NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER,

AND

WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

Vol. III. WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. *No. CCCCLVII.*

Five Dolls. Per ann. MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26th, 1803. *Paid in advance*

WASHINGTON CITY.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26.

The discussions which have lately taken place in our prints respecting European affairs indicate a contrariety of opinion, on some points of considerable importance, among those who generally think alike. This difference of opinion does not appear to be so much the result of hostile principles, as of various views taken of the same subjects, necessarily arising from an independent exercise of judgment; and may, therefore, be considered as an evidence of integrity and aversion to conform, without conviction, to prevailing sentiments.

While the friends of liberty agree in the great principles, and harmonise in the measures essential to protect it, it is not necessary, or ought to be expected, that they will coincide in every other respect. Any slight variance of opinion that may arise among them, on subordinate points, while exhibited with good temper and decorum, can be of little, if any disservice to the great cause in which they are engaged. But it certainly is of great importance that good temper and decorum should be rigidly observed: we consider it much to the honor of republican editors that few exceptions to this deportment have been manifested; and that those few have been more the result of unconscious feeling, than of deliberate design.

The diversity of opinion to which we allude relates to,

1. The question whether England or France is the aggressor in the present war.
2. Whether we have most to dread from French or English triumphs.
3. Whether it is just or prudent fully and freely to publish opinions entertained of foreign governments.

This controversy has in a great measure arisen from the remarks of the editor of the Ægis justificatory of the declaration of war by England against France, on account of the alleged ambition and spirit of aggrandizement of the government of the latter. This charge against France was immediately repelled by the Boston Chronicle, and similar motives ascribed to England. It is scarcely necessary to state that both these prints have displayed enlightened exertions in favor of liberty, and an ardent attachment to the measures of the present administration, the motives of both are, therefore, to be considered as equally upright.

It is certainly no easy matter to determine which government provoked the war. A view of the grounds of dissatisfaction already exposed will clearly shew that each government had given the other sufficient cause for war. Whether, however, war was expedient on the part of either admits of great doubt. We should be inclined to say it was not, did we not perceive a steady progress of both nations to a state of things, which could only terminate in war. This was probably the reason, why England determined to arrest this progress, and embark her great maritime resources against her enemy before she should be able to create a preponderant force.

As to the *second* point, whether we have most to dread from French or English triumphs—we have no hesitation in saying that we should be less injured by the successes of France than by those of England. Because we have more to fear from the overgrown power of England, than of France; inasmuch as England, by means of her great marine, is enabled to extend the scene of her injustice to a much greater extent than France with her land forces, and inasmuch as England, from commercial rivalry, would be more likely to attempt to crush our growing trade than France. It is not, however, to be inferred from these remarks that it is the interest of this country that the English government should be subverted or the English nation conquered by the power of France. Directly the reverse is the fact. Each government appears to be actuated by an inordinate ambition, only to be checked by the power of the other; and our peace, no less than that of Europe, depends upon the equipoise of both.

There is another view of which this point is susceptible, which may produce a result somewhat different. Considering solely the relation of these two nations to the several European powers, they have probably more to dread from the power of France than that of England; inasmuch as on the continent the land forces of France are more formidable than the British navy. This is evident from England being without an ally, while France is in close alliance with a majority of the nations of Europe. The very circumstance, therefore, that renders it *our interest* that England should not gain any important successes over France, renders it the interest of most of the nations of Europe, that she should gain those successes. In one point, however, the interest of Europe becomes identified with our interest; to wit: in the hope that no such success may attend the arms of either power, as shall essentially destroy the balance at present existing between them.

If this statement be just, there is nothing in the present struggle between France and England that ought to enlist our passions on the side of either. Some interest we undoubtedly will feel in a contest carried on with almost unprecedented fury. But there are no circumstances attending it which ought to disturb those sentiments of general good will that we should cultivate for the whole world. It is not a contest, from the termination of which, be that termination what it may, we can be vitally injured. Nor is there any great principle whose success depends upon the issue. It is not a war between tyrants and their oppressed subjects: but one between the oppressors of nations. The name of liberty, how often soever invoked, has nothing to do with it.

The discussion, however of these points, is in our opinion of little importance compared with that which involves the question, whether it be just or prudent fully and freely to publish opinions entertained of foreign governments. On the former points there undoubtedly may exist great diversity of sentiment among those who in general think alike, as there is no important principle involved. In the latter *there is* an important principle involved; and we do believe that a clear exposition of its nature and effects will greatly, if not altogether, insure a harmony of judgment.

It is of the essence of a republican government, not only to tolerate, but to invite a free investigation of public measures. Liberty depends upon it. Tyranny begins wherever this freedom ends. It is our greatest glory that this inestimable right exists in its full vigor among us. We love our government, we approve the wisdom of its measures, and defend them on all proper occasions and in all suitable ways. But we respect still more the principle that protects the freest investigation of their conduct.—Part of these measures are connected with the measures of foreign governments. Their wisdom depends, either altogether, or in a great degree, upon the general conduct of a particular foreign government to us, or on its general conduct to others, or on both. So far then it is our right, it is our duty, in examining the conduct of our own rulers, to pass judgment on the conduct of the rulers of other nations. We cannot do the one, without the other.

Now, it is no difficult task to demonstrate that, however detached we may be in some respects from foreign governments, we are in other respects connected with them. They must be our friends or enemies; they must be either the friends or enemies of our friends, or the friends or enemies of our enemies; they must be possessed of power, which directly or remotely, affects our interests; they may be possessed of principles, either leading to friendship or hostility; they may entertain views, in the promotion or avoidance of which we are deeply interested. All these are so many ties that in one sense unite us to foreign nations, that make them and ourselves members of one great family. It follows conclusively that is is impossible for any measure of importance to be taken by any one nation in which we are not directly or remotely interested under one or other of the above particulars. It is, therefore, our right to examine them and pronounce on their propriety or impropriety, their justice or injustice.

This view of the subject, we think, conclusive. It fully establishes the right. But there is a larger view which may be taken. Men are members of a particular nation. They are also citizens of the world. They have rights and correlative duties in both capacities. It is their right to admire and applaud virtue wherever it exists. It is their equal right to abhor and condemn vice wherever it is found. Whenever this virtue becomes so illustrious, or this vice becomes so enormous as to affect the essential interests of mankind, it becomes their duty to avow their feelings of admiration or condemnation. The avowal is the reward of virtue and the punishment of vice. It animates to the achievement of all that is good or great; and arrests iniquity in its maddest career. The virtues of a Washington made his fame the property of a world; the vices of a Robespiere made him universally detested. In vain shall timid prudence dictate forbearance. The feelings of nations will burst out; their gratitude will embalm the memory of their benefactors; and their curses follow the tyrants of the earth.

Apply these remarks to the subject before us. Those governments in whose measures we are most interested are those of France and England. Our national existence does not, it may be boldly said, depend on the measures of either. But much of our happiness certainly does depend upon them. Shall it then be contended that the right does not exist freely and fully to investigate, to approve or condemn them? The right certainly does exist in its fullest extent, springing directly from the right to promote our own interests. The duty to investigate, and to approve or condemn, as certainly arises from the obligation we are under to promote those interests.

If then England by her particular conduct to us in times past; by attempting to subjugate us to her arbitrary controul; by ravaging our fields with desolation and destroying our citizens by the sword; by afterwards withholding from us our just rights stipulated by treaty, and by plundering our defenceless vessels; or by her despotism over the ocean, and attempting to crush the commerce of every rival, inspires us with alarm, it is our right, it is our duty to express our sentiments without reserve. And such has, in fact, been the case.—The nation has more than once expressed in terms of high toned resentment its sense of her injuries and injustice. At this very moment her aggressions upon our rights as a neutral nation are felt and resented with undisguised spirit.

On the other hand, France struggling for freedom inspired and commanded our affection and admiration. The virtues and talents of her rulers entitled them to our highest praise. We gave it. There was not an American heart, we say it with confidence, that did not exult in the triumph of her arms. We rejoiced at the prospect of the happiness of twenty five millions of our fellow men. We also entertained the rational expectation that the establishment of a republican government in France would make that nation pacific, and render her the instrument of guarding, rather than invading the rights of other nations. Events justified our hopes; while the republican system continued, she manifested a regard, equally strong, to the rights of her own citizens, and to those of other nations. She manifested a spirit of peace. She repelled, it is true, from her borders the invaders of her soil, and made the despots who sent them tremble on their thrones. But she committed no violence on neutral rights, and she subjugated no nation.

Was it not our right, was it not our duty to approve and applaud the exertions of France in such a cause? We did approve and applaud them.

But the scene changed. Military violence usurped the power of the nation, and liberty perished—that very liberty, whose virtuous affection had excited our admiration. Was it then possible to retain our love of liberty and admiration of its defenders, without feeling indignant at its subversion and subverters? If we had the right to express the one had we not the same right to express the other? And is it not as much our duty to proclaim our abhorrence of tyranny as our love of liberty? Do we not, in fact, do the one whenever we do the other?

To apply these remarks more directly to the Consular government. If that government has destroyed the representative principle of the French government; if it has replaced it by military power wielded by military men: if it has totally destroyed the liberty of the press; if it does with the lives, the fortunes, and the persons of Frenchmen, as it pleases; if it has said to one republic, become a monarchy, and to another monarchy become a republic; if these are its principles, uniformly and universally carried into effect, can Americans, can freemen be expected to be silent? Silence, under such circumstances, would be treason to truth and virtue.

The greater the character who has effected all these measures, and the wider the field of his power, the higher the obligation of freemen to raise their voice in his condemnation. Too long have the citizens of America been charged with a blind devotion to France; let us prove it false by demonstrating that our love is not for France but liberty. Let it not be said, that because the principles and prominent measures of the Consular government are held up to censure, that, therefore, the French revolution is to be denounced. By no means. That revolution has done much, and promises more for the happiness of the world. It has sown, thickly sown the seeds of liberty; they have taken root; and the oak will rise and extend her branches in defiance of the storms that assail her. When this shall be, we pretend not to say. But that this period will arrive we have no doubt.

Nor can it be inferred from this view, that the condition of the French people is worse than under the Bourbons. The reverse is truth. Though they may have as little political liberty, they have infinitely more happiness. Much of this they undoubtedly owe to the internal regulations of the First Consul; nor can too much praise on this point be given him. Would to God! that consulting his true glory in the happiness of nations, he would exercise the ascendant genius with which he is animated in promoting their welfare. The laurel that encircles his brow would then be immortal.

Let not these remarks be mistaken or misapplied. They are entirely confined to a justification of the *individual ight of every citizen, and, of consequence, of every Editor*, freely and fully to express his ideas of foreign governments. They *do not acknowledge or justify the right of any government* in amity with another government to condemn its principles or measures. To governments it belongs to act; that is *their* prerogative; while it is the prerogative of man to *reason*. And so long as one government acts with justice to another, that other has no ground for complaint, even should her principles or measures be severely criminated before the tribunal of public opinion. There exists no responsibility of the one to the other for the opinions of her citizens either entertained or expressed. Pre-eminently is this the case under an administration, which neither has of right, or exercises from choice, any control over the press. Whatever may have been the conduct of their predecessors, it is their distinction, that so far as depends upon them, the press remains as unfettered as the liberty it protects.

The rich blessings of a National Debt.

The Income Tax is of all others the most unjust, tyrannical, and vexatious the human mind could have invented. No modification *whatever* can render it otherwise, for when a commissioner has the right to oblige an individual to make known to him his most private transactions, every branch of his industry and all his sources of wealth, that tax is tyrannical in its nature, and must consequently prove ruinous in its effects. Its former result at once confirms this reasoning, and holds up to public shame and detestation its unblushing adviser. The income tax when first brought forward by Mr. Pitt, and laid on at 10 per cent. was estimated at 10,000,000, yet produced only 7,500,000 for the first year, and barely 5,500,000 during the last, as Mr Addington himself asserted in the House of Commons; yet now this same Mr. Addington comes forward with matchless effrontery, and tells the House of Commons, that in spite of the new taxes which have since been laid on the industry of the people, this income tax will now produce 4,500,000 pounds sterling: yet we will venture to assert judging only from experience of the former tax, that it will not produce 2,000,000.

The additional tax on wine of 10l. per ton, will prove equally unproductive, (to say nothing of totally depriving the poor of what in cases of sickness is frequently a necessary.) For it is a well known fact that so impolitic was the last duty of 20l. per ton upon that article, that the wine merchants throughout England. have decreased one third, and the importation in a still greater proportion.

Tea and sugar. Both these articles are now become through long usage so much a necessary for all ranks throughout G. Britain, that to deprive the poorer class of them is to take away their greatest comfort. Coffee they cannot afford, for it was at that moment, through the enormous taxes on it, *six times as dear in England as it is in France.* Yet envious even of this *little sup of comfort*, the chancellor stretches out his relentless hand and dashes it to the ground. Smuggling cannot be prevented, experience has proved the fact, and high prices will always prove a sufficient encouragement for the smuggler to defraud the revenue, which fraud will amount to infinitely a greater sum than the revenue will gain by the increased duty.

Malt. No less than two shillings a bushel laid upon the material which forms the good, wholesome, and accustomed beverage of an Englishman. A tax peculiarly grinding on the lower order of the community, and consequently most impolitic.

We shall not stop to examine the other branches of revenues, as absurd in their origin as falacious in their results; it is sufficient that we have drawn aside the veil with which the English minister, in calling over his own incapacity and the impotence of his country, has sought to darken the eyes of Europe.

The interest on the loan amounting to near 700,000l. sterling is not to be paid, it appears by new taxes, but in adding to old burdens, under the specious names of alterations, changes, &c. but which in fact is all mere speculation. *The loan is already at a discount of 12 per cent.*

Yet not content with this public display of the impotence of Great Britain to maintain the present contest, Mr. Addington dares to abuse the credulity of Englishmen by talking to them of his intentions to continue paying off the public debt, that is paying off 1,000,000 a year, while he adds 50—much the same as a man with a wooden leg running after a hare, the more he runs, the further he is from it.

But will the people of England bear these burthens without complaint? Will they see every enjoyment, every comfort of life snatched from their lips by the greedy hands of power! Will they suffer the fruits of their industry to be snatched from their lips, their sons kidnapped by press gangs, and their daughters starving for want? Will they bear it and murmur not! Will they not view this income, and this war tax, as more odious and iniquitous than the ship money of Charles the First, and may not a second Hampden arise who by firmly resisting those tyrannical imposts will teach the indignant and oppressed countrymen, that one successful revolution remains the means of another?——*Paris Argus.*

Importation of Cotton Wool during 1802, into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, Bristol and Lancaster, Great Britain.

From whence imported.	*Bales.*
West-Indies,	1755
East-Indies,	8535
Africa,	86
Mediterranean,	4719
Cadiz,	350
Lisbon and Oporto,	72660
North Ports,	2272
Jersey,	170
Ireland,	304
Newfoundland,	2
North America,	105,187
Bahamas,	4241
Caicos,	104
Tortola,	1633
St. Thomas,	752
St. Bartholomew,	302
Jamaica,	21402
St. Croix,	42
St. Kitts,	113
Nevis,	84
Antigoa,	78
Montserratt,	196
Dominique,	73
Martinique,	1134
St. Lucia,	996
Curracoa,	7295
Barbadoes,	8087
St. Vincents,	745
Grenada,	4487
Tobago,	141
Trinidad,	6709
Cayenne,	46
Demarara,	17495
Berbice,	1996
Surrinam,	4382
St. Martins,	20
Bales or bags,	278,303

A question is constantly recurring whether the people of the United States ought not *domestically* and by the necessary trades to commence the manufacture of so immense a raw material.—The American Cotton in the above 105,187 bales imported by G. Britain alone, weighed twenty-eight millions of pounds, avoirdupois weight. (*Aurora.*)

NOTICE.

FOR Sale One hundred and fifty acres of land, One hundre acres of which is in wood—it is situated within six miles of the Eastern Branch ferry. For terms apply to

MICHAEL LOWE.

Prince George county, July 22. 3taw