



AND

North-Carolina State Gazette.

Ours are the plans of fair and faithful Peace,
Unwar'd by party rage, to live like Brothers.

Vol. XII.

THURSDAY OCTOBER 25, 1810.

No. 579

National Question.

FROM THE AURORA.

NEUTRAL COMMERCE.

SIR—I think it proper to keep in view the real state of our present situation, and the true grounds on which we now stand, with the belligerents of Europe—I have shewn,

1st. That we held out to the belligerents—favor to that power which should first respect our rights, and—penalty to that power which should refuse to respect them, after the other had ceased to violate them.

2d. That France has revoked her decrees in compliance with this our *proffer*; that she now stands upon the *spirit and letter of our law*—our national engagement; and that France does not require any other condition, than that which our law offered.

3d. That we have now only to say to Britain, "you have violated our rights upon the plea of retaliation against France; you have said that if France would abandon her decrees, you would revoke yours—France has abandoned her decrees, the plea of retaliation, therefore, no longer avails you, fulfil your promise now by doing us justice!"

These are the actual grounds upon which we now stand.

The next question for consideration, is, will Britain now do, what her own ministers and her emissaries in America have so often said she would do?

In this place it may be well to shew what are the restrictions of the Berlin & Milan decrees, and what change their removal will produce. Those decrees subjected Americans to seizure—if taken going to or returning from a British port—if they paid a tax to England, or otherwise submitted to her regulations—if they conveyed British manufactured goods or British colonial produce—if they sailed under British convoy—and if they even touched at a British port, they were forbidden to enter France. Of course from the 1st of November next, our vessels may trade as fully and as freely, if the British will not molest them, as they did before any French Decree was passed, or before the French Revolution itself.

This freedom to trade to and from England and in any English goods, has been said to be the *sole object* of Britain. But we shall now, at length, find what has been so steadily predicted by Democratic writers, that all this talk about *retaliation*, &c. has been false; we shall find that Britain never intended to respect our rights, and that we must now at the *eleventh hour*, take other means to make her respect them, or sink into everlasting disgrace as a nation.

That Britain will not now do, what it has been so often pretended she wished to do, I contend from a consideration of her established policy, her uniform conduct, and the avowals now made by her ministerial newspapers in London, and in Boston, and in New-York, and other of our seaports.

The policy of Britain is written in bloody characters upon the pages even of her own historians: by the hand of nature destined to be a nation only of the second or third order, it has been her steady purpose to rise above her destiny, and to support by force or fraud a pre-eminence amongst nations. Had her efforts been crowned by a generous ambition, by those ennobling passions which constitute glory; on the freedom, happiness, and civilization of the world; upon the diffusion of science and the promotion of virtue; had her enterprises been even flattered with the chivalrous spirit of emancipating nations, and converting the universe into a social communion of interests and enjoyments; the generosity of the intention would have palliated the extravagance of the undertaking; but when her actual policy is considered, and we analyse it; what a design and what a catastrophe does it present! selfishness is every where predominant, and millions are famished, massacred or enslaved, in order that a few thousand persons occupying only part of an island of about 400 by 300 square miles in the north of Europe, should live in luxury and wealth; at the expense and to the subjugation of the rest of the world. Where is there a commercial state in Europe that has escaped the seduction of her gold or the rapacity of her squadrons: destitute of resources for manufactures, she has prevented the superiority which the possession of

those resources naturally gave to her neighbors, by involving them in constant wars with each other, & hence has contrived one mean of establishing her monopoly, and prospering in wealth upon the miseries of other nations; by similar means, by fomenting intestine broils, exciting jealousies, by temptations and bribes, she has arrayed the nations of two quarters of the globe against each other, in one of which she has subjected 60,000,000 of people to her rapacity; on the European continent by granting subsidies she has taken care to employ continental nations in war with each other upon the land, which have at last terminated in her expulsion from it; whilst she has raised a navy upon the ocean capable of crushing all commercial intercourse, or what she fears most, commercial competition.

To secure this monopoly of manufactures and commerce & colonial rapine, she has been contending for above five centuries; is it likely then, that she will now stop in her career, to enable us to enter into a competition with, or what she fears, to sap the foundation of her monopoly? do not our merchants know the deadly jealousy, with which our commercial progress has been viewed throughout the war? however inimical to France, must they not admit that our commercial prosperity is declared by Britain to be incompatible with her interests?

If this be admitted, as it must be openly by every honest American merchant who has a grain of understanding, and covertly by every British partizan or agent, let me ask what would be the effects, if Britain were to "respect our neutral rights?"

In the first place, one great source of her revenue would be destroyed; we cannot now take our cargoes to the continent without first calling at an English port, taking out licence and paying duties for the permission; this tribute helps to support the navy, which compels us to submit to it; is it likely that this tribute will be given up?

In the next place, we should be able according to Lord Sheffield, to destroy the whole merchant trade, now carried on under licence, smuggling, &c. because we can build ships much cheaper, and we can navigate them cheaper than Britain—is it likely that we shall be allowed to do so?

France at all times afforded a better market than Britain for our staple commodities, and therefore Britain obliges us to make her ports the medium of trade, in order that by imposing duties on our productions, her own might be sold as cheap as ours; and in order that, by enhancing the price of cotton, &c. France might not be able to manufacture so cheaply as to secure our trade—will Britain abandon this policy? Can any man of sense suppose she will voluntarily enable us to excel her in trade, and France to excel her in manufacturing?

Although France is at peace with the north, our timber, tar, turpentine, &c. would be highly acceptable to her on account of her fleets—will Britain consent to abandon paper blockades, which are the only obstructions to our entrance with those articles?

France now possessing every description of new machinery, and having the command of her own Merino wool and of that of some of the flocks of Spain, can supply fine woollen cloths at a lower rate than the British manufacturers, and her fine woollens are already superior in every respect to the British: if we furnish cotton, France can enter into competition in cotton goods—will Britain allow this rivalry to go unmolested?

France and Spain consume large quantities of fish, now smuggled into those countries by Britain—can we reasonably expect that she will see us, who have the ability to supply them, in legitimate possession of that trade, to her exclusion?

France can supply us with wines, oils, brandies, fruits, cloths, silks, ribbons, laces, linens, jewelry, haberdashery, and fancy articles, cheaper than Britain can furnish them; her manufactures in iron and other metals, are progressing wonderfully in Flanders and Normandy, and the quality of many superior to the British, yet we, are now compelled to buy the greater part of them in England—will she consent to let us change the channel of trade?

All these questions are so plain, that no discerning man can hesitate to answer in the negative; and to such as doubt, I offer the conduct of Britain, prior to, and during this war, as the most satisfactory evidence, that we shall de-

lude ourselves by anticipating the abandonment of the British maritime system; I say her maritime system, because the mere repeal of the Orders in Council would amount to nothing, especially as the Marquis Wellesley has declared that, if the Orders in Council were revoked, the prior acts infringing our rights, would not therefore cease to be in operation.

Let any person review the conduct of Britain, to the Flemings, to the Hansetowns, to the Dutch, French, Spaniards, Portuguese, Russians, Turks, Genoese, Swedes and Danes, even to the Irish, and then say whether we have ought to expect from her; why should she regard our rights and interests any more than she valued those of every other commercial state? why should we alone be spared, who are more likely than any other nation to destroy her commercial supremacy?

There is no necessity for long explanatory answers, to these questions; they were answered in 1793, and have been replied to every year since with accumulation of insolence and severity. We have been more abused, if not openly & much more ignominiously, than any other commercial state that ever existed; and this shews that we are justly considered as the most dangerous rival Britain ever had to contend with in trade and mercantile resources.

At the commencement of the war, the policy of Britain was developed, she had not then, she did not pretend to have, any right to retaliate; for at that time France had not a single decree in force against neutrals; who then can expect that Britain will now consent to abandon the policy which she adopted in 1793? The same motives which induced her to adopt it, before any pretext for retaliation existed, will compel her to adhere to it, now that all pretext for retaliation is removed.

Besides it must be well known, that, although we have meanly submitted to the orders of Great-Britain not to go to France, we have never ceased to disregard the decrees of France interdicting us from Britain; no direct favor, therefore, will be done to England, by the repeal of the Berlin and Milan decrees, and therefore she will have no motive to change her policy towards us—her motives will be on the contrary more strong for a more excessive pressure upon American commerce.

These arguments, founded upon a consideration of the interests & conduct of Britain if they require any corroboration, are emphatically enforced by the avowals of British ministerial newspapers in Europe and America, made subsequent to the publication of Champagny's letter. I allude particularly to the remarks of the London Courier, (the ministerial official print), which are adopted as a text by the British emissaries, on this side of the Atlantic.

The Courier says:—"It is to be remarked that Bonaparte affects to prescribe conditions to the revocation of his decree—he considers America as pledged to oppose us, if we refuse to acknowledge the rights of neutrals; that is, to go to war—and he desires it to be understood, that in consequence of his decrees, Great Britain is to revoke her Orders in Council, and abandon her new principles of blockade. Now he knows full well that America has made no such pledge; that she has prescribed herself a line of conduct to be pursued in the event of our refusing to rescind our Orders in Council—she pledges herself to do nothing more than stop all intercourse with us."

The remarks in my last letter, in a great measure, answer this paragraph. I quote it however, in this place, in order to prevent a mis-conception of the true state of the case.

France does not merely affect to consider us pledged to maintain our rights, she considers us absolutely bound to do so; and so we are—we are pledged by our own voluntary act, to oppose Britain, if she refuses to cease her violations of our rights; but it is not true that we are bound, nor does France consider us bound, to go to war; we have made no pledge, but to cease from all trade and intercourse with the power refusing to respect our rights, and hence Champagny says we are to cause our rights to be respected, "conformably to the law" of May 1810; whatever France may wish, she asks no more than this, and this we have bound ourselves to do.

But it is what follows the above paragraph, that immediately claims my notice: the Courier proceeds:

"As to the new principles of blockade, we exercise none now which we shall be at all inclined to abandon—and we have given a sufficient proof of this in the very first act of our government, after they were informed of this new decree (revoking the Berlin and Milan decrees)—we have declared the canal of Corfou to be in a state of blockade, and have thus shut the entrance into the Adriatic."

Here, I think, is evidence sufficient to remove all doubts respecting the future conduct of Britain; no man can seriously suppose, after this, that Britain, (to use the language of our law of May last) "will so revoke or modify her edicts, as that they shall cease to violate the neutral commerce of the United States;" we know now that she will persist in her paper blockades, we know that Mr. Madison and Mr. Monroe, Mr. Smith and Mr. Pinkney, have constantly protested against those blockades, "as violating the rights of the U. States," & of course, the penalty defined by law must be inflicted.

Indeed the pretext for refusing to abandon paper blockades, is as insulting as the measure itself is injurious: I refer the reader to the remarks at large, but their substance is this—"France has succeeded in shutting us, her enemy, out of the continent, therefore what we belligerents cannot enjoy ourselves, we will not let you, neutrals, enjoy; and, since we cannot actually blockade every port by ships of war, we, masters of the seas, declare that paper proclamations shall have as much effect as actual investment."

Such is the language of the English official paper, such will be the conduct of the British government; they will not abandon the measures, which "violate our neutral commerce," because their commercial monopoly depends upon their maritime tyranny and the depression of every other nation's commercial activity; they will not abandon them, now that France has revoked her decrees, because they enforced the same tyrannical system before those decrees of France existed; they will not abandon them, because they have passed a new blockading order violating neutral rights, since France announced the abandonment of her decrees.

A heavy responsibility, therefore, rests upon the American administration in the first instance, from which we know they will not shrink, and ultimately upon Congress: now indeed the crisis has arrived. France has rendered negotiation unnecessary: action, prompt and vigorous action, will soon be necessary to our honor and our safety.

What our government should or will do, I will venture to consider in another letter. SIDNEY.

From the National Intelligencer.

SULLY.....No. X.

BANKS, &c.

In a late number, I suggested the expediency of giving to the Agriculture & Manufactures of the country at least an equal encouragement with that afforded to its Commerce. Believing conscientiously, if this should be done, that it would furnish the most effectual remedy in our power to the evils we endure from the injustice of the foreign world, I now proceed to submit to the consideration of the public some of the details which, in my opinion, ought to characterise a plan for this purpose.

It is most consonant to the theory of our government (and should it not correspond with its practice?) to leave personal industry to its own intelligence and exertions. This principle should never be violated. No one can entertain a doubt of this who contemplates the unprecedented rapidity with which we have by respecting it more than any other people, progressed in prosperity. Had we rightly regarded and applied it universally, no occasion would have existed for these remarks—not would probably, at this hour, our foreign relations be involved in so much gloom. Individuals, in the pursuit of their interests, would have engaged themselves on objects that afforded them the best profits, and all these objects, being left by government, without either fetters or bounties, would have been prosecuted according to the wants of society. No one branch would have been extended to a dangerous length; all would have been encouraged in proportion to the real demand.

A different course, however, has been pursued. Whether this sprung from accident or policy, the effect is the same—The artificial encouragement given to one kind of occupation has tended to impoverish all the rest, extending the former beyond, while it reduced the latter below their proper and wholesome limits.

However this allegation may be controverted, its proof lies in a narrow compass. Monied institutions have been occasionally incorporated by the general & state governments, whose funds were almost exclusively loaned to merchants, to an amount exceeding fifty millions of dollars, an amount double, perhaps treble, the whole specie of the country. It is idle to say that these institutions were not confined by their charters to loan to traders; the facts are indisputable, that such were the terms on which they were empowered to lend money, and particularly the shortness of the time (not exceeding sixty days) that few, but merchants residing in towns, could avail themselves of the benefits derivable from such loans, and that few but merchants actually asked for or got them.

Had these institutions been entirely private, but a small part of this effect would have been produced. It was the act of incorporating them that gave them the great ascendancy they soon acquired. In the one case, as the bankers would have been responsible in their whole fortunes for the transactions in which they were engaged, the banking business would have been gone into with circumspection; and its profits being drawn, as those of every other business, from the sagacity and attention of those engaged in it, competition would have kept it on a level with the wants of the public. But, in the other case, the incorporation invariably created a monopoly, which gave the company incorporated an advantage over every individual or private association. Such were the immediate effects of this, that the money of the farmer and the country gentleman soon left its usual channels and lodged in the vaults of the banks.—It had previously been employed directly in meliorating the soil, under the direction of its proprietor, or some poorer neighbor to whom he loaned it at the legal rate of interest. It now found itself under the direction of bank directors, who took special care to distribute it in such a way as to benefit those of their own calling. Should the accuracy of this statement be questioned, I need only appeal to the acknowledged fact, that before these institutions were established, the ability of the farmer to borrow money at legal interest, on the security of his own real estate, was general—while now it is scarcely possible to make such a loan in any part of the United States.

I am aware that there are a set of politicians, who view themselves as eminent practical economists, who aver that the prosperity of communities, in all their classes, is best promoted by concentrating, as much as possible, the specie of a country in a few large towns.—But, however this doctrine may apply to a Monarchical or Aristocratical Government, or to a nation of limited soil, I apprehend that it is altogether inapplicable to a Republic, particularly when it is founded in a country, whose territory extends more than thirteen hundred miles in one direction, and more than fifteen hundred in another. Should the example of England, on this head, be held up as a model to other nations, it must be admitted that they should not be called upon to imitate it, unless under circumstances in some measure similar to her own. And what similarity can be found between a nation whose wealth principally flows from commerce and manufactures, and one whose future as well as present prosperity must depend principally on agriculture? Finally, what similarity is there between a Monarchy, that is founded on monopoly and inequality of rank, and a Republic, whose preservation depends upon a general distribution of wealth and inequality of condition. If the example of such a nation as Great-Britain is eternally to be held up before us, when we are investigating the wisest policy for us to pursue, it ought to be as a beacon for us to shun, rather than a model to imitate. For from us be the gloomy day which shall behold us resembling in manner, in morals, in government, or the condition of her subjects, that ill-fated nation, where the happiness of one is almost invariably built on the wretched-