

135-14



8175

SEVEN  
*SHORT AND PLAIN*  
LETTERS,  
TO THE  
INHABITANTS OF BIRMINGHAM,  
ON  
THE LEADING POINTS  
CONNECTED WITH  
*THE ORDERS IN COUNCIL.*

By PHILAGATHOS.

"NOR CUNNING JUSTIFY THE PROUD MAN'S WRONG."  
COWPER.

BIRMINGHAM;

PRINTED AND SOLD BY JAMES BELCHER AND SON;

SOLD ALSO

BY O. AND H. SMITH, AND R. JABET.

1812.

TO  
**THOMAS ATTWOOD, Esq<sup>R</sup>**  
HIGH BAILIFF,

TO  
**THOMAS PHIPSON, Esq<sup>R</sup>**  
LOW BAILIFF,

TO  
**WALTER WILLIAM CAPPER, Esq<sup>R</sup>**

AND  
THE GENTLEMEN ASSOCIATED WITH HIM,  
IN MOVING AND SECONDING  
THE RESOLUTIONS AND CONSEQUENT PETITIONS  
TO BOTH HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT,

FOR THE  
**REPEAL OF THE ORDERS IN COUNCIL;**

AND TO  
**RICHARD SPOONER, Esq<sup>R</sup>**

IN GRATEFUL TESTIMONY OF  
HIS ELOQUENT AND SPIRITED VINDICATION OF THE PUBLIC  
INDEPENDANCE,

**THESE LETTERS**

ARE VERY RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED,

BY

**PHILAGATHOS.**

**LETTERS, &c. &c.**

**LETTER I.**

*"A Cat may look upon a King."*

**Introductory.**

MY FELLOW TOWNSMEN,

Considering the length of time which has elapsed since the promulgation of the Orders in Council, and their immediate relation to the interests, not of this place only, but of the populous and extensive manufacturing district of which Birmingham may be termed the Capital; I have witnessed with extreme surprise so general a want of information on this important subject, that it has long been my ardent wish to see it treated of, in a popular manner, by some one whose abilities are more competent to the task than my own. It is with great reluctance that I obtrude myself on your notice, but finding no person likely to do that which I believe essentially necessary *to be done*, and conceiving the present juncture of our affairs to be very critical, I have at length ventured to solicit your attention to a few brief and plain remarks on the question at issue. Publications it is true, and of a much

higher class than that to which this humble Pamphlet aspires, have followed each other in rapid succession, and the avidity with which they have been read and circulated, sufficiently bespeaks the eagerness of that spirit of inquiry which has at length, so happily I trust, been excited. There nevertheless appears to me to be a positive lack of that kind of evidence which you and I, and every body can *feel*, and *touch*, and *handle*.—The very erudition of the virtuous and enlightened Professor of Civil Law at Oxford\* constitutes of itself no small obstruction to the diffusion of his invaluable communications; and the frequently *indisputable* remarks on this subject of a celebrated Political Journalist are so wretchedly alloyed by that virulent and unqualified spirit of PARTY from which candour, good sense, and even common decency, shrink back as it were by instinct; that I shall endeavour in the following pages to familiarize you in the plainest language, with the result of the profound inquiries of the one, and the sterling conclusive observations of the other.

In the first place, permit me to assure you that the subject is exceedingly simple, and altogether within the reach of the most moderate abilities, provided they are accompanied by integrity. Some *few*, I admit, whose virtues it would be worse than folly to call in question,

\* Dr. Phillimore.

have been led (by causes not very difficult to explain) to form a different opinion; but the smallness of their number, like an exception to a rule, seems only to establish the general position. My reason for laying such a stress upon *integrity* will appear hereafter—I assert, therefore, and will *prove* to you, that the subject requires no aid but that of an *upright heart* to place it within the comprehension of the *meanest head*. Such gigantic abilities have hitherto been employed in its discussion, and their operations have been garnished with such formidable appendages of Greek and Latin, that the thing is become a perfect scarecrow, an absolute King Log, and we, who are accounted but the *small birds* of the corn-field, the mere *tad-poles* of the marsh, have been gazing at them with all the stupid wonder of terrified amazement. But only be persuaded to look at them with the same cool possession of your faculties which accompanies you on other occasions—the mountain will sink down to a mole hill, and your surprise will be, that your eye-sight could have been so long imposed upon. This, however, was exactly my own case. “*The subject is embarrassing*,” said a friend to me, while he shook portentously the honours of his periwig. I bowed in acquiescence—“*Very full of intricacies indeed*.”—I bowed a second time.—“*Ministers*, (continued he, emboldened by my humility) *Ministers are its only competent Judges*.” This unlucky speech marred every thing. The

( 8 )

spell was broken.—I recollected that the authorities of an ERSKINE, a ROMILLY, and a BROUGHAM, may offer *some* apology for differing in opinion from an ELDON or a PERCEVAL,\* even though they should be strengthened by the dignified legal names which adorn the declaration of a handful of our well meaning neighbours. To find ourselves on the brink of a tremendous precipice, and to be coolly bidden to "*push on, keep moving,*" because our eyes deceive us—is to receive insult, in addition to injury and falsehood.—The assertion that ministers are the only competent judges of a question like the present, is such a gross libel on the sanity of the Public Mind, as merits our most pointed reprobation.

I am, My Fellow Townsmen,  
Your very sincere Friend,  
And fervent Well Wisher,  
PHILAGATHOS.

---

LETTER II.

---

"The Law of Nations, is in fact, little more than the Law of Nature."  
PROFESSOR PHILLIMORE.

*On the Laws of Nations.*

MY FELLOW TOWNSMEN.

As my letters are designed chiefly for the perusal of those whose habits and want of leisure

\* Sic PARVIS componere MAGNA solebam.—VIRG. ECL. 1. v. 24.

( 9 )

unfit them for entering into the subject at large; their bulk and expence become such primary objects of consideration, that *brevity*, even at the expence of that cause which I would give almost my life to advocate with success, is indispensable. In calling your attention therefore, to a few homely unlettered remarks on the origin and incumbency of the "*Laws of Nations,*" I shall be solicitous rather to avoid what is wrong or disputable, than to say even the hundredth part of that which under different circumstances could not with propriety be omitted. We are all aware that on every subject of human speculation, men of exalted virtue and the most enlightened understandings will frequently be led to conclusions diametrically opposite. To a question of MORALS, however, abstractedly considered, this remark does not in the least apply—RIGHT OR WRONG has been written by the finger of the Supreme on every human action. Even the untutored savage of New Zealand whose glimmering intellect scarcely reaches to the skilful pilfering of a bauble or a nail, betrays by his secrecy and cunning a consciousness of his guilt, and would undoubtedly resent the commission of a similar injury on the part of his neighbour.

The influence of the moral principle increases with the sphere of its exertion: or, as Pope has better expressed it,

The centre touched, a circle straight succeeds,  
Another yet, and yet another spreads—  
Friend, parent, neighbour, first it will embrace,  
Our COUNTRY next, and next ALL HUMAN RACE.

The convictions of the now abject Zealander, would expand, under the auspices of more civilized society to the comprehensive but intelligible maxim "of doing to others as we would they should do unto us;" and it is simply by the voluntary unanimous application of this evangelical precept to the guidance and controul of States in their relative capacities, that a long succession of ages has witnessed the gradual tacit establishment of what are called the LAWS of NATIONS.

Deep hidden beneath the ponderous accumulation of innumerable volumes, we cannot be surprised that so few persons should revert to, or even perceive the beautiful simplicity of their origin and tenor. A few of these unwritten but indelible ordinances, selected from among such of them as are obviously connected with our subject, will best illustrate their tendency and excellence.

*Every community has an unquestionable right to choose its own form of Government.*

*Neutral States shall not be compelled to take part in the quarrels of Belligerents.*

*Even in the very act of aggression MERCY shall be granted to the Enemy who sues for it.*

*Certain destructive and barbarous modes of warfare (for instance, poisoned weapons, the use of grape shot in land battles, &c. &c.) shall not be resorted to.*

*Flags of truce shall inviolably protect whoever carries them.*

*An enemy found IN DISGUISE within the lines of his opponents, or men detected in the act of MINING, in order to destroy by gunpowder, a fortress or a camp, shall suffer an ignominious death, as being instrumental to the purposes of treachery and fraud.*

*Before any hostile port is BLOCKADED, (that is, before the approach of neutral vessels to such port can be lawfully prohibited) it shall be actually invested by a force superior to its own visible means of resistance.*

*Hostilities once commenced, any attempt at trading on the part of the subjects of either State, becomes a breach of the allegiance due to their respective sovereigns, &c. &c.*

Such, my fellow townsmen, are a few of the leading features of that inestimable PUBLIC CODE for which we are indebted to the advancement of civilization, and the progress of Christianity; which restraining the ferocious and implacable passions of mankind, have mitigated even the horrors of war; and which till within a recent period, have stood, like an august fabric, unshaken amidst the wreck of empires, consecrated by "the added wisdom of a thousand years," and girded, as with a wall of fire, by the suffrages and blessings of a world!

Founded on those immutable principles which every party vies with each other in pro-

fessing to hold sacred, where is the heart whose inmost strings do not vibrate in their eulogy? But I check myself—praise so feeble as mine shall not obscure their radiance. May HE by whom “princes decree justice,” preserve Britons above all men, from the crime of their violation!

I am, &c.

LETTER III.

“Justice is the great standing policy of civil society.” BURKE.

Orders in Council.

MY FELLOW TOWNSMEN.

Having in the preceding letter taken a very brief and elementary, but I hope not an incorrect glance at the basis and spirit of the Laws of Nations, the fundamental principle of which I must beg you constantly to keep in sight; I shall next endeavour to lay before you a plain connected statement of the origin and progress of our celebrated *Orders in Council*.

In the spring of 1806 the English Cabinet justly incensed at the illegal seizure of his Britannic Majesty's continental dominions, by the King of Prussia, and wisely regarding that pusillanimous Monarch as the mere instrument

of Buonaparte; Mr. Fox\*, at that time Foreign Secretary, officially informed Mr. Monroe, Am-

\* If you mention the subject of this Letter to a Ministerialist, he reminds you with a simper bewitchingly complacent, that “they originated in the administration of the Talents.” What does it signify to us by whom the Orders in question were suggested?—Mr. Whitbread is not our PAUL, nor Mr. George Rose our political APOLLOS: but we are of the CONSTITUTION, and we protest, not against individuals but their measures. And here, though I would be understood to speak not positively, but with great deference, yet justice requires me to add, (and the fact, if substantiated, will be consolatory to thousands) that as far as this allegation can affect the memory of a revered and illustrious Statesman, now no more, it appears admissible in a qualified sense only. On a perusal of the first Letter (dated April 8th, 1806) of MR. FOX to the American Minister, I was forcibly struck with the following expression, “His Majesty has judged it expedient to establish the most rigorous blockade at the entrances of the Ems, the Weser, the Elbe, and the Trave; and to enforce the same in the strictest manner, ACCORDING TO THE USAGES OF WAR, ACKNOWLEDGED AND ALLOWED in similar cases.” And in his second communication to the same Minister about five weeks afterwards, (May 16th) Mr. Fox says, that “the King taking into consideration, &c. &c. has thought fit to direct that the NECESSARY MEASURES SHOULD BE TAKEN for the blockade of the coasts, rivers, and ports, from the river Elbe to the port of Brest, both inclusive.” Now what could Mr. Fox mean by such language as this, if he contemplated nothing more than a Blockade by Notification? The line of coast to be traversed betwixt the two extreme points here mentioned is certainly very extensive; but if we except “the coasts, rivers, and ports from Ostend to the Seine,” which the same Paper officially informs us, “were previously in a state of strict and rigorous blockade,” and then look to the immense Naval Armament of Great Britain, I think it will scarcely be denied that the remaining tract, might have been actually invested with our Military Marine. I am not vindicating the policy of this measure, which was probably one of experiment, but I apprehend;

( 14 )

bassador from the United States, that a certain portion of the maritime frontiers of Prussia were blockaded. We have no reason to consider this measure in any other light than that of an ordinary blockade, and such as the maritime code of Europe had immemorially recognised: but not being followed by the success expected, a second Order in Council was issued soon after, elongating the line of blockade to a great and unprecedented extent. Its rigour, I cheerfully admit, was considerably mitigated by sundry accompanying regulations; yet after allowing all due weight to the circumstances mentioned in the Note, it certainly furnished the French Emperor with something like a colourable pretext for his subsequent Decrees.—These Decrees at the time of their appearance were generally imputed, and I believe justly, to a ferocious ungovernable spirit of hatred towards the British. As far as their *motive* is to be considered we shall be all of one opinion, but as to the intended *mode* of their prejudicial operation, experience I think, proves

that at this period, it does not fairly amount to an infringement of the Law of Nations. Mr. Fox died September 13th 1806, after a lingering illness of several months, in the advanced stages of which it is well known that he was seldom consulted on public business.

The seeming irrelevancy of these observations, requires, I fear, some apology; but as the opinions of his admired and predominant Rival are so generally confessed to have been adverse to the present system, I feel anxious to shew that it was never countenanced by the sanction of EITHER of our great political luminaries.

( 15 )

that we have been miserably imposed upon. In the latter part of September we find our Government, doubtful perhaps of their expediency, relaxing the strictness of the late edicts; and our next document is an official notice from Lord Howick, (now Earl Grey, who succeeded Mr. Fox in the Foreign Department,) to Mr. Monroe, signifying the discontinuance of the Blockade of the Prussian Rivers. By this time Buonaparte had over-run and taken military possession of Prussia, degraded her unhappy Sovereign to a state of vassalage, and reduced that kingdom, whose very name, almost within our own recollection, struck all Europe with terror, to the helpless and abject condition of a Feudal Province. But while the Northern powers stood aghast at the rapidity of his conquests, while Prussia grovelled like a beaten spaniel, and his insatiable rapacity banquetted in anticipation on the calamities of the distracted Peninsula; the wealth, "the ships, the colonies, and the commerce" of England became the never-dying worm which lay gnawing with ceaseless corrosion at the heart of the Imperial Despot. Stung, I conceive, to the quick, by this evident symptom of reviving good sense in the British Government—and well aware that the "gruel" would never be "thick and slab" without the aid of some more potent ingredient, he flings into the cauldron his celebrated **BERLIN DECREE**, I pretend not to the ability of



( 16 )

“Disentangling from the puzzled skein,  
“Those threads of policy and shrewd design  
“Which run through all his purposes;”

but it is my deep and abiding conviction that this non-descript of a Manifesto was a SNARE and nothing else\*: for, as an explained enigma instantly becomes obvious, so, upon the theory of this Decree having originated not in violence but in cunning, will a large portion of its extraordinary contents bear upon, and justify the position.

My fellow townsmen, read that instrument which, were it not for the effect our Ministers have given to it, would have been one of the most ludicrous and burlesque compositions ever produced by the pen of a common farce-writer. A military chieftain with scarcely a ship of war left in his possession, and who durst not trust even a paltry coaster beyond the reach of his batteries,

\* We do not know an instance in which the spirit of rhodomontade, or the impulses of rage, have hurried him (Buonaparte) into measures not conducive to some politic and deliberate purpose.” *Letter on the Genius and Disposition of the French Government.*

If I am rightly informed, Mr. Rose observed to the Gentlemen of our deputation, “I both admit and lament your distresses, but you are quite mistaken as to their origin. It is not the Orders in Council which have done all this, but the Berlin and Milan Decrees!” Was not this a *lapsus lingue* my honest friend George? I don’t believe that in saying this you had any, the least view to the insignia of the Legion of Honour, but it will certainly prove most welcome intelligence at the Thuilleries.

( 17 )

proclaims a *Blockade of the British Isles!!!* Just as feasibly, might he have announced the siege of the Moon. Who could have imagined that such a “charm” as this, had been “firm and good?”—But so it proved in the event, for, instead of despising either so shallow a stratagem, or such a puny effort of ineffectual malice, out bounced (on the 7th of January 1807) the first of those Proclamations which have since become so famous.—This edict, it must be granted, was more modest than its successors. It commences with a very pathetic and lachrymose expression of the “unwillingness of Government to follow the example of our enemies, by proceeding to an extremity so distressing to all Nations not engaged in the war, and carrying on their accustomed trade,” but nevertheless it goes on to state that England “feels herself bound, &c.—not to suffer such measures to be taken by the enemy without some steps on her part to restrain this violence, and to RETORT upon them the evils of their own injustice;” and so it *only* enacts at the conclusion “that NO VESSEL should be permitted to trade from one port to another, both which should belong to Napoleon or his allies, until the Berlin Decree was revoked.” Thus matters stood at the close of the last Administration, but our present Cabinet disliking half measures soon adopted others more decisive; and in about nine months, as many fresh Orders

( 18 )

in Council made their appearance, imposing still heavier restrictions on the commerce of Neutrals, and in fact extinguishing all neutral commerce whatever, except by way of license from England.

How gratifying to the malignity of our Arch Enemy must have been the proclamation of November 11! England had been seduced into an avowed departure from the line of moral and political rectitude.\* He could only aim the shaft, but England had bared her bosom and guided it to its destination. All that he had now to do, was to *perpetuate* these hapless measures. Accordingly on the 17th of Dec. appeared the MILAN DECREE which declared, "that its restrictions and penalties should remain in force, till the Orders in Council should be revoked." Nor was the season at which these prohibitions were issued, less unfortunate. After a sanguinary struggle of sixteen years, the military ascendancy of France gradually depriving us of every European alliance (except that of our protégée Portugal) had at length invested America with the critical and important

\* The Orders in Council "are a great and signal departure from the ordinary administration of justice,"

SIR W. SCOTT, *Judge of the Court of Admiralty.*

"The Orders in Council should be revoked not merely on account of their failure, but principally and in the first instance because they are essentially, and in their very nature, illegal, immoral, and unjust." PROFESSOR PHILLIMORE.

( 19 )

character of the sole remaining Neutral. The affinities which attached her to England were of no ordinary kind, nor the mutual advantages resulting from that attachment of an ordinary magnitude\*. But various unhappy circumstances† had long tended to weaken and interrupt their cordiality. To the Government of the United States, each of the frantic combatants made loud and reiterated appeals.— "Resent," cried England "as your dignity requires, the tyrannical Decrees of France." "My Decrees," rejoined Buonaparte, "are less injurious to you than the British Orders in Council." America calmly replied, "I dislike them BOTH," and after tedious and fruitless negotiations with each of the high contending parties, passed on the 1st. of May, 1810, her NON-INTERCOURSE ACT. This act was altogether provisional. It stated that "if either Great Britain or France

\* "The export of British manufactures to that quarter of the world (America) amounted annually to the value of nearly ten millions. The growing population, and consequently increasing consumption, would, every year, enlarge its demands upon English industry and ingenuity. The enterprize of the Americans moreover (was) perpetually enlarging their connections with distant markets already opened by them, or discovering others more remote still, to which they conveyed the manufactures of Great Britain, putting, in return, into her lap, both the price of the commodities and the profits of the voyage."

ANNUAL REGISTER 1807, p. 329.

† Affair of the Leander—Chesapeake—search of ships of war, &c.

should before the 1st. of November, 1810; so revoke or modify her edicts, that they should cease to violate the neutral commerce of America the fact should be proclaimed by the President; and that then, if the other Nation should not in three months from that time revoke or modify her edicts in like manner, the Non-Intercourse Act should be revived against that nation\*." Thus did affairs stand till the close of August.—The English Cabinet having from first to last unequivocally declared the Orders in Council to be retaliatory, having expressed its regret at the necessity of such an interference with neutral commerce,—its readiness to follow the example of the French Government, in case their decrees should be rescinded, or its willingness to proceed step by step with France in relaxing the vigour of their measures †; with what amazement shall you and I, plain folks (unacquainted with the exquisitely delicate nature of ministerial promises) read the two following Letters?

*Copy of a Letter from Mr. Pinckney, American Envoy, in England, to Lord Wellesley, English Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 25th August, 1810. †*

I have the honour to state to your Lordship that I have received from Gen. Armstrong, Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at Paris, a letter bearing date the 6th

\* Political Register.  
 † See the declaration of the British Minister in America to the American Government, in February, 1808.  
 ‡ Taken from the American National Intelligencer, 20th October, 1810.

inst. in which he informs me that the Government of France has revoked the Decrees of Berlin and Milan, and that he has received a written and official notice of that fact in the following words\* :—“ Je suis autorisé a vous déclarer, monsieur, que les Decrets de Berlin et de Milan sont revoqués, et qu'a daté du 1er Novembre ils cesseront d'avoir leur effet.”—I take for granted that the revocation of the British Orders in Council of January and November, 1807, and April, 1809; and all other orders dependant upon, analogous to, or in execution of them, will follow of course; and I shall hope to be enabled by your lordship with as little delay as possible, to announce to my government that such revocation has taken place.

*Answer of Lord Wellesley to the above †.*

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter under date the 25th inst. On the 23d of February, 1808, his Majesty's Minister in America declared to the Government of the United States, “ His Majesty's earnest desire to see the commerce of the world restored to that freedom which is necessary for its prosperity, and his readiness to abandon the system which had been forced upon him, whenever the enemy should retract the principles which had rendered it necessary.”—I am commanded by his Majesty to repeat that declaration, and to assure you that WHENEVER the repeal of the French Decrees shall have actually taken effect, and the commerce of neutral nations shall have been restored to the condition in which it stood previously to the promulgation of those Decrees, his Majesty will feel the highest satisfaction in relinquishing a system, which the conduct of the enemy compelled him to adopt.

Having observed that the Orders in Council stand unrepealed to this hour, and that the NON-

\* I am authorised, Sir, to announce to you that the Berlin and Milan Decrees ARE REVOKED, and that they will cease to be acted upon after the first of November next.

† Vide American National Intelligencer, October 20, 1810.

IMPORTATION ACT was passed in consequence, I shall subjoin but one remark to the singular epistle of my Lord Wellesley. If the pledge thus solemnly given by the French Government *deserved no credit*, how came it to pass that the English Cabinet almost at that very period agreed to act even by way of *anticipation* upon her OFFICIAL PROMISE? which was undoubtedly the case when they assured her Foreign Minister (through the medium of our Transport Board) that any French Officer then our prisoner, should be liberated and sent home, "if the French Government would *certify officially* to our Commissioners that an English prisoner of equal rank shall be released by France."

I am, &c.

LETTER IV.

*Fiat justitia—ruat cælum.*

"*Whate'er befalls—integrity maintain.*"

*The License System.*

MY FELLOW TOWNSMEN,

Though my last letter exceeds the limits I at first prescribed to myself, I am fully conscious of having omitted at least the half of

those weighty and urgent considerations which the subject naturally suggests. Enough however I hope has been said to convince you that our Orders in Council not only stand opposed to the soundest dictates of policy and wisdom, but are manifestly irreconcilable with those obvious principles of national morality and good faith, which, till the present eventful æra, it has been the proudest boast of England to maintain inviolate. I am now entering on the most distressing part of my subject. From the accelerated velocity which characterises the progress of those who have unhappily been persuaded to deviate from the direct high-road of integrity and justice, the path of error has with peculiar propriety been styled a *downward* one. Experience soon shewed that our Orders in Council instead of invigorating the body commercial, had engendered a formidable and stagnating disease. With a facility at once unskilful and disingenuous, Ministers resorted to the Trade by Licence. It will be the business of this letter to shew you, that the remedy is infinitely worse than the disorder—that, (like the prescriptions of ignorance and quackery) it is the mere partial application of a vitiated and unhealthful stimulus, which, at the same time, rapidly induces a debility of the general system.

And first, the trade before us introduces a horrible and complicated mass of fraud, evasion,

( 24 )

and perjury\*: nor can any "supposed exigencies of State, still less the visionary theories of speculative men, justify any measure which leads to the encouragement of positive wickedness." Every licensed vessel is provided with two sets of papers, in all respects so complete as to impose even on the *cruizers* of the respective Belligerents: one set represents her as bound for some *English* port, and the other as destined to a place at *enmity* with Great Britain. The Captain must of necessity † swear to the truth of both these statements, and "in the event of his meeting with a French or Danish cruizer, cancels or conceals his British papers and pretends that his destination is to a hostile port; but, on the other hand, if he is detained by a British cruizer, he deposes that he is sailing to a port of this country. The papers, in either instance, are so skilfully framed as to establish a clear belief of the fact he asserts; for nothing short of such a belief would tend to the liberation of the vessel. † "The whole catalogue of iniquity," (says a celebrated Roman moralist, quoted in the original

\* "It is a matter perfectly notorious that we are carrying on the trade of the whole world under simulated and disguised papers. The commerce of the world unavoidably assumes a disguise. These disguises we ourselves are under the necessity of employing with simulation and dissimulation." See *Judgments of the Court of Admiralty*, Aug. 10, 1808.

† For a more complete elucidation of this doctrine, See *Robinson's Admiralty Reports*, Vol. II. p. 122.

‡ Phillimore's *Reflections on the License Trade*, p. 30, 31.

( 25 )

by Dr. Phillimore\*) "presents us with no crime more flagrant than that of those who amidst the grossest deceptions, contrive to wear the mask of integrity and good faith." Accustomed and authentic species of testimony dissolve into absolute nullity under the pestilential influence of this abominable system; for the very Courts by which these tests were formerly "so much upheld and respected, are now obliged reluctantly to admit that CONCEALMENT AND FRAUD are necessary, nay, positively INDISPENSABLE!"

In the second place, the Licensed Trade directly leads to the alienation and oppression of neutral States. And here I shall observe, (on the authority of a profound Civilian) that the right of an *efficient* blockade, though clear and indisputable, is one of the most vexatious privileges which the Law of Nations has ever conferred on a Belligerent.—It follows therefore, that its exercise should as far as possible be mitigated by the most friendly and consistent attention to the feelings of the excluded Neutral. *Admitting* for argument's sake, the validity † of that imagi-

\* "Totius autem injustitiæ nulla capitalior est, &c."

*Cicero de Officiis.*

† But the decisions of our Tribunal directly contradict its efficiency.

"What is the object of blockade? Not merely to prevent an importation of supplies, but to prevent export as well as import, and to cut off all communication of commerce with the blockaded place." *Admiralty Reports*, Vol. I, p. 87.

"A blockade is just as much violated by a vessel passing outwards as inwards. A blockade is a sort of circumvallation

( 26 )

nary line which we have drawn round almost the whole continent of Europe, what apology can we, or do we attempt to offer to America, whilst she sees us carrying on a direct commerce with that very Enemy, whose coasts she herself, though neutral, is not permitted to approach \*? Neither

round a place, by which all foreign connexion and correspondence is, as far as human force can effect it, to be entirely cut off: it is intended to suspend the entire commerce of that place." *Admiralty Reports.*

"In February 1810, the blockade of Elsinour was notified in the Gazette, and in the course of the present year several vessels were proceeded against for a breach of this blockade; but it having been satisfactorily proved to the Court of Admiralty, that the British squadron off Elsinour was not competent to the circumvallation of the port, the blockade was held to have had no legal existence, and the vessels proceeded against, were restored to the claimants.

"In February, 1792, in the case of several vessels proceeded against for a breach of blockade instituted by Sir John Jervis, in the West Indies, the Lords of Appeal determined, that a proclamation could not, in itself, constitute a legal blockade, —that no blockade could exist without actual investment."

*Phillimore on the License Trade, p. 52.*

\*"As the practice exists at present, numerous European vessels are privileged to enter the ports lying between Bayonne and the river Ems, whereas if an American vessel navigated by mariners of her own country, laden with the native produce of the United States, and going for the sole account and risk of American merchants, does but approach or even intend to approach the threshold of this interdicted soil, she becomes, together with her cargo, *ipse facto* liable to condemnation. Nor is there a single instance in which under such circumstances American subjects have not been amerced of their property.

*Phillimore on the License Trade, p. 54.*

( 27 )

time nor space permit me to enlarge on this question, but I leave its reply with confidence to the spontaneous dictates of every upright mind.

Thirdly, the License Trade is eminently injurious to the interests of British shipping. Licenses originate in the Privy Council, and till of late the use of them has been properly considered a high act of sovereignty, rather permitted than encouraged. Now, however, they are scattered with an *unsparing*, though certainly not an *indiscriminate* profusion. No one will deny the vital importance to this country of the prosperity and pre-eminence of our navy. To oppose the growth of an enemy's marine, and to *refrain* as far as possible from *promoting* the maritime power even of a Neutral, is, in England, above all Nations, a measure not merely of policy, but of duty. From documents before the House of Lords it will appear that in the year 1810, FIFTEEN THOUSAND Licenses were issued, and FORTY-EIGHT THOUSAND FOREIGN SEAMEN employed in the service of Great Britain. In the course of the last year it is supposed that these numbers HAVE BEEN DOUBLED. Those who are weak, or interested enough to attempt to controvert this position, I would refer to the sound, well-principled Old English memorial, presented to the Board of Trade in April last by the Merchants and Ship Owners of the port of Hull. From this admirable and disinterested statement of un-

questionable facts, brief as I am compelled to be, I cannot deny you the gratification of a few short extracts.

“Official documents will shew, that during the last three years *many hundred thousand tons* of FOREIGN SHIPPING have been ANNUALLY employed in the British Trade—and the extraordinary demand for such ships has enabled their Owners to obtain *more than three times the freight usually paid to British ships for the same voyages.* The baneful effects of this violent inroad on those principles of Navigation, hitherto the bulwark of our national independance, cannot, we conceive, be impressed too frequently, or too forcibly on the minds of our countrymen.”

“At a period of great National impoverishment, when the balance of Foreign payments has nearly exhausted the specie of the kingdom, we are by this impolitic system, paying MILLIONS PER ANNUM to *Foreigners, to hostile* Foreigners, for becoming the carriers of goods which British ships had previously been engaged in conveying, and which they are still fully competent to convey to the greatest possible extent of our demands; for although, since the commencement of the present system, British shipping has generally been employed in other directions, yet had the Baltic also continued open to them, encouragement would have been offered to the building of an additional number and the employment of a proportionate increase of seamen: an object confessedly of the highest national importance.”

“Many of those,” says Dr. Phillimore, “who take an eager interest in our naval prosperity, (and what thinking person is there amongst us

who does not take such an interest) are wholly ignorant of the great change that has been silently operating in the system of our navigation laws; and have yet to learn, that our commercial intercourse with the rest of Europe, is now carried on almost exclusively, by means of foreign ships, built, partly in the ports of those States who profess a doubtful or colourable neutrality, but principally on the stocks of our open and avowed enemies, and in all instances navigated by mariners who are either directly or remotely subjected to that potentate who is animated by the most powerful incentives that can stimulate human exertion to surpass and degrade the maritime prowess and maritime superiority of Great Britain.”

My fourth, and for the present concluding objection to the License Trade arises from the formidable and unconstitutional preponderance which it gives to Ministers. I speak not of this or the other set of men—but it invests ANY with an undue and exorbitant influence\*. “Instances have occurred,” says Dr. Phillimore, “of British Licenses having been sold in the ports of Norway for five hundred guineas. They have been pur-

\* “(It subjects) the whole trade of the country to the controul of the executive government. When commercial speculations become the result of peculiar privileges it must follow of course, that these privileges will be liable to be obtained by favour, and extorted by intrigue.”

Phillimore on the License Trade, p. 55.

chased on 'Change at Amsterdam for seven hundred six dollars. At Bourdeaux, the price has varied according to the capricious decrees of the French Emperor;" and in London Mr. Richard Spooner informs us that FIVE THOUSAND POUNDS STERLING have been paid for the transfer of a single License! The case is simply this—if I am able to present my friend with that which he can instantly sell for a considerable sum of money, it is to all intents and purposes the same as presenting him with the money itself. Is it possible that the opponents of any Ministry should even *ask* for such a boon? Whatever may be insinuated by some, I do from my heart acquit every individual in the Cabinet, from the charge of pecuniary participation. I do not think so meanly of them. But is there no such thing as RECIPROCITY OF GOOD OFFICES? And is it in human nature that such a pregnant source of patronage and obligation, should be otherwise than extensively influential? The traffic by License, my fellow townsmen, as it subsists at this day, *must* be as conducive to the support of ANY Administration as the doubling of our Civil List—and shall we *now* be told "that Ministers are the sole judges of its expediency?"

I object then to the License System, because it is founded on base and acknowledged perjury—operates oppressively towards that Neutral State which it is our highest interest to con-

ciliate—is directly subversive of the prosperity of the British Navy—and gives incalculable weight to the preponderance of the executive.

I am, &c.

LETTER V.

*"As creeping Ivy cleaves to wood or stone  
And hides the ruin that it feeds upon;  
So sophistry cleaves close to and protects  
Sin's rotten trunk, concealing its defects."*

COWPER'S PROGRESS OF ERROR.

*Pleas of Necessity and Retaliation.*

MY FELLOW TOWNSMEN,

We have taken a cursory view of the illegal origin and impolitic tendency of the British Orders in Council. We have examined the complexion of their immediate offspring, the License System, and found it hideously disfigured by the loathsome spots of hereditary depravity\*. I proceed therefore in the next place to offer a few remarks on their alledged justification.

The only two pleas which have hitherto, I believe, been urged in their behalf are those of *Retaliation* and *Necessity*.

\* Phillimore on the License Trade, p. 51.



( 32 )

And first for the former. Were I to have recourse to the *New Testament* for an answer to this monstrous doctrine, I suppose I should be laughed at. "That book," our opponents may cry, "says that war of every kind is unjustifiable, whereas from reason and existing circumstances we all know to the contrary." In seeking to revenge the tyrannical and odious, (though of themselves ineffectual) decrees of France, is it reasonable that we should trample on the indubitable and long established rights of Neutral Powers? even supposing such a measure *did* contribute to the aggrandizement of Great Britain, is it reasonable that the innocent and the guilty should be involved in one common ruin? Supposing that America *had* been insulted by Buonaparte, upon what appearance of reason do we presume to dictate either the measure or the species of her resentment. Justly must such arrogance excite the mockery of every state not sunk into absolute barbarism. The Decrees of Berlin and Milan are, happily for England, laughably extravagant. America might have said, "France is a maniac, who threatens to fetter me with a cobweb—but *you* are in your senses, and are brandishing a real dagger." But Holland (in 1652) and France (under the 14th Lewis and during the Revolution) repeatedly outraged the Code which it was their duty to reverence. And how did Great Britain *then* conduct herself? Look, ye deluded advocates

( 33 )

of a crooked and contemptible policy, (if your mole-eyed vision shrinks not from the solar blaze) contemplate, if ye can, the dignified expositions of a Bynkershoek\*—the refulgent example of a Pitt†—and the solemn and virtuous adjudications ‡ of your own Tribunals!

\* "This profound and enlightened Publicist, himself one of the greatest masters who ever illustrated the science of jurisprudence, and who for a considerable time presided at the highest tribunals of his own country, omits no opportunity of reprobating the principles on which they (*retaliatory edicts*) were founded; clearly unfolding that they must be most unjust against Neutral States—that they would afford every Sovereign a pretext for the commission of wrong—and lastly, as they must necessarily introduce into the practice of Nations a monstrous and unnatural system of warfare."

*Phillimore on the License Trade.*

† Mr. Pitt was repeatedly importuned to *retaliate* the frantic ebullitions of French exasperation. But the advice was as uniformly as it was wisely rejected: for he well knew that our maritime superiority rendered them utterly insignificant.

‡ "I do not consider myself," says the enlightened Judge who presides over our Court of Admiralty, "as stationed in this Court to deliver occasional and shifting opinions—to serve present purposes of particular national interest;—but to administer with indifference, that justice which the Law of Nations holds out, without distinction, to independent States some happening to be Neutral and some Belligerent. The seat of judicial authority is locally here, in the Belligerent country, according to the known Law and practice of Nations, but the Law itself has no locality." *Vide Admiralty Reports, Vol. I, p. 350.*

And again, pointedly animadverting on the unjust Ordinances of France, he says, "There are, indeed, new Governments that have omitted no opportunity of expressing

As for the Plea of *Necessity*, when offered in defence of Injustice, the cheeks of an Englishman should redden at its very mention. But for those who want proofs that the justification is inapplicable, why I suppose I must go in quest of some. Will our opponents pretend to assert that the uncontrollable law of self-preservation rendered it *necessary* to extinguish *per fas et nefas*, i. e. by fair means or foul, every species of French commerce? If they will not, how have we been acting towards Neutrals? And if they will, to what conceivable excuse can they resort in defence of the Trade by License? My fellow townsmen, these are very simple and intelligible questions—and it is only when “counsel is darkened by words without knowledge” that a man need hesitate for an answer to them. To urge necessity in behalf of a wrong measure, which by any defensible possibility can be avoided, is to set up the most dangerous plea which the heart of man can devise. As to the waves of the ocean, so to a justification of this kind

themselves adversely to all rules on which the Old System has been founded; and it may be doubtful how far they are disposed to conform in practice to those ancient principles, but they shall have an example, at least to shew them that the ancient governments still adhere, with the most delicate attention, to all the principles on which the public affairs of Europe have hitherto been managed; they shall see that it is their interest to respect that system, whatever views they may have had in affecting to treat it with indignity and contempt.”

*Admiralty Reports, Vol. III. p. 146.*

where is the being who will say, “*Hitherto shalt thou go but no further.*” Its decisions can scarcely ever emanate from a legitimate, authenticated source; but on the contrary must be always clouded with the various feculencies of turbulent and depraved emotions.

Our immortal Milton puts it into the mouth of Satan himself—

“And with necessity, the tyrant’s plea,  
Excused his devilish deed.”

How did the Catholics in France justify the atrocious massacre of Bartholomew?—It was *necessary*.—Why was Poland dismembered, and her beloved and virtuous Stanislaus driven into exile?—The partitioning powers would have told you—It was *necessary*.—Why did Buonaparte compass the multiplied and diabolical treacheries which for almost three years have deluged the Peninsula with blood?—It was *necessary* to renovate the Spanish Government. What, for many years, was the sole argument for the Slave Trade?—It was *necessary*. But I will not swell the disgusting catalogue. With acts like these God forbid that I should ever be able to identify the conduct of Great Britain;—but let us, as good men and good citizens, peaceably, yet firmly and consistently, protest against the *principle* which has been adduced to justify them.

I am, &c.

( 36 )

## LETTER VI.

But tho' our judgments cannot "hold it good"  
 "To stroke the prickly grievance, and to hang  
 "Its thorns with streamers of continual praise;—  
 "We too are friends to loyalty."—

THE TASK, BOOK V.

*Our Present Situation.*

MY FELLOW TOWNSMEN,

The title of this Letter announces a very delicate subject; and I believe no man is more convinced than myself, of the gentleness and moderation with which it requires to be treated. This epistle in all probability will meet the ideas of neither party—*Mais-n'importe*. I write conscientiously, and therefore am very indifferent about that. The man who resolves to displease nobody, had better "dig potatoes," as Sir C. Mordaunt says, than address the Public.

Indeed it was my wish to avoid the matter altogether. But our antagonists won't let me. If they *will* be such acute logicians as to demonstrate to us that "having eyes, yet we see not, and hands, yet we handle not"—we are in that case *compelled* to speak. Our present situation, they assure us, is not so much amiss; and in proof of this assertion they hold up the Levy Book.—Our parochial burthens are not materially

( 37 )

augmented; *ergo*, our condition is a very tolerable one\*. I deny the truth of this inference, and for five reasons—

1. The Merchants and Manufacturers of this town have patriotically consented to the absorption of almost their last shilling in stock.

2. The earnings of better days amongst a numerous and respectable class of our workmen still hold out.

3. The great advance of wages in 1810, has ultimately rendered the demand of that extraordinary year injurious to us; for, in numberless instances, if not generally, four days wages at present equal in amount the produce of six days labour in 1807 and 1808.

4. No small proportion of the chief consumers of a family (namely hearty boys from 15 to 18 years of age) have entered into the army.

5. Birmingham (and though many persons may sneer at the remark, yet I care not, for I speak after no very limited opportunities of comparison,) Birmingham is eminently a *moral* town. Owing to the laudable and united efforts of every class of Religionists, the poor of this place are almost daily becoming more and more radically *well-principled*: and few indeed, I am persuaded, will be the instances, in which pa-

\* Those who are at all acquainted with the detail of our parochial finances, well know that (from the period at which the accounts of last year were made up) the diminution of our Levies is *apparent* and *not real*.

( 38 )

rochial aid will be solicited until every other source has been economically exhausted.

These considerations shall not be texts for declamation. I leave them, and with confidence, to the silent but progressive influence of discernment and good sense.

Driven from one untenable position to another, our fatigued opponents at last tell us that, even supposing our representations to be just, the present is not the TIME to urge them. Alas, my friends, this argument is as ancient and as good for nothing as the Plea of Necessity. Will they tell us when is the time? And *why* is it not the time? Because negotiations are said to be still pending.—But is not all this grounded upon *rumour* only—and have we not been feeding upon rumour, *visionary* rumour, for these three years?

To stigmatize every public expression of complaint or grievance with the odious epithet of “political disaffection,” is an artifice as stale as it is contemptible. Be it our care, my fellow townsmen, not to return “railing for railing,” but to let our *conduct* refute such profligate and senseless calumny. No person can deny that we have received great and signal favours at the hands of our Magistrates. On the Bench, it is impossible that we should have better. Integrity, urbanity, and industry invariably characterize their judicial proceedings, and I hold but cheaply the gratitude of that man who

( 39 )

deliberately says that Birmingham is not greatly their debtor. As individuals, be it remembered *their* sentiments are as free as ours, and if it is a duty in us to speak, why not in them? Whilst, therefore, we reserve to ourselves the right of respectfully distinguishing betwixt “things which differ;” in their *public* capacity let them have our warmest gratitude, and most animated support. If you ask how it is possible for *us* to support the authority of our Magistrates? I answer, Greatly. We can do them more service than a regiment. From the general scale of their capitals, and the peculiar *detail* of their respective trades the Manufacturers of this Town are brought more into *contact* with their Workmen than in many *other* districts it is possible that Masters should be. Let us *improve* these opportunities of friendly and judicious admonition. The question of an *actual* or only a *visible* scarcity, I do not feel myself competent to discuss. To suppose the former however, is undoubtedly in most cases the safest line of conduct.—But whatever be the fact, the insubordination of the lower classes is above all things to be deprecated; and if, on slight occasions, tumults should disgrace *our* streets, their employers may be considered perhaps, in some degree, morally accountable.

I am, &amp;c.

( 40 )

## LETTER VII.

" And let those that play your clowns, speak no more than is  
 " set down for them; for there be of them, that will themselves  
 " laugh, to set on some quantity of barren spectators to laugh too;  
 " though, in the mean time, some necessary question of the play be  
 " then to be considered:—"  
 SHAKSPEARE.

*Progress of America.*

MY FELLOW TOWNSMEN,

In admirable unison with the feelings of  
 this Town did our worthy friend George Rose,  
 who it seems

" can scarcely ope  
 " His mouth, but out there flies a trope,"  
 HUDIBRAS.

most facetiously liken the respective situations of  
 England and France to that of "*two men with  
 their heads in a bucket!*" nor less appropriate  
 was the sublime allegory of a certain Honourable  
 Member, when he assured the House of Com-  
 mons, that "*without our help, the people of the  
 United States, could neither shave themselves  
 nor catch mice\*!*" Sterne says, "that in France"

\* Seven cities contended for the birth of Homer—what  
 wonder then that *two heads* at least should share the ascribed  
 merit of this happy and dignified illustration. Uninvited to  
 the "*noctes cœnæque Divûm,*" i. e. "the lofty colloquies  
 of powers above," I presume not to elucidate such an inter-  
 esting mystery—"I say the tale as 'twas said to me."

( 41 )

(and if so, why not in England?) "a bon mot  
 is always worth something;" and that he was  
 once rewarded for one "with a pinch of snuff."  
 Now as I don't carry a snuff-box I'll give the  
 Honourable Member a piece of advice instead of  
 it. If he states the fact correctly, mice must  
 ere long, actually nestle in the beards of the  
 Americans; and I would therefore recommend  
 him to embark immediately as supercargo to a  
 sufficient quantity of approved Tom Cats;  
 an article of course not prohibited. It would  
 certainly be a famous speculation, and (after  
 making me a handsome compliment as its pro-  
 jector) he may return to England as wealthy  
 as Sir Richard Whittington. But I fear the  
 following statement offers poor encouragement  
 to European adventurers. It is principally  
 extracted from a Report\* made April 17, 1810,  
 to the House of Representatives by the Secretary  
 of the Treasury, and in part from the subsequent  
 accounts of highly respectable individuals lately  
 returned from the United States.

The following branches are firmly established, sup-  
 plying, in several instances, the greater, and in  
 all a considerable part of the consumption of  
 the United States, viz.

Iron and manufactures of iron.—Manufactures of cot-  
 ton wool, and flax.—Hats.—Paper, printing types, printed

\* This interesting but serious document is reprinted at length in the Monthly  
 Magazine, Vol. XXX. pages 297, and 393.

( 42 )

books, playing cards.—Spirituous and malt liquors.—Several manufactures of hemp.—Gunpowder.—Window glass.—Jewellery and clocks.—Several manufactures of lead.—Straw bonnets and hats.—Wax candles.

Progress has also been made in the following branches, viz.

Paints and colour; several chemical preparations, and medical drugs; salt; manufactures of copper and brass; japanned and plated ware; calico printing; queen's and other earthen and glass wares, &c.

#### *Leather and Manufactures of Leather.*

Tanneries are established in every part of the United States, and some of them on a very large scale; the capital employed in a single establishment amounting to one hundred thousand dollars.

The tanneries of the State of Delaware employ collectively a capital of one hundred and twenty thousand dollars, and ninety workmen, and make annually 100,000 dollars-worth of leather. Those of Baltimore amount to twenty-two, seventeen of which have together a capital of 187,000 dollars, and tan annually 19,000 hides, and 25,000 calf skins.

The principal manufactures of leather are those of shoes and boots, harness and saddles. Some inconsiderable quantity of the two last articles are both imported and exported. The annual importation of foreign boots and shoes, amounts to 3,250 pair of boots, and 59,000 pair of shoes, principally kid and morocco. The annual exportation of the same articles of American manufacture, amounts to 8,500 pair of boots and 127,000 pair of shoes. The shoe manufactures of New Jersey are extensive. That of Lynn, in Massachusetts, makes 100,000 pair of women's shoes annually.

#### *Soap and Tallow Candles.*

The annual importation of foreign manufacture, are candles 158,000 pounds, soap 470,000 pounds.

The annual exportations of domestic manufacture, are candles 1,775,000 pounds, soap 2,220,000 pounds.

( 43 )

#### *Cotton, Wool and Flax.*

The Woollen Manufactures.—Large establishments are formed, and the American government pays particular attention to the culture of wool, and encourages the importation of Merino sheep.

The Cotton Manufactures.—The great demand for card wire proves the flourishing state of this branch. Cotton twist is now exported from the United States to the continent of Europe. Forty thousand looms are employed in the State of New York.

Cotton and wool cards are made cheap and in great perfection in the United States; they are exported by the Americans to the East-Indies.

Woollen saddle girth webs—an important branch of American exports, are a good deal superseded by the use of cotton webs, which are made extremely well in the United States.

The Americans consume among themselves about one third of the whole quantity of cotton wool produced in the United States.

Returns have been received of eighty-seven mills which were erected at the end of the year 1809; sixty-two of which (48 water and 14 horse mills,) were in operation, and worked at the same time thirty-one thousand spindles. The other twenty-five will all be in operation in the course of this year, and together with the former ones (almost all of which are increasing their machinery,) will, by the estimate received, work more than eighty thousand spindles at the commencement of the year 1811.

The increase of carding and spinning of cotton by machinery, in establishments for that purpose, and exclusively of that done in private families, has therefore been fourfold during the last two years, and will have been tenfold in three years. The greater number is in the vicinity of Providence, in Rhode Island; they are scattered, and extending throughout all the states.

The seventeen mills in the state of Rhode Island, worked 14,290 spindles in the year 1809, are also stated to have used, during that year, 640,000 pounds of cotton, which produced 510,000 pounds of yarn; of which, 124,000 pounds

were sold for thread and knitting; 200,000 pounds were used in manufactories attached to, or in the vicinity of, the mills; and the residue was either sold for wick, and for the use of family manufactures, or exported to other parts. Eleven hundred looms are said to be employed in weaving the yarn spun by those mills into goods.

*Tin, Japanned and Plated Wares.*

Plated goods of every description are made. Plated saddlery articles and coach furniture are manufactured to a great extent, and we may look for an annual decrease in the demand for them. Common saddlery articles, such as are supplied by the small towns and villages in this neighbourhood are now got up in the United States almost as cheap as they can be imported.

Silver goods are made in considerable quantities and varieties. Many kinds of jewellery goods, particularly plain gold work of every description, are made as cheap as they can be imported.

*Household Manufactures.*

There are also manufactured in the United States, bellows, brushes, scales and scale-beams, umbrellas, muskets, looking glasses and frames, many articles of cast brass foundry, copper stills, tin goods of every description, a variety of common japanned articles, and various sorts of locks.

*Iron and Manufactures of Iron.*

The manufactures of iron consist principally of agricultural implements, and of all the usual work performed by common blacksmiths. To these may be added, anchors, shovels, and spades, axes, scythes, and other edge-tools, saws, bits and stirrups, and a great variety of the coarser articles of ironmongery. A joint stock Company for drawing wire, is proposed in the state of New York with a capital of one million and a half of dollars.—Slitting and rolling mills are common.—A pin manufactory is established at Philadelphia.—Nails both wrought and cut out, are made in the United States in great abundance.

It may be here added, that there are several iron founderies for casting every species of work wanted for machinery, and that steam-engines are made at that of Philadelphia.

At the two public armouries of Springfield and Harper's Ferry 19,000 muskets are annually made. About 20,000 more are made at other factories. Swords and pistols are also manufactured at several places.

The value of all the iron and manufactories of iron made in the United States is believed to be from twelve to fifteen millions of dollars, whereas the annual importation from all foreign countries, including Bar Iron and every description of manufacture of iron and steel, does not exceed four millions of dollars.

*Printing and Paper.*

Printing is carried on to an extent commensurate with the demand. Exclusively of the numerous newspapers, which alone form a considerable item in value, all the books for which there is an adequate number of purchasers, are re-printed in the United States.

*Hats.*

The quantity made in Rhode Island, is stated at 50,000, worth five dollars each, exclusively of felt hats.

It is stated by the hatters of Philadelphia, that 92,000 hats, worth five dollars each, are annually made there; in addition to which, 50,000 country hats, worth three dollars each, are annually sold in the city.

About three or four years ago a proposition to wear home-spun woollen cloth, to the exclusion of British, was made by a member of Congress, and extensively countenanced. Nothing is now more common in the United States than shop-keepers announcing, that they sell no articles but such as are manufactured in America; and a decided preference is given to goods made by themselves, even when the consideration of price and workmanship are greatly in favour of those imported from England.

( 46 )

Such, my fellow townsmen, *two years ago*, were the internal resources of that country which the servile adherents of a Ministry, and other misguided persons (in the exuberance of their ignorant and contemptible witticisms,) represent as being absolutely dependent on the manufacturers of Great Britain. That the progress of America should be so astonishingly rapid, is to men of this description incomprehensible, and therefore, incredible; but you and I, who are practically acquainted with the prolific nature of the manufacturing principle, see nothing in it but an ordinary chain of powerful causes, and correspondent effects. *We* know from experience, that a trifling series of the lowest arithmetical figures, when taken collectively, does not more certainly beget a formidable aggregate, than that the existence of *one* and *one* manufactory in the same district, will almost instantaneously engender a *third*, and a *fourth*, and a *fifth*. My heart ached at its very core, when I first examined the materials which presented themselves for the subject of this Letter—to me they prove indisputably that the Orders in Council have served as manure to the hot-bed of American Manufactures.

“The year 1811,” remarked a Gentleman, whose opinions we have all for many years held in the highest, and most deserved estimation, “the year 1811 has been supported by the produce of 1810—but how we shall be enabled to maintain the year 1812, I am yet unable to dis-

( 47 )

cern.” Every man is undoubtedly at liberty to ride, what a very ancient\* proverb styles, “his own hobby horse,” but still, my respect for the Town of Birmingham encourages me to flatter myself, that had many of the facts adverted to in these letters, been more maturely considered, we should have been spared the mortification of seeing a motley group of Clergy, Gentry, Professional-men, &c. &c. rush “with one accord” to oppose the tenor of our petition.

Before I conclude, permit me gratefully to acknowledge my weighty and manifold obligations to the patriotic and excellent Dr. Phillimore. I am deeply sensible of my own incompetency, under any circumstances, to present you even with a satisfactory abridgement of his publications. Several distinct grounds of argument have not been followed up, and not a few pretty urgent ones have been passed over in silence, from a just deference to the supposed opinions of the Gentlemen whose names appear in my dedication. I write because nobody else would; and the industry of my printer, with the unavoidable interruptions which occur to a person in business—have left me little or no time for revision and correction. Numerous inaccuracies both of expression and arrangement are obvious (though at too late a season) to myself, who am not in the habit of composition; and no doubt many more will be visible to the ken of others.—But I

\* Trahit sua quemque voluptas. OVID.



abjure disqualifying professions—What I have written, I have written; and it is submitted to you in respectful, but firm, reliance on the conviction, that NO EFFORT, however feeble, originating in singleness of heart, and directed to the advancement of Equity and Truth, WILL EVER ULTIMATELY BE LOST.

I am, My Fellow Townsmen,  
Your very sincere Friend,  
And fervent Well Wisher,

PHILAGATHOS.

ERRATA.

- In page 23 line 24, for "prescriptions," read "prescription."
- In page 25 line 13, for "alienation and oppression," read "oppression and consequent alienation."
- In page 25 line 25, for "Tribunal," read "Maritime Tribunals."
- In page 33 line 4, for "these," read "them."