

THE
ANTI-JACOBIN
REVIEW AND MAGAZINE,

OR,
Monthly Political and Literary Censor,

FROM

DECEMBER TO APRIL (INCLUSIVE.)

—1804—

WITH AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

AN AMPLE REVIEW OF FOREIGN LITERATURE.

PROFESSE ET DELECTARE.

VOL. XVII.

LONDON:

Printed, for the Proprietors, by J. HALES, at the Anti-Jacobin Press,
No. 22, Old Bowwell-court, Strand,

AND PUBLISHED AT THE ANTI-JACOBIN OFFICE, NO. 22, OLD BOSWELL-COURT, STRAND,
BY J. WHITTLE; AND BY E. HARDING, AT THE CROWN AND MITRE, FALL-MALL;
C. CHAPPEL, FALL MALL; T. PIERSON, BIRMINGHAM; BELL AND BRADFUTE, EDIN-
BURGH; BRASH AND REID, GLASGOW; AND BY J. W. FENNO, NEW-YORK.

1803.

ed themselves to our minds, but our limits forbade their insertion; indeed, but for this objection, we would gladly have inserted *the whole* of the correspondence.

REVIEWERS REVIEWED.

Strictures on an Article in the Edinburgh Review, relative to the History of the Maroons. By R. C. Dallas, Esq. Author of Percival, History of the Maroons, &c.

IN the number of the publications reviewed in the *Edinburgh Review*, its readers may have seen, what is termed by the Compiler of its Index an *Analysis of the History of the Maroons*. Had the article been, indeed, an analysis, or had it been a severe criticism on the work, whatever I might have thought of it, content with the opinion of other critics, content with the public approbation as proved by the sale of the book, content with private testimonies of satisfaction, I should have paid no regard to the asperities of a pseudo-critic, purchased by the proprietors of the *Review*, like other commodities of trade, to fill their periodical sales. Taught by the abuse heaped on men (to whose genius I bow with reverence) who have taken their flight to a better world, and whose merit posterity has established, I should have quietly borne the reflection that some unknown hireling had been providing his dinners at my expence: but malicious attacks upon the heart are not so easily endured, and the person attacked has a right to call upon those who look on not to suffer injustice. More than a right, he is *bound* to do it. "The insults that we receive before the public," says an admired poet, "by being more open are more distressing; by treating them with silent contempt we do not pay a sufficient deference to the opinion of the world. Every man should singly consider himself as a guardian of the liberty of the press, and as far as his influence can extend, should endeavour to prevent its licentiousness becoming at last the grave of its freedom."

I am made to appear before the readers of the *Edinburgh Review*, as a keen advocate for the use of blood-hounds trained exclusively to the scent, the taste of human flesh, and the tearing of the victim limb from limb; I am described to them, as ridiculing the clamour that was raised in England against the employment of blood-hounds; they are told that I maintain that the possession of liberty is of little value. My feelings are extremely shocked at this malignant slander, and I cannot suffer it to pass unnoticed.

Of the extent of the sale of the *Edinburgh Review* I am ignorant; but taking a part for the whole, a figure in great use among Reviewers, its readers have the accustomed claim to be considered as the public, and as such I address them with all the respect due to the public, calling upon them in justice to examine the validity of assertions so malignant in their nature, so artful in their design, so false in their applications.

From the style assumed by the writer of the pretended analysis of the work, the reader must suppose me a monster of cruelty, a devoted instrument of despotism. My heart revolts at the charges, and were it not for the respect I owe to those whom I address, I should use the strongest language of contradiction in resenting the insidious manner in which such

charges

charges are laid before the public; charges preferred against one who feels a pang on treading accidentally upon a worm, whose heart bleeds for the sufferings of his fellow creatures, and who to the candid reader of this very book, (the sentiments of which are so wickedly perverted,) must appear an advocate for every degree of freedom consistent with their happiness.

Whoever this assailant of my mind be, I trust I shall prove him as weak as he is malignant. I should leave my book to speak for me in these particulars, were I confident that it was in the hands of all the readers of the Edinburgh Review; but aware how many there are, and worthy men, who form their judgment from the decisions of periodical publications, I think it incumbent upon me to expose the falshood of this writer, and to show the public how grossly they may be deceived in giving implicit faith to the statements of certain critics, who, far from being worthy of leading the judgment of others, are themselves led by their passions and prejudices, or are the venal slaves and promoters of the passions and prejudices of others.

When the account was first brought to England of *blood-hounds* being employed to pursue the Maroons, the manner of telling it excited a horror, in the sensation of which I fully shared. When afterwards the nature of the dogs (falsely termed blood-hounds) was explained to me, and when I became acquainted with the use made of them in Cuba, and the mode of employing them in Jamaica, I yielded my feelings to what appeared to me the reason of the case. I learned that these animals were taught to act more by terror than by attack; I heard of murderers, pirates, and other criminals being taken by means of them, without the slightest personal injury, and brought to justice; I heard of the Maroon-war being terminated without bloodshed by their being brought to Jamaica; and I was convinced that a large body of my countrymen owed their escape from massacre, and horrors shocking to relate, by the exertions of a man of whose humanity to his negroes I had had experience, and who procured the Spaniards and their dogs. Thus far I rejoiced, thus far I defended the step that had been attended with so successful a result: but, after all, I stated *with diffidence* the arguments on both sides, and I shall here insert the statement that it may appear whether in writing I was influenced by mild and philanthropic motives, or stood forward *the keen advocate for the use of blood-hounds,* trained exclusively to the scent of men, the taste of human flesh, and the tearing of the victim limb from limb.*†

“ The argument has been stated thus: The Assembly of Jamaica were not unapprized that the measure of calling in such auxiliaries, and using the canine species against human beings, would give rise to much animadversion in England; and that the horrible enormities of the Spaniards in the conquest of the new world, would be brought again to remembrance. It is but too true, that dogs were used by those Christian barbarians against the peaceful and inoffensive Americans, and the just indignation of mankind has ever since branded, and will continue to brand, the Spanish nation with infamy, for such atrocities. It was foreseen, and strongly urged as an argument against recurring to the same means in the present case, that the prejudices of party, and the virulent zeal of restless and turbulent men, would place the proceedings of the Assembly on this occasion, in a point of view equally odious with the conduct of Spain on the same blood-stained theatre,

* No. IV. Edinburgh Review, page 384.

† Ibid. page 362.

in times past. No allowance would be made for the wide difference existing between the two cases. Some gentlemen even thought that the cooperation of dogs with British troops, would give not only a cruel, but a very dastardly complexion to the proceedings of Government.

" To these and similar objections, it was answered, that the safety of the island and the lives of the inhabitants were not to be sacrificed to the apprehension of perverse misconstruction or wilful misrepresentation in the mother country. It was maintained, that the grounds of the measure needed only to be fully examined, and fairly stated, to induce all reasonable men to admit its propriety and necessity. To hold it as a principle, that it is an act of cruelty or cowardice in man to employ other animals as instruments of war, is a position contradicted by the practice of all nations. The Asiatics have ever used elephants in their battles; and if lions and tygers possessed the docility of the elephant, no one can doubt that these also would be made to assist the military operations of man, in those regions where they abound. Even the use of cava'ry, as established among the most civilized and polished nations of Europe, must be rejected, if this principle be admitted; for wherein, it was asked, does the humanity of that doctrine consist, which allows the employment of troops of horse in the pursuit of discomfited and flying infantry, yet shrinks at the preventive measure of sparing the effusion of human blood, by tracing with hounds the haunts of murderers, and rousing from ambush, savages more ferocious and blood-thirsty than the animals which track them?

" The merits of the question, it was said, depended altogether on the origin and cause of the war, and the objects to be obtained by its continuance; and the authority of the most celebrated writers on public law was adduced in support of this construction. ' If the cause and end of war,' says Paley, ' be justifiable, all the means that appear necessary to that end are justifiable also. This is the principle which defends those extremities to which the violence of war usually proceeds: for since war is a contest by force between parties who acknowledge no common superior, and since it includes not in its idea the supposition of any convention which should place limits to the operations of force, it has naturally no boundary but that in which force terminates; the destruction of the life against which the force is directed.' It was allowed, with the same author, that useless and wanton barbarities derive no excuse from the licence of war, of which kind is every cruelty and insult that serves only to exasperate the sufferings, or to increase the hatred of an enemy, without weakening his strength, or in any manner tending to procure his submission; such as the slaughter of captives, subjecting them to indignities or torture, the violation of women, and, in general, the destruction or defacing of works that conduce nothing to annoyance or defence. These enormities are prohibited not only by the practice of civilized nations, but by the law of nature itself, as having no proper tendency to accelerate the termination, or accomplish the object of the war, and as containing that which in peace or war is equally unjustifiable, namely, ultimate and useless mischief. Now all these very enormities were practised, not by the colonists against the Maroons, but by the Maroons against the colonists. Humanity therefore, it was said, was no way concerned in the expedient that was proposed, or any other by which such an enemy could be most speedily reduced.*"

" * Edwards."

“The Maroons, though not coming, more than other people at war, within the definition of the term murderers, with which they are branded in this statement of the argument, were, like most uncivilized people, and not unlike some civilized nations, hurried by unruly passions to acts of barbarity. Depredation, devastation, and massacre, disgrace the wars not only of savages, but of Christians, or nations so called. What are the horrors of the Maroon war in comparison with those we can trace throughout the French Revolution? Wherever we follow them, we see the most shocking delicacy of human nature. I have already shown that the Maroons, safe themselves in their natural and impregnable garrisons, sent out parties to surprise and destroy, to massacre the unprepared, and to burn houses and plantations. They had defied, they had foiled British troops; the colonists were in despair; and it was with difficulty that General Walpole had prevailed upon an assembly of them to refrain from a concession that was pregnant with ruin. In such a situation, what archbishop will maintain that delicacy was to be preserved in the means of removing such an evil? Were a man bit by a mad dog, would he scruple to cut or burn out the part which had received the contagion? Do we not amputate a limb to save the body? And if self-preservation dictate these personal sufferings, shall not the preservation of a large community justify the use of the readiest, perhaps the only means of averting its destruction? How different the case from that of the Spaniards hunting the native Americans! How different from the conduct of the Romans, sitting at ease in their amphitheatres to enjoy the fight of criminals encountering wild beasts! How different from that most horrible of all horrid diversions the Cryptia, in which the poor unoffending Helots were hunted and poniarded by the Spartans! These were, indeed, cases of wanton barbarity; but the man who says that the colonists of Jamaica were cruel in hiring the Spanish chassours, will be inconsistent if he does not condemn the practice of keeping watch-dogs, lest they should injure the nocturnal prowler; or, if he allow that he might save his own life, or the lives of others, by setting his dog on a lawless band of assailants. The clamour, therefore, that was raised in England against the employment of the Spanish chassours was groundless and unjust, and it will be admitted to be the more so, when it is known, that all that was at first expected by the inhabitants from the use of the dogs, was to discover ambushes laid by the Maroons, in order that they might be defeated; and that many, doubting even this good effect, ridiculed the project: nay, the extent of the plan was unknown, and the mode of executing it uncertain. The commissioner, feeling for the situation of the island, had suggested it; the planters finding every other expedient tried in vain, and eager to seize on any hope, were anxious to try it; and Lord Balcarras, solicitous for their welfare, complied with their wishes, on their representing the probability of its answering a good purpose. Cruelty was entirely foreign to the project: the island had been thrown into so singular and alarming a dilemma, that no means which might extricate it could be deemed cruel. The commissioner’s humanity and kindness to his own black people are well known in Jamaica; I myself bear witness to it, having had an opportunity, by residing at his house for a considerable time, to be well acquainted with his disposition; and I believe that his slaves enjoyed a far greater portion of happiness than the generality of the poor in any country upon the face of the earth. But had it been otherwise, had the suggestion proceeded from a despotic and ferocious spirit, bent on the extermination of some of the human species

cies by a barbarous expedient, it is not likely that a mild, humane, and beneficent mind, like that of Lord Balcarras, or that the majority of any assembly of educated men, would have concurred in the experiment. It appeared to them at that time, as it must appear now to every rational man, a choice of two evils; and the one wisely chosen was trivial in comparison with the magnitude of the other."

I ask any reader of common sense and feeling, if this passage (and it is the only one) displays any keenness for the use of blood-hounds to tear limb from limb? I ask him if it does not, on the contrary, manifest a disposition desirous of producing the least evil possible? But, imagine the fact worse than I have described it; imagine one half of the Maroons (the whole did not much exceed 500) destroyed by this shocking means,—horrid is the thought: Contrast this horror, however, with the cruelties of successful barbarians; imagine the massacre of 30,000 white inhabitants, attended with the dreadful scenes rendered but too familiar to the imagination by recent experience: in owning that of the horrid alternatives, I should prefer the former; I cannot think that I deserve to be called the keen advocate of inhumanity, for such in fact is meant by the reviewer. I know what it is to be a father; alas! I know it but too well, by the loss, as well as by the possession, of amiable children: let me tell the man, who, creeping behind the leaf of a review, has spit his venom at me, that, did I see him making up to a child of mine—what do I say? to a child of any man, with a dagger in his hand, I should not scruple, could I not prevent him in time myself, to set my dog upon him, and though I should writhe with horror to see him torn limb from limb, I would rest satisfied with the action that saved the child.

Before I enter upon the questions of policy, give me leave to request attention to what this assailant calls ridicule.

"But Mr. Dallas ridicules the clamour that was raised in England, against the employment of blood-hounds, partly by enumerating instances of greater and more inexcusable violence; such as, the Spaniards hunting the naked Americans, the Romans exposing criminals to wild beasts in their public amusements, and the Spartans hunting the Helotes for their diversion; and partly by stating, what he considers as a parallel case, the practice of keeping watch-dogs. With respect to the last of these arguments, it is sufficient to remark, that the objection formerly urged, applies to it in full force: it proves a great deal too much, if we admit that it applies at all. With respect to the former cases, what do they prove, but that still greater enormities were once committed by the Spaniards, the Romans, and the Spartans, than those of which we have to accuse the government of Jamaica?"

The ridicule consists in the following sentence, which I take the liberty of repeating:

"The clamour, therefore, that was raised in England against the employment of the Spanish chassours was groundless and unjust, and it will be admitted to be the more so, when it is known, that all that was at first expected by the inhabitants from the use of the dogs, was to discover ambushes laid by the Maroons, in order that they might be defeated; and that many, doubting even this good effect, ridiculed the project: nay, the extent of the plan was unknown, and the mode of executing it uncertain."

Is this ridicule? Surely this great critic would do well to revise his rhetoric, and perhaps, as we shall see, his grammar. Are the allusions to the Spaniards, the Romans, the Spartans, used for the purpose of ridicule? No,

but to mark the distinction between wanton barbarity, and the lamentable resort of self-preservation.

Before I proceed to the remaining charge of despotic principles, it will not be amiss here to observe what he has made of the old arguments against me. He says, that the dread of retaliation is the chief argument against the employment of extraordinary methods of attack, and that these are rights recognised in civilized warfare. I had said as much before—be it so, and God forbid I should be conscious of an inclination to multiply the means of destruction: but in extraordinary, in *extreme* cases, some allowance is to be made, and such a one was that of the Maroon war. In the heart of the island, secured by inaccessible retreats, lay an enemy, whose mode of warfare was unlike any ever heard of before; who, safe themselves, were continually laying ambush for the colonists, and who, in another month, when the cane-fields presented dry tops, would have fired the whole country, forced the working negroes to take a part in the rebellion, and massacred every white person. All this I stated; but what is that to the purpose, says this humane writer; it is against the policy recognised by civilized nations at war. Rather than terrify your enemy from his haunts by dogs, wait quietly and be sacrificed. No, said the colonists, we will do no such thing:—extraordinary cases require extraordinary expedients. Very well, says my critic, you are a pack of blood-hounds yourselves. This philanthropic warrior, quitting his hold of the dread of retaliation, slides again into the plea of humanity, and goes on declaiming, as if the case were an ordinary one, and compares it to poisoning the waters of a besieged city, and the assassination of the generals of a hostile army. Judge, readers, of the reviewer's temper by this: had he meant a fair, candid, liberal investigation, instead of poisoning the waters of a besieged city, he would have put his poison in the springs of the country round the city, and he would have made the besieged warn the invader and his army, that if they approached, they approached to destruction; he would have placed his dagger in the hand of a Mutius: these, sufficiently shocking in themselves, would have been more analagous, but to have represented the expedients as the dictate of self-preservation, would not have answered his purpose. Be this as it may; be the tendency of the arguments used by Mr. Edwards, and cited by me, what they will, I contend that it is solely on the principle of self-preservation, pushed to a necessity which admitted no delay, that I defended the employment of the Spanish chaffeurs, and this I think fully evident from what I added myself to the original statement of the argument. Without relying here on the strength of those illustrations, I say they evince, that I *laid* down self-preservation for the foundation of the defence which I *temperately*, and with *deference*, submitted to the public. I beg to repeat the words:

“ In *such* a situation, what archfoplist will maintain that delicacy was to be preserved in the means of removing such an evil? Were a man bit by a mad dog, would he scruple to cut or burn out the part which had received the contagion? Do we not amputate a limb to save the body? And if self-preservation dictate these personal sufferings, shall not the preservation of a large community justify the use of the readiest, perhaps the only means of averting its destruction?”

These words imply *necessity*, not heroism; but they may be twisted into a different sense than was meant, for it is not only lawyers that twist words and meanings as they please, it is a part of the duty of the pretenders to criticism, and accordingly this wrangler has inflated the figures of rhetoric, and

talks

talks of heroism, and self-denial, and sufferings, as requisite to render the illustration just. Is a surgeon very *heroic*, when, to save life, he amputates a limb? No, but he is *wise*.

As I write particularly to those who may not have perused the volumes, it will be necessary for me to confute the false and very malignant fabrication, respecting the nature of the dogs, imposed on the readers of the Edinburgh Review, by laying before them my account of those animals. When they have read it, they will form their opinion of this guardian and expositor of the principles of literature and of morals, who has not blushed to charge an author, whose exertions in all his writings, and obviously in every part of the work thus scandalously reviewed, have constantly and warmly been directed to the support of the cause of humanity, with being a *keen advocate for the use of blood-hounds*, described falsely, as *trained exclusively to the scent of men, the taste of human flesh, and the tearing of the victim limb from limb.**

“Don Manuel de Seias, the *Alcalde Provincial*, commanded about six and thirty chasseurs, who were in the King's pay. The employment of these is to traverse the country for the purpose of pursuing and taking up all persons guilty of murder and other offences, in which they seldom fail of success, no activity on the part of the offenders being able to elude their pursuit. An extraordinary instance occurred about a month before the commissioner arrived at the Havanna. A fleet from Jamaica, under convoy to Great Britain, passing through the gulf of Mexico, beat up on the north side of Cuba. One of the ships, manned with foreigners, chiefly renegado Spaniards, being a dull sailer, and consequently lagging astern, standing in with the land at night, was run on shore, the captain, officers, and the few British hands on board murdered, and the vessel plundered by the Spanish renegadoes. The part of the coast on which the vessel was stranded, being wild and unfrequented, the assassins retired with their booty to the mountains, intending to penetrate through the woods to some remote settlements on the south side, where they hoped to secure themselves, and elude all pursuit. Early intelligence of the crime, however, had been conveyed to the Havanna, and the assassins were pursued by a detachment of twelve of the Chasseurs del Rey, with their dogs. In a few days they were all brought in and executed. The head and right arm of each were suspended in frames, not unlike parrot-cages, which were hung on various gibbets, at the port and other conspicuous places on the coast, near the entrance of the harbour.

“The dogs carried out by the Chasseurs del Rey are perfectly broken in, that is to say, they will not kill the object they pursue unless resisted. On coming up with a fugitive, they bark at him till he stops, they then couch near him, terrifying him with a ferocious growling if he stirs. In this position they continue barking to give notice to the chasseurs, who come up and secure their prisoner. Each chasseur, though he can hunt only with two dogs properly, is obliged to have three, which he maintains at his own cost, and that at no small expence. These people live with their dogs, from which they are inseparable. At home the dogs are kept chained, and when walking with their masters, are never unmuzzled, or let out of ropes, but for attack. They are constantly accompanied with one or two small dogs called finders, whose scent is very keen, and always sure of hitting off a track. Dogs and bitches hunt equally well, and the chasseurs rear no more

* Edinburgh Review, No. IV. p. 392.

than will supply the number required. This breed of dogs, indeed, is not so prolific as the common kinds, though infinitely stronger and hardier. The animal is the size of a very large hound, with ears erect, which are usually cropped at the points; the nose more pointed, but widening very much towards the after-part of the jaw. His coat, or skin, is much harder than that of most dogs, and so must be the whole structure of the body, as the severe beatings he undergoes in training would kill any other species of dog. There are some, but not many, of a more obtuse nose, and which are rather squarer set. These, it may be presumed, have been crossed by the mastiff, but if by this the bulk has been a little increased, it has added nothing to the strength, height, beauty, or agility, of the native breed."

I trust I have cleared myself from the charge of blood-thirstiness. With respect to the question of policy in the employment of the dogs, it is not possible to decide upon the mutilated extracts given by this reviewer, or from a hasty violent discussion, founded on dissimilar premises. The critic flies to the writers of public law, on the rules of civilized warfare, and evincing a determined ignorance of the state of the subject; for though he acknowledges that he has gained an accurate idea of the cock-pits, and of the nature of Maroon warfare, he says, "*We conceive, that discipline, artillery, and regular supplies of provisions, will generally render acuteness of sense superfluous, patience and perseverance unnecessary, and acquaintance with the fastnesses of the country of little avail.**" A fine conception! With what a profound knowledge of colonial topography was this writer pregnant! The question was, "Did the preservation of the lives, as well as the property, of the colonists depend upon the use of the extraordinary expedient?" This seems to be decided in the affirmative, by what, on the best authorities, I have related, and on those authorities it must rest.

Before I entirely leave this subject, I shall make an observation, which is decisive, I think, in manifesting the spirit of my critic. In mentioning the only instance that occurred of a dog's stopping a man, I shew, that though the man attacked the dog with his sword, the animal did not proceed to hurt him materially, but only secured him till his master came up; this fact my critic adduces to prove their thirst of blood, that is, in his language, the eagerness with which his imaginary blood-hounds scent, taste, and quarter the victim. Shame, shame on such a critic!

I shall now advert to the other charge, namely, that *I maintain that the possession of liberty is rendered of little value, by the recollection of what has lately passed in France*. Had I, before I arrived at this sentence, been induced by the candour and good sense of the critic, to respect his principles and his talents, I should have doubted my senses, I should have remembered that I laboured with a heavy heart, and I would have eagerly flown to the text, to ascertain whether *he* had fallen into an error, or *I* had been mad, not only while writing such a sentiment, but at the time of correcting the press. No, my affliction did not deprive me of my reason, I never wrote nor thought in such a manner: liberty is a blessing of which I have ever been an enthusiastic defender. I know not from what page of my book the virus of this charge can have been collected, for there is no reference to it in the Edinburgh Review; but, after searching some time, I found a passage, which I suspected to have been converted into poison by the nature and operation of the cri-

* Edinburgh Review, p. 388.

tic's fang. The passage is in page 441 of Vol. II. and runs thus: "Improve his condition, but improve it gradually and cautiously, remembering with awe what a monster improvement has lately been manifested; the parent of atheism, of treason, of murder, and of slavery." Good heaven! that such a charge, that such venom should be extracted from this part of the book! Turn many pages back, many forward, and I shall be found warmly interesting myself in promoting the happiness of the negroes, and in exposing the defects of the colonial system. These strictures would run to too great a length, were I to insert the manner in which I have treated the questions of slavery and the slave-trade: but I affirm that the accusation is false, that I have stated the arguments on both sides respecting the slave-trade impartially, and that I feel (and have expressed the feeling in those very pages) an ardent tendency in my heart to disapprove of the trade. I have indeed suggested what should appear a better mode of obtaining the labour of Africans, namely, their own consent; in doing which, after the statement of the question on both sides, I go on, expressing myself thus: "God forbid that I should support a position of which the object were to diminish the happiness of my fellow-creatures."

Having done with these charges, I cannot but notice some other passages of this Review, which shew that, far from following the rules of criticism, the writer labours through thick and thin, through falsehood and misrepresentation, for the purpose of injuring the work. From the nature of my subject, I expected such an attempt; perhaps it may appear to be the interest of some persons that it should be stifled. I should, however, have suffered my book to make its way without any further support from me, had I not been charged with such odious depravity of sentiment, but the pen being in my hand, I will take the liberty of proceeding a little farther in defence of it.

The following assertions are misrepresentations or *falsehoods*: 1. "The reviewer charges me with the want of reference to authorities on disputed points." I was so attentive to references, that I can only guess he alludes to a passage he discovered to be quoted from the *Crisis of the Sugar-Colonies*, and from which he takes occasion to say, "We cannot avoid reproaching the careless or insidious manner in which the author alludes to the *excellent writer* of it;" and this insidious manner, it seems, appears in the expression, *champion of negro liberty*. I have a great respect for the author of the *Crisis*. I am convinced he is sincere, and I think him *an excellent writer*, and what is much higher praise, a good man; but I confess, I wonder at the use of the former commendation in a book where, as an author, he has been treated so illiberally. It is a new proof to me, that some reviewers depend for the display of their criticism on petulance, rather than on candid judgment and liberal remark. Though I differ in certain opinions from the author of the *Crisis*, I am free from any intention of treachery or disrespect; and I declare, that under similar convictions, I should be proud of being esteemed a champion of the same cause, as much as I should be delighted in being a successful champion against the remaining defects of the colonial system, and for the happiness of the negroes.

2. He says, (p. 380.) "That I charge the expedition from Jamaica to St. Domingo with being the cause of the negro emancipation in that ill-fated colony." I only said what is the fact, that the French proclamation, abolishing slavery, was the immediate consequence of it, without deviating from my subject into the discussion of its causes.

3. He says, (p. 390.) "Rather induced by the expence, than by the unhappy

happy condition of these people, the colonial legislature took measures, in the year 1799, for transporting them (the Maroons) to Sierra Leone." There is no such information in the volumes: the fact is otherwise. (But, by the way, let me refer the reader to the elegant construction of this sentence, "rather induced by expence.") He meant one would presume, induced by a desire to avoid expence.

4. He says, (p. 390.) "That the opinions of *their* author, upon all the negro questions, differ extremely from those which *they* have been led to form, even by attending to his own statement of facts;"—and proves the great attention he has given, by saying, that I "positively deny the dangers of an independent negro commonwealth being allowed to grow up in the West Indies." Judge of his attention, when I declare that I am of opinion, that such a negro commonwealth as he conceives would be fatal to the colonies, and that I have never expressed a different opinion. The opinion I have expressed was, that *such an independent negro commonwealth* would never be formed there: and I still think, in spite of the events which have since taken place, that no general and united government of the blacks will be formed in St. Domingo:—but, to avoid digression, I shall only say, in allusion to the misstatement of my opinion, so much for attention! so much for candour!

5. A determined malevolence has led this critic to note what he calls the discrepancy of eye-witnesses.

"As an example of the discrepancy which often prevails among eye-witnesses of the same facts, we may observe, that both these writers ground several of their contradictory opinions upon alleged personal observation; and, as a proof of Mr. Edward's zeal to blacken the character of the Maroons, we shall mention one singular circumstance. Mr. Dallas tells us, that six weeks after Colonel Fitch's death, his skeleton was found among other bones of the slain, and that the skull was thrown within the ribs, (vol. i. p. 239.) In order to render this picture more horrid, Mr. Edwards has converted the six weeks into a day or two, covered the bones with flesh, and filled the abdominal cavity with bowels."

In relating this horrid act, I was induced, by the apprehension of shocking the friends of the brave and amiable Colonel Fitch, to mention it as delicately as possible. The remains of himself and those who fell with him were not discovered for some weeks after their fall: of course, from the nature of the climate, there remained only their skeletons. But even here, this writer makes me say, what I did not say, that *the skull was thrown* into the ribs, as if it had been afterwards taken up and thrown in.—I said the skull *was found* within the ribs: the sentence is in Latin, *inter costas ductis reperitum est ipsius cranium*, and I confess I expressed myself in that manner to soften the relation; but it creates no discrepancy, and there is no doubt entertained that the fact was as Mr. Edwards stated it. Clear as my intention was in the narration, this humane compositor of reviews, if I may be allowed the expression in speaking of the arranger of the common places of criticism, chose to drag into view the horrid truth as related by Mr. Edwards, in order to chuckle at a supposed discrepancy, which, if he wanted not understanding to reconcile, he wanted feeling in attempting to expose.

The reader who had been induced by the spirit of justice to accompany me thus far, will, from the same spirit, grant me his attention a little longer; though the object of what follows is of such comparative insignificance, that I should never have given it a second thought, had not the malignity of the other parts of the abuse forced me to notice them.

The

The same determined spirit of misrepresentation appears in all the common places of this writer's profession; in his attack upon the composition of the work, as well as upon the principles of its author. He says, "if instead of a history, we had only been led to expect in these volumes an amusing collection of anecdotes, founded in truth, we *must admit* that we should have risen from the perusal *highly satisfied*. This is, in fact, considered as a book of *entertainment*, one of the *most pleasing, and interesting that we have ever met with*. Taking it in this point of view, the selection and arrangement displays (display) no small portion of skill."—"But," says he, just before, the author *has* somewhat too highly estimated the importance of his work, when he ranked it (*in ranking it*) with that class of writings in which the qualities of elegance, dignity, and correctness, are, *most peculiarly required*." So that a slight alteration in the title page of my book, would have had a delightful effect on the feelings of this critic. Here I should willingly stand corrected had I not pleas to offer on the occasion which I think the reader will admit. One of these is unpublished, the others are to be found in the volumes themselves. I had sent a portion of the MSS. to the press when I was driven into the country, to run, if possible, from wretched recollections. The half-title, which was to be printed at the head of the first page, was simply *The Maroon War*. A friend, who thought better of the present title, wrote to me to request I would adopt it, and knowing the state of my mind, he said that if he had no answer he should conclude my concurrence granted. I did not answer in time, the sheet was printed off, and I did not regard the alteration as of importance. Still I took pains to express my sentiments on the subject, not only in my preface, but in the body of the work. I acknowledged my sense of the superior dignity required in history, I begged to shelter myself under the familiar style of correspondence, and I professed my design to amuse as well as to inform. After this acknowledgment and profession, would a candid critic carp at a title page? Would he, after this, first acknowledge the talk of elevating the subject to the style of history, difficult even for a Robertson, then try the work severely and solely by the rules of that style? Such is the conduct of my Reviewer, who though, as he confesses, delighted in spite of his spleen, sits down to show the heinousness of using the word *tars* instead of *seamen*, and *fine fellows* instead of *fine men* or *soldiers*; and to expose, by his parenthesis, my gross ignorance of the Spanish word *Senor*, which, consequential as he is, he writes himself without the liquifying symbol. What shall we say of the critic, who, in verbal corrections, blunders on the very error he attempts to expose?

With like liberality he represents me as eking out the volumes. He says with an air of triumphant sagacity; "Because the Maroons lived in Jamaica, a *succinct history* of that island must precede it—St. Domingo must be brought in because it bears some relation to the interests of Jamaica—because the Maroons are negroes, and other negroes are slaves, a copy of the consolidated Slave Act of Jamaica is inserted, &c. &c."—thus artfully insinuating that subjects intimately connected have no affinity, and that they are thrown heterogeneously one upon another. To do this he was under the necessity, not only of considering the work as a regular history, but also as if subject to the rules of the drama. As a professional hireling he had learned the terms, *unity of time, unity of action, unity of place*; these unities he confounds with the unity of design, which is not inconsistent with a branching of necessary parts.

The error I have committed consists, I believe, in the arrangement of the title page, for, as it stands, it requires some indulgence to allow, though not to see, that my *general design* is to give an account of Jamaica for the last ten years, in which the part sustained by the Maroons forms the chief subject. In such a design there can be no want of unity in prefixing an abridgement of the previous history of the country, or in inserting so important a document relative to the subject as the Slave Act; and with respect to the expedition to Cuba, if its connexion be collateral, let it be remembered that I prepared my readers for it, and in a manner requested them permission to leave the direct road.

It were easy for me to call the reader's attention to the contempt in which Reviewers (I do not mean Critics) have been held at all times by men of letters; I could tell him what Fielding's opinion of them was, to what Voltaire compared them, and how Foote compounded them, but I have not time. I shall only say that though it is evident that there are able and candid Critics, whose talents do honour to Periodical Publications, it is a great pity that the necessity of filling up the usual quantity of sheets should render the employment of illiberal hirelings unavoidable, and that those proprietors of Reviews whose part it is to publish them should thus be involved in the serious responsibility of selling judgments with their journals.

With respect to the Edinburgh Review, I never had a page of it in my hands till I was informed of the illiberal manner in which I had been attacked. I know not whether the Editor be answerable for all he admits—it seems by the few ungrammatical lines at the end of No. III. that he collects the productions of the various workmen, and takes considerable liberties with their work. I meant to have addressed myself to him, but when I found him also ignorant of his grammar, I dropped the idea; and had I been attacked only for the composition and style of my work, I would have likewise dropped the idea of addressing the public. Men who undertake to judge the works of others should, at least, prove their competence, by the accuracy of their own compositions: they should be *thoroughly* informed, not “thorough” informed; they should be sent over to this country, not sent over “into” this country; they should be careful in the editing of the articles, instead of being careless in “the editing the articles;” they should make their nominatives and their verbs agree; their idioms should be *English*, their style perspicuous, as well as their remarks just; but, above all, it is indispensable to them, both as men and as critics, to adhere to truth in their statements and quotations. From these rules a scholar and a moral man will find the writers of the Edinburgh Review perpetually deviating. I shall only refer the reader to the Introductory Advertisement of this quarterly Review, as a specimen of the judgment and ability which are offered as conductors of his taste and opinion.

“In committing this Work to the judgment of the Public, the Editors have but little to observe.

“It will be easily perceived, [how?] that it forms no part of their object, to take notice of *every production* that issues from the Press: and that they wish their Journal to be distinguished, rather for the selection, than for the number of its articles.

“Of the books that are daily presented to the world, a very large *proportion* is evidently destined to obscurity, by the insignificance of their subjects,

or

or the defects of their execution; and it seems unreasonable to expect that the Public should be interested by any account of performances, which have never attracted any share of its attention. A review of such productions, like the biography of private individuals, could afford gratification only to the partiality of friends, or the malignity of enemies.—The *very lowest* order of publications are rejected, accordingly, by most of the literary journals of which the Public is already in possession. But the Conductors of the EDINBURGH REVIEW propose [intend] to carry this principle of selection a good deal farther; to decline any attempt at exhibiting a complete view of modern literature; and to confine their notice, in a great degree, to works that either have attained, or deserve, a certain portion of celebrity.

“As the value of a publication, [to be] conducted upon this principle, will not depend very materially upon the earliness of its intelligence, they have been induced to prefer a quarterly, to a monthly period of publication, that they may always have before them a greater variety for selection, and be occasionally guided in their choice by the tendencies of public opinion.

“In a Review which is [intended to be] published at so long intervals, it would be improper to continue any article from one Number to another; and, for this reason, as well as for the full discussion of important subjects, it may sometimes be found necessary to extend these articles to a greater length, than is usual in works of this nature. Even with these allowances, perhaps the reader may think, that some apology is necessary for the length of a few articles in the present Number.—If he cannot find an excuse for them, [it,] [that is the length,] in the extraordinary interest of the subjects, his candour will probably lead him to impute this defect to that inexperience, which subjects the beginning of all such undertakings to so many other disadvantages.”

It would take up too much time to analyze completely this noble specimen of fine writing, short as it is. The Italics will perhaps be sufficient to point out some of its defects—defects unpardonable in critics, whatever indulgence might be given to them in favour of some interesting subject.

They, that is, he, need not have assured us that they did not mean to take notice of every production, for common sense tells us it was impossible that they should; but this, as they say, is easily perceived.

Proportion is ignorantly used for *portion*.

If the public were not often interested in an account of performances, before they are attracted by the performances themselves, what would become of reviews? and what analogy is there to form a simile from, between an account of them, and the account of the life of a private person? Perhaps there may be some in a sense opposite to what the editor aims at: striking traits in the account of a work of which one has never heard before, and uncommon incidents in the life of a virtuous, or of a vicious man, would naturally interest the mind.

What are the *very lowest* order of publications?

If the reader wish to judge of the vigour of language, will he seek the aid of a writer, who proposes to carry the principle of selection a good deal farther?

The public is, truly, much obliged to the proprietors of the Edinburgh Review, who, though enlarging the usual interval of publication, resolve not to give a complete view of the literature of the times, but only to notice such works as they themselves approve, or as one already celebrated. How different is this narrow spirit from the animated design of the editor of the Annual

Annual

Annual Review lately established, which includes a complete prospect of literature rising through the year.*

In a review which is, is not properly followed by the conditional tense, would.

These articles—what articles?

Of a few articles—of a few of the articles.

With so nerveless, so faulty a preface, to usher in a Critical Journal, it is some wonder to find it arrived at the 4th Number. There may be some learning in particular articles, and there may be articles written candidly and ably, but those which I have looked into are the reverse.—Edinburgh, like other capitals, had the misfortune of being a focus of Jacobinism while the pestilence raged, but Edinburgh, in a greater degree than most other capitals, has always been in possession of great talents, learning, and virtue; and certainly the task of reviewing the literature of the age might be undertaken in that city, not only without presumption, but with brilliancy, but its press must be purged of the papillonst of criticism.

MISCELLANIES.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

IF the following sketch of the celebrated system of the late Mr. Baillie, be deemed worthy of a place in your valuable publication, its admission will be thought by the writer of this article a very high honour. In offering it to the Anti-Jacobin Review the writer manifests his conviction that it contains no principles or doctrines inimical to religion and social order to hierarchy and monarchy, as you will be satisfied by his initials. R. B.

When Mr. Baillie's letter on the origin of the arts and sciences were first published, they obtained the most flattering reception from the public.—They were every where read, and every where admired, in France. Except the Persian letters of Montesquieu, Frenchmen could scarce find a book in the language with which they might compare them. Their beauties as a composition, the elegance of the style, and the brilliancy of the diction, delighted and charmed their readers, and raised this performance to the first rank in the scale of French literature.

* I take this opportunity of observing, that in my letter to the editor of the Anti-Jacobin, inserted in the Number before the last, the words which, by inverted commas, seem to be those of the editor of the Annual Review, were intended by me merely to express what I recollected to be his idea,—the words were my own, the prospectus not being at hand, and they should not have been within inverted commas. I hope he will admit this apology: his words are, "If any essential carelessness should be found in the typographical execution of the work; if personal invective should be in any case indulged; if laxity of morals should be encouraged, to the editor alone will the blame be imputable. But the critical opinions on the works reviewed, whether well or ill founded, whether favourable or unfavourable, being out of the discretion of the editor, cannot involve him in any responsibility."

† See Foote's Comedy of the Liar.

But