Dr. Swift, in a learned discussion on the subject of government, observes, "I think it manifest from the practice of the wisest nations, and who seem to have the truest notions of freedom, that there was *no natural right* in *one man* to *govern another*.', And Vattel says, "*every* man is born free."

None but a knave or a maniac, it would seem, can dispute the rationality and correctness of the principle laid down by Dr. Swift, that there exists "*no natural right in one to govern another*" As this must be admitted, it will appear, that *unlike* yourself, the *learned*, the *honored* and *distinguished* p nman of the *Declaration* of *Independence*, was not inclined to *impose* on the world, mere idle rant, when in that *immortal* instrument, he recognised the right of man, to "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness" And notwithstanding you will not concede, that the Grand Jury were correct in making the reference quoted from the declaration of Indepedence; yet there is in my mind, something felicitous in the idea of its bearing upon the subject in controversy. I do not profess myself to be very familiar on the subject of expatriation; but *honest* political views —*common sense* and a *slight* portion of *manly sentiment*, with any thing *like* sollid judgement, must furnish many conclusive arguments in support of it. Indeed, I would deem it matter of supererogation to glance at the subject, were it not to defend the *purity* of the reply to the charge, in some of its important points from your *contemptible* criticisms upon it.

That such sages as signed the Declarotion of Independence, should declare to the world, that "liberty and the pursuit of happiness" were the *natural*, the *inherent*, and "UNALIENABLE" rights of man, is, to my mind a *strong* confirmation of the truth of the doctrine; however much it may be foreign to the *Anti-American* views of the *foreign* interest & attatchment of any individual! A right to be unalienable, CANNOT be *transferable*. How then can the *life* and *liberty* of a man, which are *his* by the laws of God and Nature, be made the property of the soil on which he may breath; have chanced to draw his first or of the government, under which he may have been born. On the score of equity and justice, the *principle* is *immutable*—that there "is no natural right in one man to govern another."—*Tyranny* and its friends may interfere with and condemn this doctrine; but they cannot subvert its truth. Were a *free born* American to offer *incense* at *this* shrine, it would stamp such foul blot on his charracter, as could not fail to consign his name to abhorrence and execration!

It is admitted, that all governments are foundad on on *institution*, *consent*, or *force*:—but it is asked, where is the proof that either *institution;* or *consent* renders the natives of England or Ireland the property of the Prince Regent; particularly, after they may have left, "in pursuit of happiness," a scene of starvation and misery, to expatriate themselves in this country, where they have sought and found plenty and content? No such proof can be adduced. That *force* should establish a claim on the part of a despot, who *alone* would exercise it; none but a madman, a *rank* monarchist, or parasite of monarchieal power, would admit.

Perhaps you may conceive the divine right of Emperors & Kings constitutes a claim to the subjugation of man,—and that holding in vile bondage the *minds* and *bodies* of their subjects, is not an usurpation of power, but the *legitimate* offspring of "annointed" consequence and supremacy? Even such bloody and capricious *excesses*, as those commited by *Nero* and *Calligula*, in exercsing *such* DIVINE right, might perhaps, find palliation in your system of opposition to the right of expatriation—and apologists among its advocates!

By a reference to the histories of Greece and Rome, it will be found, that at times the *divine* right and power of their potentates were not held sacred or inviolable. But does the *immaculate* genealogy of *British* sovereignty *better* entitle it to *its* subjects as *absolute* heritage? And by *compact*, or otherwise, in what part of the English history have the subjects of the realm ever extinguished or relinquished the *natural* right of expatriation? In my plain and unsophisticated mode of discussion, I am desirous of looking to the source, as the quarter from whence correct deductions should be drawn.

The simple and natural principle laid down is as *indestructible* as truth itself. How then can you make those divine aspirations of the soul of man, which would embrace such "liberty and the pursuit of happiness," as constitute his claim to the right of expatriation, the *abject* property of any spot of earth, or of frail humanity, in the shape of tyranny and oppression? As well might you contend that the *soul* itself were *tangible*, and subject to the grasp of earthly power!

Your *mean* attempt to *circumvent* the force of the *true* application of the terms "liberty and the pursuit of happiness," as introduced in the reply to the charge, is *pitifully* insignificant. To infer that you could not discover *they* had any meaning, "unless, indeed, the Grand Jury contend, that this *concession* authorises a man to be guilty of perjury, to lie, to steal, to riot, or murder, or to violate every duty he owes to his fellow citizens, whenever those duties interfere with his pursuits of happiness"—is a *violation* of every thing *like* decency; and the *low artifice* resorted to, for the purpose of parrying truth, and indulging in an *attempt* at wit or sarcasm, has not been *equalled* by the *brilliancy* of the display you have given! Had you held in proper respect the sacred charter of our rights; you would not thus have ridiculed the import and tenor of its language. Your insinuation, that the blessings of "liberty and the pursuit of happiness," must connect with them the crimes enumerated, is *too* flagrant an absurdity to justify further comment.

When *disrespect* is offered to the Declaration of American Independence; or when the *fair* construction of its chaste, sublime and patriotic language is *tortured* and *derided*, by having heaped upon it the most despicable *bufoonery;* we may reasonably calculate, that the Constitution of OUR beloved country, (excuse the expression)—the sacred Palladium of our Liberty, will not be honored with greater regard!

Impelled by your *rage* of *folly* and *error*, you seem to set at defiance the admonitory dictates of prudence, and to carry a point, which if established, could only yield advantage to the enemy; you have, I believe, transcended the truth; when you state, that "the constitution, does not declare that persons so naturalized shall thereby become discharged from their allegiance to that government, of which they were previously the subjects or citizens, *or from any other duties*, which they owed either to that government or their fellow citizens." Again, you say, "A government may confer what privileges it pleases on foreigners, and on what terms it pleases; *but it cannot take* away *the rights, which his former government* had to his PERSON and PROPERTY. It may protect the one and the other, while remaining within its jurisdiction; but the moment either *he* or his PROPERTY is out of that jurisdiction and falls within the power of his former government, *that* government, has a right to enforce, whatever obligations such citizen or his property is under to it, or to punish any breach of those obligations, and in so doing it gives no cause of just complaint to the government which had adopted him."

The *reprehensible* length you are disposed to go, in intrenching upon, and beating down the *natural* and "*unalienable*" rights of man; and in *hostility* to the ground taken by the government, is the *fair* counterpart of some *other* splendid acts of your life! Pity, at present restrains me from giving effusion to feelings excited, at the recollection of past occurrences; and if *exposition* is not urged by yourself, the mantle of compassion shall still shelter your *most* vulnerable points, from the "pelting of the pitiless storm" of public disapprobation.

The Constitution of the United States, authorizes Congress to "*establish an uniform* rule of naturalization"—Such authorization, necessarily *pre-supposes* the existence of power to produce it:—and if the right of expatriation is *sustained*, by the authorities furnished, then *such* power did *amply* exist; not only to render naturalization a *local* and *partial* benefit; but an *universal* one.

*Puffendorf* declares "it is impossible that the *same* aubject should be capable of *two* obligations of the *same* nature." And the same highly venerated writer adds, "it has been *justly* concluded, therefore, that *naturalization* NECESSARILY *annuals his first allegiance*." How then could you venture to sink yourself *still* lower in public opinion, by stating that "none could be found who have ever contended, that (by naturalization) they thereby could annihilate the obligation such citizen was under before his adoption, either to his former government, or any INDIVIDUAL" Even admitting that you intended to apply your declaration to *governments*—it can then be answered, both in contradiction and condemnation of prevarication and absurdity, that the American government recognizes such principle in the oath imposed by law, as necessary to be administered, in investing the individual with the rights of citizenship.

It would be *preposterous* in the extreme, and nothing less than the most *impious blasphemy* on the *part* of the *government* and the *agents* of its power, to impose a solemn oath in granting citizenship, obliging the individual to whom it may be administered, to *disavow* and sacredly *abjure* ALL *allegiance*, to any power or government on earth, other than to that of these United States, if it could be admitted, as you contend, that the rights of his former government *connot* be shaken off. To support your position, are you prepared to say, that the government and those who execute its power, are guilty of *such* foul crimes? For this you do declare, in advocating your *Anglo*-American doctrine!

Borne down, it would seem, by the strength of *crooked* views and the most *preverse* passion; *blind* too in *self-sufficiency*, in the path of error, you seem determined to involve yourself in the most *inextricable* absurdity. You say, "no part of our constitution, nor of our laws, recognize this doctrine (expatriation) or promise to naturalized citizens its benefits, therefore, the good faith, and the honor of the nation, are in no manner pledged to them for its support"—Did you intend that this barefaced *imposition* should be practised to throw a damp on such noble ardor of feeling, in the bosom of the adopted citizen, as animated the immortal *Montgomery*; which laid him in the grave of honor, and has erected an *imperishable* monument, sacred to his name and glory, in every Ameriean heart? A *glimmer* of *honest* reflection, must flash conviction on the mind, to establish the *contrary* of your position; and the naturalized citizen holds his guarantee of security, in the existence of an admitted *reciprocal* obligation on the part of the government to protect him. But how ought you to hide your *diminished* head, when the present dignified attitude of the government in support of the principle you *deny*, is brought into view; with that system of *retaliation* which has grown out of its determination to maintain it!

Your declaration, that even the *property* of the *adopted citizen*, when out of the jurisdiction of this country, is subject to the grasp of *his* former *owner*, is a *novelty* in *magnitude* equal to the *dimensions* of the *absurdity* last exposed; and is too *shallow*, even to be calculated to *strengthen* the hostile tone of the enemy. But in a period of peace, where can you make reference to *verify* such sentiment? It must be admitted that some of the European governments combine with their organization of power, a *sufficiency* of atrocity to take advantage of *this* right you are so willing to extend to them, if they had the liberty of exercising it; without, *like* yourself, setting at defiance every *salutary* restraint! A *perilous* jeopardy would, indeed, ivolve the commercial interests of adopted citizens, if their property were thus the prey of the fangs your *prolific* fancy has formed! If your allulusions were directed to a time of war; it needed not the *sapience* of your *exalted* mind to demonstrate their object to the world!

The manner in which you have regulated the "even tenor of your way," by such *scrupulous* respect for *propriety* and *truth:* and the *extreme* solicitude you have manifested in *both* your communications, by the *assiduous* attention you have paid to, and the *extensive* range you have taken in *support* of *Religion* and *Morality*, makes it require but a "*slight* beam of SOBER reason to play upon the mind," to discover that *devout* and *pious* research is one of the *great* and *leading* objects of your SPIRITUALIZED, *refined* and *etherial* mind! And although Puffendorf and Vattel, combined with the whole system of the Laws of Nations, may not make you a proselyte to their opinion, on the subject of expatriation; yet it may be hoped, that the *stiff* neck will be bent, and the *hardened* heart *softened*, when the *Bible* is cited to prove that those great and good men are right. Notwithstanding you must be very familiar with the contents of that sacred volume, as it would appear, by the *visible* effect its divine *diedates* have in influencing your *conduct;* still by some fatility you certainly omitted to be properly impressed with the following. *Leviticus*, Chap. 19, ver. 34. "But the stranger that dwelleth with you, shall be unto you, AS ONE BORN ANONG YOU, AND THOU SHALT LOVE HIM AS THYSELF." To make the stranger *as one born among us*, we must give him *all* the rights, and the *same* security and protection to *person* and *property*, we are entitled to, and enjoy ourselves. "*And thou shalt love him as thyself:*" to *owe* him, and *promise* him protection, in every extent we would claim it ourselves; and afterwards *point* him out to the *enemy* as a *fit* victim for *ignominious* punishment, and *use* arguments to *produce* the sacrifice, would be *baseness* and *cruelty*, instead of love!

The mere *remnant* of that *ability* which constitutes *literary* fame—or the chaotic *ruins* of *decayed* intellect, might have furnished *better* materials, even in a *bad* cause, than those on which you have attempted to base and raise your superstructure of error. But could you wield the *ponderous* shield of *former* times, it would not avail, in *such* a cause, when opposed to the sacred *ægis* of truth.

Even the few feeble arguments which my artless views have furnished, without much reflection, must, I flatter myself, carry conviction to every honest mind, in favor of the right of expatriation. And after such *exposure*, if *ordinary* sensibility were the resident of your bosom, you would be covered with shame and confusion.

As one of the late Grand Jury, I am not sensible that they "had totally forgotten their proper station in the order of Jurisprudence, had assumed to themselves powers unknown to our constitution, or our laws, and had acted with gross impropriety, arrogance and indecency."—Nor do I believe such to be the fact. For although I will be ever willing to shew a proper respect for Courts of Justice, when in the correct sphere of *official* duty; I would, notwithstanding, ever *protest* against any undue infringement of those sacred prerogatives confided to a Grand Jury; and as becomes a Freeman, as a member of such body, I would resist *innovation*, when indulged in to gratify *political* spleen, and when combined with the solemnity of a charge: and I would ever be prepared, to prostrate the *silly self importance;* the *turgid insolence*, and *vaporing arrogance*, of any individual, "clothed with a little brief authority," who would attempt to *over-awe*, by *towering* in *consequence* beyond his *legal* height!

If answering the charge was "*gross impropriety;*" much more so, was the introduction, into it, of that factious and intollerant political *mania*, for which it was so conspicuous. To blend the attributes of a Judge, with the blazing passions of a political partizan, arrayed against the government, is an "assumption of power," it is believed, "unknown to the constitution and Laws"—and a *more* "gross impropriety, arrogance and indecency;" than for a Grand Jury to curb *such* violence, when calculated to inflame and offend the feelings of a large majority of their fellow citizens.

You would remind the late Grand Jury, "that subordination is essential in all well regulated societies;" how far *you* put in practice this sentiment can be readily appreciated, by the *respect* you evince for the constituted authority of your country and the laws.

The spirit of "subordination" you have manifested, may be seen in the following exhibits from your rejoinder; which are brought in *splendid* array before you, to *please* and *dazzle* you with a *condensed* view of the *patriotic* sublimity of your composition! In charity to you it is hoped, that your *warmth* & *enthusiasm* in support of *Religion* and *Morality*, is not so much a matter of *empty* parade! On this point, if it were a pleazing task, I might, perhaps, be disposed to strip sanctimonious gasconade of its georgeous trappings, and expose the enormity of CANTING fanaticism to contempt and detestation.

*EXHIBIT No* 1.

"That the Grand Jury have taken this opportunity to identify themselves with every vile Sycophant and Lickspittle of the present administration, wretches who would sacrifice a nation to their interest, their pride, their hatred, or their ambition; who would wade to wealth or to power through the blood of the innocent and unoffending, and mock at the distress and misery brought by them upon their country—and to stigmatize all those worthy and virtuous citizens of the U. States who condemn the measures of the government, and disapprove of the War in which we are engaged, as unnecessary and unjust—and who consider the weakness by which it hath been conducted only equalled by the wickedness of declaring it, as being treacherous, venal and abandoned, wickedly endeavoring to paralize the National Arm and appal the National Heart, is what the Court cannot believe to be the object, as thereby they would only prove their ignorance of the rights of free Citizens, their insolence and arrogance, and the imbecility of their malignity."

You will remember, the above Exibit, and those which follow, have all been copied from the Rejoinder, in MS as handed to the late Grand Jury, and which is in my possession You or your printer have deemed it *expedient* to *depart a little* from *that* copy, in presenting it to the public in printed form; and in doing so, you have rendered your *ingenuity* MORE manifest than your *ingenuousness*! Tho' the paragraph does not bear even the *semblance* of *propriety*, or any traces of the *gentleman* or the *scholar*—yet as a *man of feeling*, and a *Printer*, I have *corrected* your *orthography*; from an unwillingness to exhibit *such* deficiency to the world, as attached to yourself—the would be *great* and *invincible literary* and *political Luminary* o Maryland! Of the construction of your language, I will only observe, that your *component* parts, in many instances, from an *incongruous* whole! But, it cannot be wondered at, that there should be a *want* of *method*; if, as it is said, your present "temperament of mind is as hot as pepper, and subject to perpetual whirlwinds and tornadoes!" Should a moment of calm reflection happily visit you, it cannot fail to admonish you to abandon the pen; for, by perseverring in its *abuse*, the tottering fabric of your fame will soon bury you in its ruins!

It is with a portion of self condemnation; I humble myself so *low*, as to notice the *scurrilous* tenor of Exhibit No. 1. If you intended to apply to the administration and its friends, the *foul* epithets, . . "every vile sycophant and lick-spittle of the present administration, wretches who would sacrifice a nation to their interest, their pride, their hatred, or their ambition who would wade to wealth or power through the blood of the innocent and unoffending, and mock at the distress and misery brought by them on their country"—I repeat, for the length of your *stream* of *venom* seems to require it, that if the administration and its friends were intended, you really deserve to be EXALTED—and it shall be by conferring on you a title of distinction, which you seem contending for—that of great *political incendiary*!

The *subtility* of your judgment, in defining what constitutes *paralizing the national arm and appalling the national heart*, may not accommodate itself to my blunt and plain mode of construction of the subject; for I am willing to brand with infamy any American, who would raise the *standard* of daring opposition to a war with a foreign power, when *fairly* and *constitutionally* declared—or, what is equal thereto, with strenuous *insidiousness* and *artifice*, obstruct its favorable progress, by *endeavoring* to *lessen* its *physical* strength!--And it cannot be viewed, either as a display of "*subordination*," or as a proof of love for, or devotion to, the interest and happiness of his country!

To complain of the "weakness by [*with* would have been better] "which the war hath been conducted;" and at the same time, to *intimate* to naturalized citizens, who are an important sinew in its prosecution, that if they enlist and should be found with arms, opposed to the enemy, whose subjects they may formerly have been; they will be guilty of treason, and be liable to its cosequent punishment, is, it must be admitted, adding to the cause of that weakness—and an individual who *thus* complains and *thus* acts, deserves the reprobation of every honest man!

When "Satan is permitted to reprove Sin"..then you may lecture on the "wickedness" and "deterioration" of the American government and people; but to add to your own credit, or to dignify the theme in your hands, it would be necessary to *astonish* the world with an evidence that your practice, in some measure, keeps pace with your precept That you should hold yorself forth as the *pattern* of *piety* and moral *perfection*, is ludicrous indeed!

*EXHIBIT No.* 2

"The Court do not feel hemselves under any obligation to decide on the Justice or the sound policy, of the invective expressed against that nation which our administration hath thought proper to select for an enemy; but it may be considered a very proper supplement to, and confirmation of, those denunciations made against that Nation by Heaven's chosen Messenger, brought up out of the Island of Corsica to give peace and happiness to the afflicted world. And indeed from present appearances, he seems to stand in need of some aid, which tho' delayed until distress is overtaking him, yet may be considered more meritorious, as it is in the hour of distress that pure friendship hath the best opportunity of displaying itself. After this unanswerable confirmation of all her crimes, is it possible that there can be one dissenting voice, which will not cordially join in the pious wish that Great Britain should be swallowed up in that ocean which hath hitherto protected her, and have her name blotted out from the list of nations? Or can there be a doubt but that it will hasten the dissolution of that coalition recently formed in her favor, which certainly should never have been formed, if this so respectable a confirmation of the black ertalogue of her crimes had been previously known to the European powers? One advantage may at least, be hoped from it, if sufficiently circulated, that it may free our exclusive Patriots, who wish to prolong all the horrors of war and prevent the return of peace, by implanting in the hearts of our citizens the seeds of eternal and unextinguishable hatred to that nation, from the trouble (guilt would be too uncourtly a term) of perjury and subornation to perjury, for that holy purpose."

In the above exhibit, you say "you do not feel under any obligation to decide, on the justice, or the sound policy of the invective" (as you term it) "expressed against that nation, which our Administration has thought proper to select for an enemy" And, is it possible you can thus restrain yourself, and feel indifferent, as to strictures against a nation, about whose interest and purity of charter you seem elsewhere so sensitive and tenacious? But though you will not express any opinion as to the "justice and sound policy of the invective"— still, you say, "it is a confirmation of those denunciations made against that nation [England] by Heaven's chosen Messenger, brought up out of Corsica to give peace and happiness to an afflicted world." In sympathy towards you, the continuation of this *frenzied* flight shall not be dwelt on. It is apprehended, a few *such* exhibits would induce the world to believe, that there has been a "*deterioration*" of those *colossal* energies of intellect, of which your pen has so often given the most *ponderous* proofs! But though you will indulge in such *frantic* gambols yet it is hoped, the *stamina* of the mind is not irrecoverably impaired!

EXHIBIT NO 3.

"As to that part of the address, wherein is mentioned, that "to the disgrace of human nature, it was nothing uncommon, for a powerful, *ambitious* nation *aspiring* to unlimited sovereignty, to attack and commit aggressions, on a virtuous and religious people," the courtwould have thereby naturally supposed the Grand Jury alluded *to the conduct of our government towards the virtuous and gallant Spaniards, of whose late critical and distressed situation IT has taken the advantage, to light up the torch of rebellion, and carry bloodshed and slaughter throughout their provinces*, as a return for those services rendered to us by that nation, in the days of our distress; a mistake which was only corrected by the latter part of the sentence.

Had the Gd. J., in addition to those other splendid endowments, which they must be admitted to possess, and to which the court are disposed to pay due respect, assumed to themselves the attribute of knowing the human heart, and discerning the secret thoughts thereof and consequently had thought it "within the bounds of their duty to inquire what was meant by the *strong* terms, in which they seemed to imprecate the wrath of heaven, upon the head of that individual, who should plunge a happy people into the calamities of war, to gratify his own ambition," the Court would not have been much surprized, nor would they have dreaded the *Inquisition*. As to what follows concerning the present chief magistrate, *that*, taken in connection with some other parts of this address, savours so much of the fulsome panegyrics lavished on a Charles and a James, the first, as to prove that adulation to power, and the doctrine of passive obedience, if banished from Great Britain, have like many miscreants from the other side of the Atlantic, found an asylum in the United States.

That the censure so distinctly and emphatically directed by the Grand Jury against Great Britain, as "a powerful and ambitious nation, aspiring to unlimited sovereignty," should be misunderstood by you, in its object; and that it should comport with your feelings and wishes to relieve Great Britain from such deserved odium, whilst it was equally agreeable and *loyal* to cast the burthen on the administration of the United States, is quite in unison with your other *patriotic* efforts;—if not *satisfactorily* descriptive of the strength of *attachment* to the one and *hostility* to the other!

With the same *obduracy* of feeling; and with an apparent disposition to exhibit a heart totally insensible to any thing *like* national dignity and honor—you say, you "would have naturally supposed that the Grand Jury alluded to the conduct of our administration towards the virtuous and gallant Spaniards, of whose late critical and distressed situation it has taken advantage, to light up the torch of rebellion, and carry bloodshed and slaughter throughout their provinces." An audacious imputation, devoid of every particle of decency and respect. The gravitation of truth must bear down, *low* as yourself, such barefaced and outrageous calumny!

You are assured, the late Grand Jury could decisively enough discriminate the object against whom the "arrow dipped in gaul" was directed, and on whom the wrath of heaven was imprecated in such *strong* terms, without having "assumed to themselves the high attribute of knowing the human heart, and discerning the secret thoughts thereof." And without the assumption of that or any supernatural attribute, I am prepared to say, that the arrow missed its aim, by reason of the *exalted* height of the object against whom it was directed. In this instance, my feelings shall be restrained from being brought in play against the archer who sent it forth!

As to your charge of *miscreancy*, as applied to foreigners, I would only make one remark; which is, that if I were disposed to furnish a *picture* of it, in its *blackest* shades, I should not find it necessary to go far for one of *native* origin, in all its *native* deformity!

A body of men who have souls dignified enough to resist *arbitrary* power, are not happily constituted to submit to a system of "passive obedience;" nor do they seem the proper instruments to produce "adulation, sycophancy, or fulsome panegyric." Had the late Grand Jury been of *such* stamp, they would not have hurled your *assumed* consequence as a *political* censor, in the dust, and held you forth as an example of *curbed* authority, unduly exercised! And this too, with an almost unanimous vote!

When you say you would not "have dreaded the *inquisition*," you would have rendered yourself more intelligible, by expressing whether you meant as *presiding* officer of *such* a body, or as one on whom its power was to operate! This I am bold to say, that the late Grand Jury were composed of such materials, as repudiated the exercise of *inquisitorial* authority—*and would have been unwilling* to exert it in co-operation with the *interference of undue influence from any quarter!*

EXHIBIT No. 4.

"The Court will further observe, that as to the doctrine, with regard to allegiance and expatriation, so zealously contended for by the Grand Jury, their opinion remains unshaken; they consider it as originating in the source to which they have ascribed it; propagated in Europe, with a view to undermine the stability of all government; and propagated here, by those who wish to gratify their hatred to Great Britain, by the annihilation of her empire; to effect which they are regardless of the calamities this country may suffer. They know that the establishment of their principle would pave the way for her downfal. All other nations disavow the principle. None more so than the emperor of France; who acts in open defiance of it, towards our government, and in the most offensive manner. But against his conduct not a murmur of displeasure is heard. Hatred to Great Britain is the ruling passion to be gratified by its propagators. It is a doctrine, the immediate effect of which is, to render the present war perpetual, and to extinguish from our hearts every hope of the speedy return of the blessings of peace. It is a doctrine, which must, and will, be abandoned by our administration; they already lament their rash precipitancy in plunging into this disastrous war, and wish to get rid of it, if they knew how. Nor need they the spirit of prophecy to foresee, that the time is fast approaching, when, unless this war is previously terminated, this country will have to contend single and alone, against the united forces of Great Britain and Spain, and with those gallant veterans, who have so gloriously triumphed over a more formidable foe."

You seem greatly afflicted that "hatred to *Great* Britain is the ruling passion." Your religion, no doubt, teaches you a different sentiment! But in making the emperor of France appear an aggressor, is it your wish, thereby, to add to political motives, the spur of animosity and hatred against *that* nation, to prove that the United States are engaged in an *unjust* and *wicked* war; because they are fighting *his* enemy, "the bulwark of our religion?"

You say the French government *disavows the principle of expatriation*. The following, being the 7th article of the Code Nepoleon, will prove you guilty of *misrepresentation*. *British* PRACTICE recognizes the principle as relates to that government—though *her* system of *reciprocity* will not yield it to others.

"The quality of a French subject shall be lost,

1. By naturalizations acquired in a foreign country.

2. By the acceptance, not authorised by the Emperor, of public functions conferred by a foreign government."

3. Finally, By every settlement made in a foreign country without the intention of returning."

☞ Concluded in this day's American.