

If the present one should fall as full of itself. The late revolution in Massachusetts has given more alarm than I think it should have done. Calculate that one rebellion in thirteen States in the course of eleven years, is but one for each State in a century and a half, nor will any degree of power in the hands of government prevent insurrections. France, with all its despotism and two or three hundred thousand men always in arms, has had three insurrections in the three years I have been here, in every one of which greater numbers were engaged than in Massachusetts, and a great deal more blood was spilt. In Turkey, which Montesquieu supposes more despotic, insurrections are the events of every day. In England, where the hand of power is lighter than here, but heavier than with us, they happen every half dozen years. Compare again the atrocious depredations of their insurrections with the order, the moderation, and the almost self-extinguishment of ours. After all, it is my principle that the will of the majority should always prevail. If I approve the proposed convention in all its parts, I shall consent to it cheerfully, in hopes that they will mend it whenever they shall find it work wrong. I think our governments will remain virtuous for many centuries; as long as they are chiefly agricultural; and this will be as long as there shall be vacant lands in any part of America. When they get piled upon one another in large cities, as in Europe, they will become corrupt as in Europe. Above all things, I hope the character of the common people will be attended to; continued that on their good sense we may rely with the most security for the preservation of a due degree of liberty."

[To be continued.]

For the NATIONAL GAZETTE.

A candid State of PARTIES.

AS it is the business of the contemplative statesman to trace the history of parties in a free country, so it is the duty of the citizen at all times to understand the actual state of them. Whenever this duty is omitted, an opportunity is given to designing men, by the use of artificial or nominal distinctions, to oppose and balance against each other those who never differed as to the end to be pursued, and may no longer differ as to the means of attaining it. The most interesting state of parties in the United States may be referred to three periods: That of the espousal of the cause of independence and those who adhered to the British claims, formed the parties of the first period; in which, the dissipated class were considerable enough to deserve the name of a party. This state of things was superseded by the treaty of peace in 1783. From 1783 to 1787 there were parties in absolute existence, but being rather local than general, they are not within the present review.

The Federal Constitution, proposed in the latter year, paved the way to a second and most interesting division of the people. Every one remembers it, because every one was involved in it.

Among those who embraced the constitution, the great body were, unquestionably, friends to republican liberty; tho' there were, no doubt, some who were openly or secretly attached to monarchy and aristocracy; and hoped to make the constitution a cradle for their hereditary establishments.

Among those who opposed the constitution, the great body were certainly well affected to the union and to good government, tho' there might be a few who had a leaning unfavourable to both. This state of parties was terminated by the regular and effectual establishment of the federal government in 1789; out of the administration of which, however, has arisen a third division, which being natural to most political societies, is likely to be of some duration in ours.

One of the divisions consists of those, who from particular interest, from natural temper, or from the habits of life, are more partial to the opulent than to the other class of society; and having debauched themselves into a persuasion that mankind are incapable of governing themselves, it follows with them, of course, that government can be carried on only by the paganism of rank, the influence of money and emoluments, and the terror of military force. Men of these sentiments must naturally support the measures of government less to the interest of the many than to the weakness of the few; hoping perhaps in proportion to the measure of government by giving such a turn to the administration, the government itself may by degrees be narrowed into fewer hands, and approximated to an hereditary form.

The other division consists of those who believe in the doctrine that mankind are capable of governing themselves, and that hereditary power is an insult to the reason and an outrage to the rights of man, are

naturally offended at every public measure that does not appeal to the understanding, and to the general interest of the community, or that is not strictly conformable to the principles, and conducive to the preservation of republican government.

This being the real state of parties among us, an experienced and dispassionate observer will be at no loss to decide on the probable conduct of each.

The anti-republican party, as it may be called, being the weaker in point of numbers, will be induced by the most obvious motives to strengthen themselves with the men of influence, particularly of moneyed influence, which is the most active and insinuating influence. It will be equal to their true policy to weaken their opponents by reviving exploded parties, and taking advantage of all prejudices, local, political, and occupational, thus may prevent or disturb a general coalition of sentiments.

The Republican party, as it may be termed, conscious that the mass of people in every part of the union, in every State, and of every occupation must in some be with them, both in interest and sentiment, will naturally find their account in burying all antecedent questions, in banishing every other distinction than that between enemies and friends; to repel the government, and in promoting a general harmony among the latter, wherever residing, or however employed.

Whether the republican or the rival party will ultimately establish its ascendancy, is a problem which may be contemplated now, but which time alone can solve. On one hand experience shews that in politics as in war, dragage is often an overmatch for numbers; and among more happy characteristics of our political situation, it is now well understood that there are peculiarities, one temporary, others more durable, which may favour that side in the contest. On the republican side, again, the superiority of numbers is to great, their sentiments are so decided, and the practice of making a common cause, where there is a common sentiment and common interest, in spite of vicissitudes and artificial distinctions, is a well understood, that no temperate observer of human affairs will be surprised if the issue in the present instance should be decided, and the government be administered in the spirit and form approved by the great body of the people.

Philadelphia, Sept. 23.

To the Editor of the National Gazette.

SIR,

BEING a real friend to manufactures, I am not disposed to defend the power of Congress on that subject, or to throw obstacles in the way of others affirming it, if not delegated by the constitution. I am, however, so far from joining in opinion with those who are in favor of taxing agriculture by way of bounty to manufacturers, that I think their learned arguments ought to be directly faced and made to look towards the opposite conclusion, to wit, that manufactures ought to be taxed in order to raise premiums for improving and maturing agriculture; and this not so much with a view to the immediate advantage of agriculture, as to the solid and ultimate prosperity of manufactures. The following reasons, if I conceived, must overcome the most obstinate prejudices in this case.

First, all writers and all experience agree, that population is more rapid in the country than in the city, that the soil, than in towns, the chief abode of manufactures. Secondly, that an abundant population can alone support a flourishing State, either of agriculture or of manufactures. Thirdly, that hands for manufactures are to be drawn from that surplus of labourers which is bound on the soil—Fourthly, to nurse and multiply labourers of the soil, is, therefore, the true and obvious means of providing for the wants of food and of manufactures, both of which are the fruit of the soil, the very life and soul of manufactures; and his cleanness will be promoted by filling up the vacant country with labourers, and stimulating by bounties their dull and indolent industry. Sixthly, as population is the great resource from which manufacturers are to be derived, so immigration is one of the means that may help to fill up the reference. Now, in every just view, it is better to invite foreigners from the country, than from the towns of Europe, because they will bring with them equal, if not more, industry, and certainly less vice, and as to manufactures, they must gain as much from the introduction of tillers as of artisans; hence the former by increasing the stock of hands on the soil, will enable the latter to supply hands for manufactures, and, by increasing the quantity and keeping down the price of provisions and materials, will give immediate nourishment to that valuable branch of industry.

It will be asked, perhaps, where will be the justice, where the respect for the rights of property, where the equal protection to the free choice of our occupations and the free use of our faculties, that to take money from the pocket of the manufacturer and give it to the farmer?

This question would be attended with its difficulties, were it not for two considerations. First, our opponents must answer it themselves, by showing the justice of taking the money of the farmer, and giving it to the manufacturer; the other, that this is not a question of justice, but of mere policy, and being decided in that light only, it is impertinent to view it in any other.

Should this answer not be satisfactory, and the justice, right, and equality of the measure still be insisted on as less indispensable than its policy, I will endeavour to avoid the difficulty by another theory, derived not so much from my own principles, or contrivance, as from the ingenuity of a friend who has been so kind as to communicate it to me.

This theory proposes, that instead of taxing agriculture in favour of manufactures, or manufactures in behalf of agriculture, all professions, trades, occupations, and employments whatsoever shall be reciprocally taxed and reciprocally bountied by a comprehensive provision of the government for that purpose. Thus let the manufacturer be taxed, and the bounty be paid to the farmer; and the amount be balanced by a tax levied on the farmer, and paid back as a bounty to the manufacturer. So again, a bounty may be taxed on the maker of hemp, and given to the maker of cotton, and a like bounty in turn be levied on the maker of cotton and bestowed on the maker of hemp. Or, in a more circular way, by tax and bounty adjusted, the maker of hemp, cotton or wool, after receiving a bounty drawn from some other occupation, may pay a bounty to the grader, he to the tanner, he to the shoemaker, he to the saddler, he to the coach-maker, he to the frongearer, he to the tinsmith, he to the flocking weaver, he to the cotton manufacturer, &c. &c. quite round to the point from which you set out. In this manner, every body will receive bounties, and every body will pay taxes. In this way, I will be a lottery where every ticket will draw a prize, and every adventurer contentedly be pleased.

To the objection, that the prizes received by the whole body cannot exceed the taxes paid by the whole, and that as great deductions must be made in the bargain for the expense of managing the scheme, every one of citizens instead of being gainers, will in fact be uselessly losers; to this objection, I say, my friend who is so ingenious in defending as he is ingenious in forming his thoughts, has a double reply ready.

To those who contend for any other form of premium, he says, bounties, as they must either fall into evident partiality and injustice, or proceed in the same magical circle, they have no right to claim the objection. To those, who, under this embarrassment, he remarks, that in all lotteries and like schemes, where prizes and premiums are to be obtained, the fund for paying them must be taxed on the adventurers, and hence, that the deductions and drawbacks not only make a part of the scheme, but constitute its very essence; the scheme being set on foot for the sake not of those who are to share the prizes, and hence, that those who are to have the benefit of the drawbacks and profits. The former is quite a secondary, collateral, and incidental matter, well enough to be calculated and hoped of, but the adventurers, being by no means the direct or primary object of the projectors, considered in this point of view, every thing is smooth and square; for note (says he) the elegant and charming effects of a universal system of bounties, upon the system of taxes well digested and digested for such an application.

First, having the appearance of equality, it deceives, at least, the noisy declaimers against the principles of legislation. Secondly, it will diffuse good humour among all the superficial and inconsiderate part of the community, who, receiving the bounty immediately and palpably, and paying the tax they know not when and feel not how, forget that the bounty is taken out of their own pockets, and are ready to imagine it the product of some deign of hand in the government beyond their comprehension, or else worth their enquiry. Thirdly, the deductions and drawbacks in such a case may fairly be estimated at 10 or 15 per cent. of the sum paid by the people, the whole of which becomes a fund for salaries and perquisites to collectors, receivers, treasurers, commissioners, managers, &c. &c. enabling the government to reward a greater number of its active friends, and encouraging its means of obtaining a willing obedience to all its measures, or of compelling obedience where its measures may produce an unwillingness. Fourthly, of no less value to the advocates that must accrue to the government from a proper distribution of the bounties. No better opportunity can be conceived for rewarding political merit of all sorts, for extending the salutary influence of power in every direction; and for throwing a decent veil over the jobs and schemes in which the members of all well regulated governments have the immemorial privilege of flaring; but which in our new-fangled republic, and in these censorious times, it will be prudent to hide from the public eye. Fifthly, the last advantage to be noticed, out of the infinite that re-

main, is the solid ground it affords to the government for enlarging its whole system of taxation; for nothing can be more just and reasonable, or which is the same thing, can be more (especially to be called, than that the government should reap where it has sown; that it should gather fruit from the tree it has planted; or to speak plainly and without a metaphor, that it should excite every article as far as its bounties have brought it to sufficient maturity for the operation.

Against this reasoning one objection only is foreseen by an ingenious theorist, to wit, that the whole of the advantages contemplated are to fall to the government; whereas, the interest of the people is the true object for which every public measure ought to be calculated. But this he treats with the greatest levity, as a pitiful squabble. He insists that the distinction is fanciful and inadmissible, and appeals with the utmost confidence to various numbers of the *Gazette of the United States*, where it has been demonstrated over and over again, that the government is the people and the people the government; that they are physically, morally, numerically, identically, and indivisibly one and the same; so that the more power the government assumes, the more freedom the people enjoy; and that every shilling which the members of the government put into their own pockets, is a shilling put into the pockets of their constituents.

A CITIZEN.

Philadelphia, Sept. 24.

For the NATIONAL GAZETTE.

MR. FENNO.

YOU are requested to publish the enclosed in your impartial Gazette. It will be remembered by the public, that Mr. Fenno, after publishing numerous pieces replete with slander and personality against Mr. Jefferson, when Aristides sent his former publication to him, furnished a note in the *Gazette* of the same day, in which it was published, cautioning Aristides if he appeared again, to give him notice. Now, as this cautioner had without scruple published the most personal abuse of Mr. Jefferson, without before calling for names, I take it for granted that publications on that side are really acceptable to him.

ARISTIDES.

MR. FENNO.

IF Aristides merit Ostracism for his clumsy defence of Mr. Jefferson, what species of punishment does an anonymous slanderer merit, who publicly avows his own wickedness? It was not enough for *Scourge* in Mr. Fenno's last *Gazette*, existing his enmity to Mr. Jefferson, to detract from the endowments of his friends, but he must exultingly add in the same *Gazette*, that he would in this "errify the influence in which Mr. Jefferson had lost more by the jealousy of his friends than by the wickedness of his enemies." Such a public avowal of wickedness on the part of the Juno was little to be expected, but as coming from one of themselves, and compared with the tenor of their united exertions to calumniate Mr. Jefferson, the public, it is precluded, will be well disposed to give it their full credence. There is another trait in the last publication which distinguishes it from the others, defending from the dignity of a public accuser and sustained with the causes of slander heretofore exhibited, this writer discharges the last volume of his malice in one furious clasp of calumny and detraction, sometimes ludicrous, sometimes serious, but always complaining or condemning, he parades Mr. Jefferson tho' every circumstance of his public life, and condemns him alive in France or in America as the malign dilator of the repose of both hemispheres.

The attempt to vilify the philosophy and talents of Mr. Jefferson reminds us of the puny efforts of a writing boy to excite mirth, which, not being sufficient to provoke our merriment, seeks to other emotion than that of contempt and pity. But the enlightened citizens of America will not readily assent to the idea, that that man is an enemy to the cause of human nature, or to the union & prosperity of his country, whose public acts and writings have already distinguished him as the great mover, and champion of the independence of his country; the uniform and zealous friend to the present union of the States; the strenuous advocate of a Bill of Rights to secure the liberties of his fellow citizens; the firm and able ally of the freedom of the blacks; the author of that glorious system of tolerated and universal freedom in the rights of conscience enshrined into law in Virginia, and to which the martial assembly of France, and most of the philosophers in Europe have paid their tribute of applause; and, finally, whose virtues and talents full return to him the unpaired confidence of that great man, who, watching with a comprehensive and equal eye over the interests of an extensive community, committed to his charge, has with the most judicious estimate of character, been so kind as to remark, that this gentleman is to fill an important position in the government.

For what cause then, or on what pretext, may he be assailed, and his name heaped upon so far as respects the cause, it may be observed, that the purpose is to be answered, First, if possible and by any means to injure the reputation of Mr. Jefferson in the public opinion, and from an enquiry into public measures, and lead it away in the fruitless pursuit of an anonymous