

What, in the mean time, has been done by these states, to resist the invasion of the enemy, about to be reinforced from New York, and once more advancing to attack Charles-Town? Has the militia of the neighbouring states of North-Carolina and Virginia been early roused to march to oppose their progress? Have bodies of regular troops, in these states, been ordered there, with a rapid movement, to effect the same purpose? Have the continental troops, ordered from the main army, to that quarter, been sent forward with all that expedition which the exigence required? On the contrary, have not the militia of the neighbouring states slumbered through the winter? Have not many officers, and bodies of regular troops, been suffered to remain in the towns of the neighbouring states, as if they could suspect that these states might be the scene of action? Have not the troops ordered from the main army lingered on our borders, and when it behoved them to have met the enemy before Charles-Town, have been only within some days march of it, and greatly apprehensive, lest this capital, the key of the southern states, might be under the necessity of capitulating before they could arrive? I do not call in question the promptness of the militia of the southern states, to step forth, when called upon to defend their territories. They are moved, roused, agitated, or composed, at the will of those, in whom, by the constitutions of the respective governments, the power is vested to call them forth. I do not mean to blame the continental officers, and troops, who have lingered on our borders. They are detained or sent forward, as they have received orders, or as they are provided with necessaries for the march. It must be owing to a deficiency of elastic vigour in the spring of our public councils, that our operations have proceeded with so slow a step, for some time past. I am not acquainted with every remora, which, unavoidably, may have been thrown in the way; but knowing that men, after high exertions, are prone to sink into indolence, especially if they falsely apprehend themselves to have nearly attained their purpose, as has been the case with us, the preceding winter, from our hopes of peace, I think it not improbable, from the face of things, that we have not been so solicitous as we might have been, to be prepared at all points, to meet the enemy the ensuing campaign. The memory of past misconduct ought to be a spur to redoubled diligence in a future juncture of affairs.

Let it be considered what may be the consequence, if we do not repel the enemy from these southern territories. They will continue to despise our independence, as long as they shall be able to retain possession of a foot of ground upon the continent. They will boast in the language of Archimedes to remove the new world from its present political existence, as long as they shall find a place whereon to fix their armies, the fulcrum and the power, by which they labour to effect it. If, by any means, they should, at length, be brought to admit our independence, they will admit it only with regard to those states of which they do not hold possession. This will embarrass our negotiation, and protract the war. It will be impossible to desert any state, and leave it to the arms of Britain. The states are bound to each other by the most indissoluble knot, and they must live or fall together. While Britain therefore possesses one state, she has, in a certain sense, possession of the whole, and before one state can be independent, the whole must be rescued from her grasp.

We know that, of late years, war has been usually composed, in Europe, by the inter-mediation of other powers. Two nations, though equally weary of the contest, often continue it, merely from an unwillingness to make the first advances to an accommodation, lest these should be imputed to weakness; or they persist in it, from animosity, and against their real interest. Then, common friends effectually interfere, offering themselves for mediators. An article usually takes place, stipulating that both parties shall retain possession of what they have acquired during the war.

For this reason it will be, radically and essentially, our interest, that the enemy shall retain possession of no part of these states. Mediators will then have it in their power to demand, with a good face, the relinquishment of every claim of dominion, or jurisdiction, over them; the ground will be smooth, and there will be nothing to impede the course of a negotiation.

AN ANTI-ANGLICAN.

For the MARYLAND GAZETTE.

MUCH scoff and scorn has been cast on a position of the Senator, that a man may owe allegiance to two countries; and yet we hear of a snake in New-England (according to

the account of Cotton Mather, to the royal society) which had two heads, and could run two ways at a time; also of a negro in this state (according to the account of a gentleman, to the same body) which was white and black, by turns; that is (not a pyc-bald negro, but) one who was white, one season of the year, and black the other. Is it more extraordinary, that a man should be the subject of two countries and inhabit in both?

If the advocates for confiscation should persist in their burlesquery, I will undertake to prove the possibility of a *miris que fiet*, that is, *allegiance*, and not as some would interpret it, *jealty*, to two sovereigns, by authorities from Bracton, Britton, the author of Fleta, the mirror, Glanville, and others, expressly in point.

PHILO-SENATOR.

Bush-town, March 31.

To the P U B L I C.

IT has been objected, that the property of British subjects, in this state, ought not to be confiscated, because we were once connected with the kingdom of Great-Britain. "This property, says the Senator, was acquired at a time when we were all fellow-subjects of the same government; the laws permitted them, at that time, to purchase and hold estates among us, and we cannot now deprive them of those estates, without being guilty of a breach of faith."

It is a melancholy truth, that nine tenths of mankind scarce think at all; and even of the thinking few, by far the greater part suffer themselves so often to be blindly hurried away by their passions, their prejudices, or their interest, that they might almost as well be deprived of the faculty. Never was an objection more groundless and frivolous adopted by the advocates of error; nor can I conceive how it is possible for any person of common reflection to deceive himself into the belief, that it has any weight or solidity. Was the property in dispute acquired under the sanction of the faith of this state? So far from it, that this state was not at that time in existence. Were they entitled to purchase and hold lands and goods, in Maryland, by the laws and constitution of our present government? This constitution was not at that time formed; nor were these laws adopted. It was under the British government, that those lands and those goods were acquired. It was by the laws and constitution of Great-Britain, that their late owners were authorized to purchase and to hold them. While we were all subjects of that empire, we were prohibited from intermeddling with this property, except in such manner as her laws and constitution permitted, and the faith of the British nation was pledged to its owners for the secure enjoyment of their property. This faith did not only consist in giving redress by means of her laws, and courts of justice, to those of her subjects, who might be illegally dispossessed of their estates; but also required of the nation, that she would not, by her public acts of government, give just cause to any foreign power to seize the goods of her subjects; or to one part of her subjects to seize the goods of the other. Who broke those bonds by which we were connected? Great-Britain. Who cancelled that government, under which those estates were acquired and holden, and, in consequence, cancelled to every person all those rights, to which they had no other title, but as subjects of that government? Great-Britain. Who obliged the inhabitants of Maryland to declare themselves independent, to form a new constitution, and to adopt a government and laws of their own? It was Great Britain. All these events, by a series of injustice and oppression, Great-Britain hath accomplished. She violated that faith, which she owed to her American subjects; and, by that breach of faith, she gave to such of her former subjects, as separated from her, just cause to seize the estates of those who elected to remain under her dominion.

The property in dispute was never acquired, nor were its owners ever entitled to own it, under the laws, constitution, or faith of this state; and therefore by its confiscation, neither the laws, constitution, or faith, of this state can be violated; nor can we, as individuals, be accused of injustice, or breach of private faith, unless the opponents of confiscation will be hardy enough to assert, that we were not justifiable in breaking off our connection with the British nation, but that we declared ourselves independent, for the purpose of plundering her subjects. For further illustration of this subject, let us suppose the case of two nations originally separate and independent, for instance, Great-Britain and France. A French merchant, in time of peace, takes up his residence in England, engages in commerce, conducts himself honestly and industriously, and acquires a considerable share of

property. An Englishman has goods taken from him by some other subjects of the French king, and their king, upon requisition being made, refuses to do justice. Or hostilities are commenced by France against Britain. In such case the goods of the French merchant may be seized upon; in the first, by letters of marque for the particular injury; in the last, by a declaration of the damages and expences of the war. Should this merchant remonstrate to the British government, that he had acquired his property under the sanction of their laws, and had placed the most implicit trust and confidence in their good faith, for his enjoying it without molestation, might not the British government, with the strictest justice, reply, "it is true, your laws permitted you to reside here, and to acquire property among us, but those laws were as well the law of nations, declare that the property shall be answerable to us for the defence of your nation, and authorise us to seize it, as we have done, for reparation of the injuries and expences of the war, as the case might be; if you would avail yourself of the benefits of our laws in one instance, you must put up with the inconveniences in the other; and remember, if you suffer any loss, it proceeds from the injustice of your own nation." I admit, should Great-Britain be the aggressor; should she, without just cause, begin the war against France, and under pretence of that war seize upon the property of the French merchant, this seizure would be unjust and inconsistent with public faith, for this reason, that the war being unjust in its commencement and prosecution, no national debt would become due from France to Britain, and therefore there would not be any pretext to seize the property of the surety, that is to say, of the French merchant, for the payment of a debt which was never due from the principal, to the collective body of the French nation.

So when the property in dispute was originally acquired, it is admitted that the laws of the British government, to which we were at that time all of us under subjection, authorized its acquisition; but it is equally true, that not only by the law of nature, but also by the laws and constitution of that kingdom, there may be cases where subjects have a right to resist the oppressive acts of government, and, should it be necessary for the preservation of their liberties, they separate themselves from it, withdraw their allegiance, and form an independent state; upon which event taking place, those, who form themselves into such a state, have an indisputable right, not only by the law of nature and nations, but even by the express principles of the very laws, under the sanction of which the acquisition was made, to seize upon the property of such, who remain the subjects of that government, whose oppression and injustice obliged the separation. If we declared ourselves independent, without any justifiable necessity, if we are still the subjects of that nation, and, at this time, in rebellion, the seizure of British property will be an act of injustice; because the fountain being corrupt, all the streams, which immediately flow from it, must necessarily partake of its nature.

If it is admitted, that the war in which Great-Britain is engaged with America was cruel and unjust in its commencement, nor less so in its continuance; if it is admitted that our opposition was and yet is still necessary; positions which every whig in this state not only admit to be true, but have solemnly sworn to support; if these positions, I say are admitted, it follows by immediate inference, that for all the property which hath been taken from us by taxation, for all that heavy load of debt which we have contracted for the expences of this war, we are every individual of this state, injured and damaged to the amount of our respective share and proportion of that property and that debt, to that amount as the British nation as principal with every of its subjects as security stand indebted to each of us; we are, one and all of us, by the conditions on which we enter into society, entitled to demand, as an undoubted right, from our government, that it will, as far as it has opportunity and power, procure us, from the principal or security, the satisfaction of these damages, the payment of this debt. Whatever British property lies within this state, our government has an opportunity to seize, and, as far as it will go, to apply it for that use, and that, if inclination is not wanting, it has power to do this, no person in his right senses will attempt to deny. Should therefore the government of this state refuse to comply with this obligation, it may, with the strictest propriety, be charged with cruelty, injustice, inhumanity, to those, whom it is bound by every tie to protect, support, and defend, to its own subjects. Let us

the just, procure ment of the should the children character purpose, their pri them be v- erty and ave true, am country, their lim children o- spects es- wanted ave the u- orted t- cause of- connectio- rranical- rampled- as leng- uin. There- pleasible- they were- hem of c- ladered- ale and- en from- and with- an barb- of our c- thers ha- gols; th- moved, a- rible: t- the prop- hem to p- ad which- of repelli- suddenly- nishes in- dingly al- while ju- andied: a- ould be- to other- bat hum- or its ex- and! an- whose fee- be inter- which the- Baltimore- M A- FOR A- defen- of the en- 1. Acco- rived fro- ron of vi- ly damag- re said to- ffered m- as to the- hofe who- audred. be secon- commande- t. Luc- duct of- air of th- fleet o- age to th- ne, with- ion may- portallied- themselves- l. de la M- of gallant- l the eulo- It is repo- ved at Ba- and, with- ere soon- at the co- nglish sq- y for th- ed taken- en; and- or Gibral- ral Don- e Strigh- e; and c- nder, f- Feb. 3- s of ad- e to the- and, La-