

Gazette of the United States.

PUBLISHED WEDNESDAYS AND SATURDAYS BY JOHN FENNO, No. 69, HIGH-STREET, BETWEEN SECOND AND THIRD STREETS, PHILADELPHIA.

[No. 77, of Vol. III.]

SATURDAY, JANUARY 21, 1792.

[Whole No. 285.]

LONDON, November 1.

The following paper has been circulated at Paris, and stands precisely on the same authority as the other publications of the same nature.

The Protest of the Princes of the House of Bourbon, against the acceptance of the Constitution.

IT is in vain that an unfortunate monarch, always captive, though free in appearance, has consented to the ruin of his faithful subjects—to the ruin of the Monarchy—by accepting a pretended Constitution of the Empire; it is in vain that he has signed his own degradation; this sanction which the King has given *in fact* to a monstrous code, is really no sanction *in right*. And who can be persuaded of the legality of such an assent, while every thing proclaims the contrary?

Can a Prince, left alone amidst usurpers, surrounded with the wrecks of his own throne, encompassed by fears and menaces, beset by intrigue, have freedom of choice? And without freedom of choice, is not every consent null?

Freedom consists in being able to chuse without danger, and without fear; it cannot exist without this condition, and consent is null, when refusal would hazard the safety and property of him who gives it. If the King had refused to accept the constitution, he would have been deprived of the crown; so had the usurping Assembly decreed. And in rejecting with disdain a degraded crown, when presented by a seditious Assembly, was the King master of the choice of his asylum? and would he not have exposed his person, and all that was still more dear to him, to outrage, and his faithful subjects to proscription, to murder, and to conflagration?

Without doubt, had Louis XVI. entertained the hope of dying at least with glory, if his blood could have saved France, the inheritor of the virtues of Henry IV. would have displayed his courage. Forced to obtain his inheritance by conquest, he would, like him, have been the victor and the father of his subjects; and, like him, would have compelled them to become happy. But what can courage do without support! Henry had an army; while Louis, alone, betrayed, abandoned, captive in the hands of his enemies, without troops, without auxiliaries, forced even to regret the happy obscurity of the meanest of his subjects, in the midst of an importunate crowd, who served rather to besiege than defend him, found not even one friend to share his sorrows, and wipe away his tears.

The King then could form no other determination than that which he adopted, without hazarding the loss of his crown, and perhaps of his life. His degradation, and even his death, would have been an useless sacrifice to honor; it would have caused France long and fruitless remorse, but could not have saved it.

The King then was not free; his sanction is therefore null; and in this case to disobey illusory orders, is to give the strongest and most courageous proof of obedience and fidelity; it is to serve the real Monarch, it is to serve God and our country.

Scarcely could this pretended assent be credited, if the King had proclaimed it amidst his family, surrounded with his ancient and faithful servants, with all his military household, in fine, with all the splendor of his former power. Then the royal assent, though the occasion of so much ruin, would nevertheless have been recognized as just, at least reputed free; then we might have condemned the error of the Prince, but should not have wept over his chains; then the fact would have been incontestible, we could only have disputed the right.

In fact, even if the King had enjoyed full possession of his liberty, would he have had the right to sanction laws contrary to the fundamental laws of the kingdom? Could he, from a mistaken generosity, and in the expectation of a deceitful calm, have sacrificed, along with himself, his family, his successors, the true happiness of the people, generations present and to come? Could he give a valid approbation to the pretended Constitution, which had occasioned so many misfortunes? Possessor for life of the throne which he received from his ancestors, could the King, in alienating his primordial rights, destroy the constitutive basis on which it is founded? Born Defender of the Religion of the State, could he consent to what tends to its ruin, and abandon its ministers to wretchedness and dis-

grace? Bound to administer justice to his subjects, could he renounce the function, essentially royal, of causing it to be administered by tribunals legally constituted, and of superintending himself the administration? Protector of the rights of all the orders, and of the possessions of individuals; could he sanction the invasion of the one, and the violation of the other? Father of the People, could he abandon them to disorder and anarchy? In fine, could he highly approve what reason and justice condemn, and eternize the misfortunes of France?

And what is this Constitution, which they pretend to give us, except a monster destructive of laws human and divine; a work of offence and iniquity; null, from the vice of the convocation of the members of the Assembly, styling themselves Constitutive; null from the combination of the Deliberating Body, a combination subversive of the first basis of the State, the distinction of orders; null from the principles which it establishes, since they overturn the throne and the altar, and tend to replunge men into barbarism by appearing to bring them back to nature; null from its consequences, dreadful consequences, of which experience already presents a too faithful catalogue in the disorder of the finances, in the scarcity of money, in the stagnation of commerce, in the want of discipline among the troops, in the inactivity of the tribunals, the silence of the laws, the tyranny of the factious, and the oppression of the rich; in one word, the triumph of licentiousness over true liberty?

It would be useless to accumulate reasoning; truth is too striking; and facts already speak so loudly, that the consequence cannot be denied, without a species of self-deception. The King then had no right to sanction such a Constitution, of which his sanction, already null by the defect of freedom, is null likewise by the defect of right.

Ah! when victorious over the Gauls the first Franks assembled in the Champ-de-Mars, raised Pharamond on the shield; when their warlike voices exclaimed—"Reign over us, and let your descendants reign over our children,"—they were far from foreseeing, that at the end of fourteen ages a generation would come, whose madness would destroy the work of wisdom and of valour! When Philip the Fair, reviving the rights of the people, that had been disregarded under indolent Monarchs, summoned to the States General the Deputies of the Third Estate, and placed them along with the Peers of his realm, he did not suspect that one day this ungrateful order would overturn the two others, would deck ambitious Tribunes with the spoils of Supreme Power, and leave only the phantom of a King on the throne of Charlemagne.

No, it shall not be so: no, the French Monarchy shall not perish. And since motives which it is impossible for us to perceive, but which can originate only from the violence and constraint which, by being disguised, are only more cruel, force Louis XVI. to subscribe an acceptance which his heart rejects, which his own interest and that of his people condemn, and which his duty as King expressly prohibits;

We protest in the face of the whole world, and in the most solemn manner, against this illusive act, and all that may follow from it. We have shewn that it is null of itself, null by defect of liberty, null from the radical vice of all the operations of the usurping Assembly, which not being an Assembly of the States General, is nothing. We are supported by the rights of the whole nation, in rejecting decrees diametrically opposite to their wishes, expressed by the unanimous tenor of instructions to their Representatives; and we disavow, on behalf of the nation, those treacherous mandatories, who, in violating their orders, and departing from the mission entrusted to them, ceased to be its Representatives. We will maintain what is evident, that having acted contrary to their title, they have acted without power, and what they could not legally do cannot be validly accepted.

We protest for the King, and in his name, against only what can bear its false impression. His voice being stifled by oppression, we will be its necessary organs; and we express his real sentiments as they exist in the oath of his accession to the throne, as they have appeared in the actions of his whole life, as they have been displayed in the Declaration which he made at

the first moment that he believed himself free. He neither can nor ought to have any other, and his will exists only in those acts where it breathes freely.

We protest for the People, who, in their delirium, cannot perceive how destructive this phantom of a new Constitution, which is made to dazzle their eyes, and before which they are vainly made to swear, must become to them. When these people neither knowing their lawful Chief, nor their dearest interests, suffer themselves to be misguided to their destruction; when blinded by deceitful promises, they see not those who excite them to destroy the pledges of their own security, the supporters of their repose, the principles of their subsistence, and all the ties of their civil association; it becomes necessary to claim for them the re-establishment of all these; it becomes necessary to save them from their own frenzy.

We protest for the religion of our fathers, which is attacked in its dogmas and worship, as well as its Ministers; and in order to supply the Monarch's want of power at present to discharge in his own person his duties as eldest son of the Church, we assume in his name the defence of its rights; we oppose those invasions of its property which tend to degrade it; we rise with indignation against acts which menace the kingdom with the horrors of schism; and we loudly profess our unalterable attachment to the Ecclesiastical Rules admitted in the States, the observance of which he has sworn to maintain.

We protest for the fundamental maxims of the Monarchy, from which the King is not permitted to depart; which the nation itself has declared to be inviolable; and which would be totally reversed by the decrees which abolish Royalty itself; by suppressing all the intermediate ranks; by those which deprive Monarchy of the functions most essential to Monarchical government.

In fine, we protest in the presence of the Supreme Being, and in the name of Eternal Justice, for all Orders of the State, and for all Frenchmen.

This Protest, signed along with us by all the Princes of the Blood who are connected with us, is common to all the House of Bourbon, on whom their eventual rights to the crown impose the duty of defending the august deposit.

(Signed) LOUIS-STANISLAUS-XAVIER,
CHARLES-PHILIPPE,
L. JOSEPH DE BOURBON,
LOUIS-HENRI JOS. DE BOURBON,
L. A. H. DE BOURBON.

Coblentz, October 8, 1791.

A messenger arrived in town on Wednesday with dispatches from Constantinople, Warsaw, Vienna and Berlin, containing the treaty of peace with the Turks, signed by all the powers concerned.

Letters from Stockholm mention, that in consequence of the report becoming public there, that the King intended to assist the French refugee princes, in re-establishing them and their arbitrary power in France, several of the Swedish regiments have declared they will not act, and it is thought such will become the general declaration of the army.

The King of Sweden's acquiescence to his Most Christian Majesty's acceptance of the Crown, with the limitations prescribed by the National Assembly, takes off one of the most active enemies to the new Constitution.

The Court of Saxony likewise, reckoned amongst the most inveterate foes to the Revolutionists, according to the last accounts from the Continent, has acknowledged the new Constitution, and accepted of the Ambassador sent with it.

With regard to Great-Britain, little remarkable has occurred during the present vacation of parliament, either to arouse the attention of the people, or excite the curiosity of the politician. The late armament, like the baseless fabric of a vision, has now almost vanished; the greater part of the ships are paid off; and the seamen being discharged, such of them as prefer vice and idleness to industry and labour, will seek a livelihood by rapine and plunder. The expences of this armament, which must be considerable, will no doubt form a topic of discussion in the course of next session; the abolition of the slave-trade will, in all probability, be also revived; but