nearly 6,000,000, and the whole black population but about 1,200,000. By what arithmetic is this more than one fourth of 6,000,000? The assertion, that, "the increase of the slaves and people of color appear to have been much greater, in proportion, than that of the white population," is equally destitute of the truth.—What a comparison does our situations, in this respect, make with the West India dominions of Great Britain? who has, as these Reviewers have said, given universal liberty to the world. We will present the picture for the information of these gentlemen, who seem to have too much imagination to regard truth, and too little leisure to examine facts.

Jamaica has 319,912 slaves, being at least nine tenths of its population.  
Bermuda—a population of about 10,000, of whom nearly one half are negroes.  
Dominico—slaves, 21,727—whites, 1,325—free persons of color, 2,988.  
Demarara—slaves, 71,180—whites, 2,871.  
St. Vincent—whites, 827—slaves, 22,020.

The slave population of Barbadoes exceeds 60,000—of Antigua, 30,568.

An attempt is made to depreciate the strength of our population for the purposes of war. It is, however, admitted to be tolerably powerful for defensive war, but totally incompetent for offensive operations—and long may it remain so. We desire but to defend ourselves and our rights—and Great Britain has received such lessons as have satisfied her of our ability to do this; while she has given us a lesson of the folly of sending armies abroad for conquest or glory. We are told, with a sort of contemptuous comparison, that "Prussia, whose population does not exceed that of the United States, brought into the field an army ten times more numerous and better disciplined than all the regular troops which America could muster;—and Portugal, with less than half the population of North America (meaning the United States,) marched a greater force into France than the United States have ever been able to bring into the field." And how stands Prussia now? with her revenues and credit both exhausted—living on loans, and sinking under a depreciated currency and heavy taxation—while the United States have repaid their war taxes, paid off a great part of their debt, and are in full credit at home and abroad. While, to suit the object of this part of the review, our population is swelled into so much importance, in another place, when for another object it is convenient to degrade it, it is "less than that of the second rate states of Europe." What then is Prussia and Portugal; the one is but equal to us in this respect, and the other minus, by one half—what is England herself, who, exclusive of Scotland, which adds not greatly to her strength, and Ireland, which, to her, is "weakness and not strength," has not a population much exceeding that of

the United States? We may now be fairly estimated at ten millions, and England does not exceed twelve.

Here follows an attempt, evidently made with pain and mortification, to account for our naval victories over the "mistress of the ocean," by the old stories of big ships and British seamen—who fought so much better on board of our vessels than their own, because they had "the halter round their necks;" by which we are given to understand, that an Englishman can be made to fight as he ought to do, only by the fear of a gallows.

As to the remarks upon the depressed and embarrassed state of the finances of the general government, at the close of the late war, it is sufficient to say, that it is true they were exceedingly so; the prices of the public stock show the extent of the difficulty; but it must also be remembered that the resources of the people of the United States were full and ample, and would have been offered to the support & contest, as long as Great Britain could have found it convenient to continue it. Indeed, the peace was quite as opportune for her as for us. In proof of this we have seen that, immediately on the restoration of peace, the public credit was at a moment, restored; the general coffers were filled from the ordinary sources of revenue; the internal taxes wholly repealed, and the prosperity of the country flourished, as before. Is there this elasticity in any of the governments of Europe, even this boastful England? Every war there has furnished an apology for some new burdens upon the people; but no peace has ever yet been made which removed them.

I omit to notice many details of ignorance and calumny, scattered through this review of "Bristed's Resources"—they are either so stale as to require no refutation, or so silly as to deserve none: I hasten to the concluding paragraph, in which, after affecting to be exceedingly amused with our "American vanity," and our expectations of future greatness and power, the Reviewer proceeds: "The inhabitants of New South Wales might, with equal reason, indulge the same lofty expectations. They are indeed a century behind their transatlantic brethren; [much more nearly related to the reviewers than to us,] but their population has increased faster, [by the increase of the rogues and convicts of England] their country is more extensive, their soil more fertile, and their climate far more salubrious." Yes, gentlemen Reviewers, when your brethren of Botany Bay shall have maintained a seven years' war against their haughty mother, when they shall have exhausted and defeated her almost strength, and compelled her with the deepest humiliation and most painful reluctance, to acknowledge their independence, and receive those as equals she had for seven years denounced as traitors and rebels; then let the inhabitants of New South Wales, that hopeful shoot from the parent tree in England, "indulge the same lofty expectations" as the people of these United States. When these "embryo statesmen, philosophers, and warriors, having thus vanquished the power of G. Britain and thrown off her galling fetters, shall freely & deliberately frame for themselves a government which the wisest and best men of all nations, not excepting England, have eulogized, as combining most happily the securities of liberty with the energies of government; and when, under the protection and influence of such a government, they shall, in a few years, reach an elevation of power of the first rank; extend and establish a commerce, second but to one on earth; then let them "indulge our lofty expectations." When again engaged in a sanguinary contest with the same haughty and unrelenting enemy, they shall cut down armies of her invincible troops, sink and capture her vessels of war, in fair and equal combat, singly and in fleet; vanquish her on that element on which the world has long consented she should be supreme, & proudly called her home; and make the drapery of their Navy Office of British flags; then let the convicts of Botany Bay, the offspring of the poverty and crimes of England, the brethren in blood and principle of the English reviewers, be compared to the people of the United States, and "indulge the same lofty expectations." It is undeniable, that no power has ever broken down the pride, pretensions and character of Great Britain, as the United States have done. It began with the revolution, in which we captured two entire armies, scattered her commerce, wore out her strength, and drew her to an ignominious peace. It has continued since in the cabinet, on the ocean, in the field; wherever we have met her as an adversary, she has parted from us humbled in the sight of the world, mortified and discomfited.

Of the thinking and liberal people of

England, I would ask, of what avail are these miserable assaults upon this country? They but excite resentments in those who are unwilling to indulge them; and bitter those who have before felt them. Assuredly, the petty mercenary scribbler of a quarterly pamphlet cannot be so infatuated with folly and importance as to believe the estimation we shall be held by the world or ourselves, can be in the least affected by this periodical exhibition of malevolence and ignorance. The people of Great Britain, themselves the readers and feeders, the patrons and paymasters of these pamphleteers, are not so grossly stupid as to be deceived by such representations. They will remember that the same sort of contempt of the character, spirit, & strength of this country was poured forth by their little politicians at the beginning of the revolutionary war; and they well remember what humiliation and disgrace their administration brought on itself by encouraging and listening to such tales. But if every man, woman, and child, in Great Britain, shall choose to adopt the opinions and feelings of the Quarterly Review, of what importance is it to us? We are desirous of cultivating friendly and respectful sentiments with the people of that country; but if they imagine they can play off a game of superiority and contempt upon us, they will find we shall regard it as little as we did the noise of their menaces, and the force of their arms. Standing above the reach of their power, we cannot be touched by their derision; whenever it shall be necessary, we know how to make them respect us.

In the review of Fearon's Works, these critics observe, that "a spirit of hostility towards England is but too prevalent in the United States; a spirit which is industriously kept up by the Cobberts, the Emmetts, the McNeivins, the Shamrock Society, and, above all, by the editors of newspapers; who are generally Scotch or Irish rebels, or felons who have defrauded the gallows of its due." If this catalogue of causes be correct, there is another, yet equally potent with any of them, which has been omitted; that is, such publications as the Quarterly Review. Coming directly from the metropolis of England, under the eye of the court, it is supposed to have high authority for its conduct; and to indicate settled design with greater men than reviewers, to insult and degrade this country in the eyes of the people of England, and the rest of Europe. If the friendship of the United States be thought of any importance by the governing politicians of Great Britain, it behoves them to change the tone of the Quarterly Reviewers, which doubtless, a frown or smile would do. In truth, those pure and patriotic critics are but the coadjutors and allies of the "Scotch and Irish rebels, the felons who have defrauded the gallows of its due." They labor in the same cause, acting different parts, but to the same end. One abuses America, the other Great Britain; but both keep up that spirit of hostility the Reviewers affect to lament.

If there be any employment which degrades the intellect and corrupts the heart, it must be that of a man who writes, not on the impulses of genius, or the spontaneous efforts of his own mind, but by contract as to time, subject, and sentiments; who binds himself to furnish, at stated periods, a dish of a given size, suited to the taste of his paymasters, seasoned to their palates, and adapted to their digestion. How soon must such a man lose all perception of moral beauty, all regard for truth, all sense of decorum, and become the thoughtless and heartless instrument of interest not his own; the slave of other men's passions and prejudices, the habitual fabricator of calumny and fraud! The genius and learning of such a man, like the beauty and accomplishments of a prostitute, may enhance the price of his services, but cannot elevate or purify his calling. How unlike the independent and honorable man of letters, who employs his talents to vindicate truth, to embellish virtue, and improve mankind!

Of the review of "Fearon's Sketches," it is enough to say, that it is more low and vulgar, more false and slanderous, than the preceding. News-papers are gleaned for advertisements of absconding husbands, probably not Americans; and electioneering conversations picked up from the mouths of butchers and porters, to obtain an insight into the character and mind of this people? Are the people of England willing to be judged in this way? Shall we resort to the battings between blackguards at an election, to decide how they "act in their political capacity;" and pronounce, thereupon, that "it is all bruise and wound, and putrifying sore?" The unconcealed fraud, the dangerous, and sometimes fatal, violence of an English election, can be sur-