

Gazette of the United States.

A NATIONAL PAPER, PUBLISHED WEDNESDAYS AND SATURDAYS BY JOHN FENNO, No. 34, NORTH FIFTH STREET, PHILADELPHIA.

[No. 104 of Vol. IV.]

WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 1793.

[Whole No. 426.]

For the GAZETTE of the UNITED STATES.

THOUGHTS ON THE STATE OF AMERICAN INDIANS. (Continued from No. 99, of this Gazette.) No. VIII.

ANOTHER important step to be taken in bringing the aborigines of this country to civilized manners, is the permanent establishment of marriage between a single pair.—The practice of polygamy—the informalities of the marriage contract—and the frequent and causeless separations, which take place among them, call for a reform. Polygamy is condemned by nature—the proportion which exists between the two sexes—the actual experience of its inefficacy to promote population, and the jealousy, distrust and inhumanity it creates, prove it incompatible with the interests of society or morals.

The formalities at the commencement of the contract, are so few and unimportant, as leave no durable impression of the obligations it confers—and the frequent divorces and renewed marriages, lessen domestic harmony, weaken parental affection, and retard the multiplication of the species. The institution of marriage, is one of the foundation principles of civil society. It at once raises the female sex from that state of degradation in which savage nations have confined them, to the rank and influence to which by the equal laws of nature they are entitled—and gives them that ascendancy over the public opinion and manners, which they are peculiarly fitted to maintain. The delicacy of their constitutions, the exquisite sensibility of their passions, the softness of their manners, and the attractions of love, are calculated to temper the fierce passions, and humanize the coarser feelings of the men. The estimation of women is in effect a distinguishing mark of growing refinement.

Marriage also lays the most solid foundation for domestic happiness and the increase of population. A community of goods—a participation of joy and sorrow—mutual interest in each others reputation—the habit of reciprocal attentions and kindnesses, and the equal and interesting care of the offspring, strengthen the attachment of the parents, sweeten the ties which unite them, and add new delights to all the scenes of domestic intercourse. Marriage further ensures the care of both the parents to support and educate their children, and to train them to some employment by which they may be able to obtain their own subsistence, and contribute to the wealth and strength of the community.

It is in the narrow circle of domestic society that good members of the community are formed. There the principles of order, subordination and industry, are first acquired, and youth trained for the duties of manhood.

In the means employed by ancient legislators to introduce the institution of marriage, to render it honorable, and to prevent the violation of it, we trace the high esteem in which they held it.

The more effectually to destroy the promiscuous and temporary connexion which generally prevails between the sexes in rude and savage nations, and to introduce the custom of a permanent union between a single pair—they incorporated the form of marriage with the ceremonies of religion, and sanctioned it by the authority of the laws.

They also availed themselves of those customs to which accident or necessity had given birth, and by blending them with their institutions, facilitated their reception, and augmented the public veneration for modesty and decorum. In later times, the same principles have been adopted for the same purpose. Thus the man always solicits. The ceremony is performed by a person invested with authority, in the presence of the relations and friends of the parties, attended with some act of religion. So highly was the conjugal union esteemed among the ancient Greeks, that above two centuries elapsed before widows dared marry again, and the surprise of antiquity has transmitted us the name of the woman who first entered on a second marriage—celibacy was disgraceful, and barrenness was deemed a great misfortune.

Children born in lawful wedlock were an honor and an ornament to their parents, and gave them rank and distinction among their fellow citizens.

In Rome marriage was encouraged by annexing particular privileges to it. Those who had the most children, *ceteris paribus*, were always preferred. Thus the consul who had the most numerous offspring, received the ensigns of office first, and had the choice of the provinces. The senator, in like circumstances, had his name written first in the catalogue, and the privilege of delivering his opinion first in the senate. Such were looser capable of office, and were exempted from such as were troublesome.

The severe laws of almost all nations against conjugal infidelity discover to us the respect they entertained for modesty, and the care they employed to preserve the public veneration for it—among the Egyptians, Grecians, Romans, Hindoos, Germans, and Peruvians—the crime of adultery was punished with extreme rigor.

Thus by establishing a permanent union between a single pair—by obtaining the public sentiment in favor of it—by enacting laws to prevent the violation of the contract and by strengthening the natural guards to modesty, ancient legislators brought their people from promiscuous love to a lawful and honorable connection, and rendered it a powerful instrument in improving their manners and in bringing them to a relish for civil society.

Let these precautions which have succeeded in other nations be taken to establish marriages among our American Indians—let the ceremony be public and solemn—let it be honorable and desirable—make it the interest of the parents to have a numerous offspring, let those who excel in this respect be entitled to superior distinction and let modesty be guarded by the public sentiment and the authority of law.

For the GAZETTE of the UNITED STATES.

MR. FENNO,

IN justification of the French revolution which promises to be productive of so much good to mankind, though unhappily attended with some very disagreeable appendages in bringing it about, permit me to recapitulate, some observations I have met with in the course of my reading on the civil war of Great Britain in the last century.

“The English have, by more historians than one, been much reproached for entering so readily into a civil war against their sovereign, and the same reflections have been made against other nations, that have been actuated by the same spirit: It may not be efore be amiss to enquire into the propriety of this opinion and draw a slight parallel between the value of Liberty, and the unhappy effects which must necessarily attend the assertion of it, by violent means.—If the latter are found to outweigh the former, those who have made such remarks are doubtless in the right, and have proved sufficiently that a nation when she finds her liberties attacked, had better resign them all at once, and by that means escape the horrors of a civil war.

But if coolness is pardonable in answering such a proposition, let us ask a plain question without the least heat—What on earth is so valuable as freedom? Can any sacrifices too great be made for the preservation of that, without which nothing is any longer of value; without which all possession, even of the common rights of nature, the enjoyment of health, family, fortune and every thing most dear to the human mind is totally precarious! Can any, one hesitate a moment in answering this query? A florid description of the horrors of a civil war, may be the answer. But why are these effects called horrors? Surely because they are destructive of those very connections and possessions, the security of which fly on the approach of arbitrary power. Can a civil war be the ruin of any thing, which despotism will spare? Are not domestic convulsions temporary, and the loss of liberty perpetual? May not the security of every thing valuable to mankind, be rendered permanent by a resolute defence of liberty? Is any thing gained by its loss? where then, in the name of common sense, can be found an argument sufficient to level the comparison.

But I am not much surpris'd at historians disliking the age wherein public liberty is asserted; the reign of Charles the first cannot figure like that of an Anne, wherein the actions of a Marlborough are recited—nor like that of a Louis XIV. wherein the monarch is the grand Hero. But where a people are struggling for their liberty—where the legislative power is constantly involved in disputes with an ill desigining executive, the historic page is by no means brilliant. The nation's jealousy and stubbornness may have some bad consequences in the opinion of courtiers—the reign may not be shining, but perplexed and crabbed, filled with the circle of endless disputes, and all the jarring dissidence of patriotism and power, party and corruption, accusation and defence, with a long string of suspicions and fears, which make a wretched figure in history—in such a situation even the public foreign affairs will suffer. Paltry considerations! Let them! The people however are securing their Liberty; and they had better preserve that, with such fancied disgrace, than lose it triumphing in the midst of glory.

I am persuaded that a free nation, had better be continually involved in disgusting disputes between courtiers and patriots, in all the minutiae of discontent, and jealous of the power of government, be aiming ever at fixing new bounds to ambition, and raising fresh obstacles to despotic designs:—better far let their annals be despised in future ages, as a collection of disgusting quarrels and rash vio-

lences, than have them shine with the glorious but diabolic details, which enliven and adorn the page of an historian.—The conquests of an Alexander—the slaughtered millions of a Cæsar—the daring rashness of a Charles; and the victorious career of a Frederic;—These are the tales of wonder which glow in splendid colours beneath the pencil of an admiring recorder; these are the wretches who fill the world with carnage—trample on the liberties of mankind—break thro' all the ties of nature, and leave their names foremost on the list of Fame.—Is this fame? Is fame the reward of these military heroes, who to use an excellent expression of Rousseau, are good for nothing but to knock one another on the head—what a pother is made about this fame! This shining phantom which glitters on the ruins of humanity! The ineffable worth of liberty is not to be put in competition with these alone, but with civil wars themselves and every domestic convulsion that can disturb a free people: No horrors are too great to hazard for the enjoyment of this greatest of all earthly blessings. Take the long run of several ages, and it will be found that public freedom has seldom been secured but by means of domestic war; England has more than once been a pregnant instance of this. To the courage of worthy patriots, exerted in the field against the sway of tyranny, is that freedom owing, which we now enjoy and is the envy of nine tenths of Europe. It is to the convulsions which shook England in the middle of the last century, that succeeding ages owe their liberty. Thoe wars, it is true, were very terrible (though not half so much so, as the modern campaign) but had they been fifty times more so, would a brave nation hesitate to hazard all, to overturn the effects of arbitrary power? No, paint the terrors of domestic war in the most striking colours; the terrors of despotism will be more terrible still; infinitely are all imaginable horrors of that kind to be preferred to the deadly tranquility which hoods over a nation of slaves—before that state of stupid ferocity, corruption and negligence which fascinates a nation's courage, and with all the silence of certainty forges the chains of despotism itself.” CIVIS.

Address of the German Republican Society of Philadelphia, to M. GENET, Minister Plenipotentiary from the Republic of France to the United States.

Citizen Genet, Minister Plenipotentiary from the Republic of France to the United States of America.

S I R,

THE German Republican Society of Philadelphia, congratulate you as the Representative of the people of France, on your safe arrival in this city: We welcome you, with heart-felt joy, to this Land of Liberty, which your generous and gallant nation contributed to make happy. We feel the liveliest sympathy for the distresses of our republican brethren, who are combating the fell hosts of tyrants, in defence of their own natural rights, and the rights of mankind; and deplore, that a nation, from whom we are descended, should be among the first in the conspiracy against Liberty. We see, with pain and horror, the confederation of all European despots against Freedom—their united efforts to supersede the general will of France: but though foes encompass her brave sons, we trust, the arm, nerve'd by Liberty, will be invincible, and that the millennium of political happiness, is opening its prospects upon them. The combinations of the sovereignty of the people, are the only security for general liberty and happiness; and we flatter ourselves, these will be at length so well understood, as to fix the Rights of Man upon an immovable basis, and that the French nation will give an example to the European world, of rulers and ruled having but one object and one will—the GOOD OF THEIR COUNTRY.

With our best wishes for the perpetual union and freedom of our respective republics, and for your full enjoyment of every blessing which can serve the glorious cause in which you are embarked,

We are,
With sentiments of republican affection,
Your friends,
By order of the Society,
HENRY KAMMERER, Pres.
MICHAEL LEIB, } Sec'ries.
ANDREW GEYER, }
Philadelphia, May 17, 1793.

TO WHICH BE RETURNED THE FOLLOWING ANSWER:

The German Republican Society of Philadelphia.

CITIZENS,

I HAVE had the satisfaction of spending several years of my life among the people of Germany, and during my stay with them, knew how to esteem and respect those individuals, whom the absurd prejudices of birth, and the disgraceful habits of slavery, had not entirely estranged from humanity. It was ever my opinion, that this great nation would

enthusiastically rouse itself to vindicate and maintain with invincible firmness, the sacred flame of liberty, as soon as it could free itself from the incumbrances of its monstrous constitution:—That desirable event has not yet, however, taken place. The hubs of despots that have possess'd themselves of the sovereignty of the German people, still continue to rivet their chains upon them: I am convinced, however, my opinion is well founded notwithstanding, and that Germany will be FREE.

The republican sentiments that animate the hearts of all those I have had the opportunity of seeing beyond the limits of their own unfortunate country, are a convincing proof to me, that this will be the case; and under such a view of things, so important to the sincere friends of humanity, I cannot express how much your address has excited my sensibility.

I shall make your sentiments known to my fellow-citizens, and have no doubt they will receive, with the most lively marks of satisfaction, the good wishes you have expressed for the success of their arms and the extension of their principles.

GENET.

EXTRACTS,

Written in 1790.—Translated from the French.

IN the human body it is the combination of the organs which form the Constitution—the head dictates laws and the other members execute. It is essential that the head which represents the legislative and judicial powers, should be calm and deliberate in its decrees, and that the arm, representing the executive power, should have promptitude and force.

MONTESQUIEU, having first established the distinction of the three powers, proved that they existed in every form of government, whether Democracy or Monarchy, Despotism or Aristocracy, in like manner as the primitive colours exist and are found in every ray of the Sun. Such is the leading idea of this great man. But he has not said with a sufficient clearness, in treating on the different kinds of government, that a pure democracy as well as an absolute despotism did not and cannot exist on earth—that they are two creatures of our imagination, two conceptions of the mind, two models of which all the governments in the world bear some resemblance—for there is in fact no state where the people at once govern always by themselves without representation; nor is there any empire on the globe where the will of an individual governs without controul. Whence it follows, that as all possible governments float between pure democracy and absolute despotism, as between two extremes to which they more or less approach, there is not and never will be in the world but *Aristocracies*, that is to say, mixed governments. This name is properly given to the government of those States where a permanent senate governs all without ever consulting the people. Such is Venice which is also called a Republic; it is a pure aristocracy in this sense, that the three powers are in the hands of the nobles. That state in which the will of an individual is most frequently a law, and decides on the life or death of the subject, is called a despotic state. Such is the Turkish empire. But it is not true that the Sultan is absolute master; his power finds limits at every step he advances, and he is obliged to respect them. This empire then is between aristocracy and despotism, but inclines towards the latter. In fine, the state where the people choose their magistrates for a fixed period, and often assemble to exercise the sovereignty, is a democracy, and is called a republic; such were Athens and Rome, and such are the United States of America. The government of these states is between an aristocracy and

* Carter, chap. 12.
† Ibidem History of North America, p. 63.
‡ Carter, chap. 12. Colden, History of the Five Nations.
§ Coquet, vol. 1 p. 52.
¶ Montesquieu, vol. 11. p. 123.