

GREAT-BRITAIN
AND THE
UNITED-STATES.

FROM THE HALIFAX JOURNAL, Dec. 29.

[We beg to call the attention of our readers, to the subjoined remarks, to which a perusal of the Publication of—*Notions of the Americans*, has given rise; and we think that every inhabitant of the North American Provinces will unite, with the writer of them, in reprobating the wish, but too evidently displayed, by so many authors in the United States, to engender in their countrymen, the most bitter feelings of dislike and animosity towards the Government and the People of Great-Britain.

We are far from being anxious for that state of warfare which the author of *Notions of the Americans* appears so desirous to excite; but we venture to predict, that when it does come, the United-States will bitterly rue the day on which the vanity and hatred of their writer may lead them to the insensate hope of being able to wage a successful war against the Mother Country.

The following article will, no doubt, be viewed in the light in which we are certain the writer meant it—as an antidote—and not, by any means, as intended to promote those feelings of virulence between kindred nations, the endeavour to create which he so justly censures in the American authors from whom he quotes.]

AMERICAN AUTHORS.

“Notions of the Americans.”—“Reid’s Life of General Jackson.”—“Historical Memoir of the New-Orleans Campaign.”

At no period of the greatest exasperation existing between contending nations, did rancor ever give birth to a publication more deserving of the reprobation of mankind, than *NOTIONS of the Americans*.

Throughout the whole of that reprehensible work, the author evinces an inveteracy of hatred towards the Government, the people, and institutions of Great Britain, that is only equalled by the anxiety exhibited, in every page, to instil the venom of his rancor into the breasts of his countrymen.

But vain and futile, it is hoped, so detestable an endeavour will prove, for it is impossible but all reflecting Americans must clearly perceive the most distinct indications, in all parts of the book, of the author’s spleen proceeding from personal feelings, such as he has no right to call them to be partakers of.

Before we proceed to notice the most censurable of the author’s *“NOTIONS”* we shall give a few quotations—some strongly marking his *unbounded modesty*—and others showing his inaccuracy.

Page 60, Vol. 1.—“New England may justly glory in its Villages, in neatness and comfort they far exceed any thing I have ever seen in the Mother Country.”

Page 67, Vol. 1.—“America is beyond doubt the most civilized nation in the world; in as much as the aggregate of her humanity, intelligence and comfort, compared with her numbers, has nothing like an equal.”

Page 133, Vol. 1.—“It is almost unprecedented for a Lover to venture on any inquiries concerning the fortune of his fair one, even in any class.”

Has the author ever been at the springs of Saratoga? for there, it is believed, that the above is the somewhat common theme of the American Gentlemen.

Has he never heard the question—“How will the Father cut up?”—The young Americans are, we imagine, neither much better, nor much worse than the young men of the rest of the world, in making choice of a wife—But with our author, they must excel in this, as in all other things.

In pages 240 and 241, the author states, that if England took Cuba, “they would go to war.”—This reminds us of an anecdote told by Mathews.

When on one occasion that Comedian was travelling in an American Diligence, when he was not known to the passengers, a conversation happened to take place respecting the probability of his (Mathews) turning them into ridicule on his revisiting England, on which one of the party remarked “he dare not.”—“Why not?” said Mathews, “for it is very likely he will.”—“Because he dare not,” repeated the passenger.—“O” replied Mathews, “I

know him well, and I am sure he is just the fellow to do it, and how can you prevent him.”—“We would not allow him,” rejoined the American.—“But I am certain he will do it, and if he does, how can you help it?”—“Help it,” said the Yankee, in a nasal tone, “we would go to war.” And truly our American friends would be as likely to prevent our taking Cuba by going to war, as to prevent Mathews from making money by such a threat.

Page 325.—“One of the best bred and easy women I met in London was a countrywoman of my own; a very cosmopolite took occasion to compliment me on the subject; but probably fearing that he had said to much, he concluded by telling me, that she had been caught young.”

We are assured that Mr. Cadwallader must have been in rather low company when the above occurred, for no English gentleman would so express himself to a foreigner, unless such foreigner was an intimate friend, to whom he might make the remark in jest.

In Page 47, Vol. 2, our author says, that his countrymen are no longer so fond of Military Titles as formerly, except that of General.

The above may be true, among the first people, but it proceeds from a highly aristocratical feeling,—as the middling and lower orders are particularly attached to such titles, and use them on all occasions, and an American gentleman does not, therefore, wish himself to be styled in the same manner, as an American dram vender, Hostler, or Scavenger; as persons of that description, may be, and frequently are, by the vitious system of popular election, appointed as officers, to the destruction of the respectability of the Militia of the United States.

The author may, perhaps, have heard of Colonel Pluck, the drunken Philadelphia Hostler, who was disgracefully elevated by his fellow citizens, to the command of a battalion of Pennsylvania Militia.

Page 47, Vol. 2.—“We are much disposed to dispense with all kinds of Titles.”—This is excellent, when in the United States, you never heard one spoken or written of, but as—the Honourable,—Judge,—General,—Colonel,—or, such a one Esquire.

Page 71, Vol. 2.—“Not an officer necessarily on half pay, either in the land or sea service.”

Have the officers of the United States Army half pay?

Page 150, Vol. 2.—“The Supreme Court of the United States is the most august Tribunal of the World.”

Page 247, Vol. 2.—“The freest, happiest, and will shortly be the wealthiest and most powerful nation of the Globe, let other people like the prediction as they may.”

Page 279, Vol. 2.—“In civilization, comforts, and character, the Atlantic coast Indians, are, perhaps, somewhat below the English, but not below the Irish peasants.—They are below the condition of the mass of the slaves.”

Will any person credit that the author believes what he states in the above paragraph?—We think not.—He is recommended to refer to the Duke of Saxe Weimra’s remarks, respecting the condition of the *Slaves of the Republic*.

All the above quotations merely excite our risibility, but those that follow are of a character calculated to create disgust and contempt.

In page 315, Vol. 1, He says, “that the English Government paid the Press for abusing the Americans, and sent people to travel amongst them for the same purpose.”—This is distinctly denied.—The onus probandi rests with our author.

In Pages 320 and 321, Vol. 1.—After some impertinently presumptuous remarks, as to what England may suffer from America in a short time, and an insinuation that the former is beginning to assume through *prudence and fear* of the consequences—a cautious tone!!! The author says:

“What a noble promise for the future has England not jeoparded. “Why is Russia already occupying that place in American politics, which England should have only filled. Why did America choose England for her foe, when equal cause of war was given by France?”

That is indeed a question to be asked, Mr. Author, nor can it ever be answered, but to the eternal disgrace of the Government, which in utter disregard of the feelings and wishes of millions of Americans, declared war against the Land of their Fathers, at the moment it was struggling single handed, not only for the liberty of the world, but even for its own existence.

Such, undoubtedly, was not the time for a gene-

rous people to make demands on their Mother Country, for the abandonment of principles, from which she could not then recede, without virtually acknowledging her decreased power, at a period of all others that she was required to strain every nerve, towards rendering available the whole of her moral and physical strength, in combatting the colossal power and determined hatred of Napoleon.

How glorious would it not be for America, if History could say—

The United States had long seriously complained against Great Britain and France, but finding that the former had to contend for existence, against the concentrated power of Europe, headed by Napoleon, she, at so critical a period, with a generous magnanimity, forgot all complaints against her Mother Country, and devoted herself to her aid, in combatting the ambitions of the French Ruler, and in supporting that glorious Fabric of her Ancestors—the *British Constitution*.

How different is the following?

The United States equally complained of Great Britain and France for the interruption of her commerce, without adopting hostile steps against either, until the moment that Napoleon, the Ruler not only of France, but nearly the whole of Continental Europe, was directing all the energies of his gigantic power, against Great Britain, with the avowed purpose of effecting her annihilation—and at that period did *Republican America* declare a parricidal war, and unite with the despot of France, in his endeavours to overthrow the liberties of her Mother Country.

Page 323, Vol. 1.—“The fault of America, has been that of a too cautious forbearance.” “No doubt vulgar and impotent minds have already commenced the pitiful task of recrimination.” (Does not the author here allude to himself?)

Page 327, Vol. 1.—“The time is near, I had almost written frightfully near, when two nations who thoroughly understand each others vituperations, shall support a delicate rivalry by equal power.”

Page 73, Vol. 2.—“When peace was announced, two squadrons of fast sailing schooners, bought for the purpose, were about to sail with orders to burn, ravage and destroy. The fire-brand would have gleamed on the Island of Great Britain itself.”—This is truly a very pretty admission.—Never was the fire brand resorted to by the British during the war, except in necessary preventive retaliation of the most barbarous cruelty.—The burning of Newark, in Upper Canada, by the American General M’Clure, when old and young were driven by the flames, from their comfortable and happy dwellings, on a Canadian winter’s night, while the ground was covered with snow, but too well justifies the retaliatory means, to which dire necessity, unfortunately, compelled the British Commanders to have resort.

We remember having once heard an American, who was loud in condemnation of our destruction of the Capital of Washington, reminded that we were not only justified by their having previously burned the whole town of Newark, but likewise by the example they had set us, in the destruction of the public buildings at York in Upper Canada, when they had possession of that capital. To this the American remarked “your Court House at York, was a miserable wooden building, our Capitol was a magnificent structure of stone, calculated to last for ages.”

This reply led to the American’s being further reminded, that the conduct of his countrymen, in burning the wooden Court House, showed what they would have done had one of marble been equally in their power. The guilt of a Highwayman is, it is imagined, much the same, whether he robs you of a shilling or of a pound.

Pages 87, 88, Vol. 2.—“In a few years this Republic will not be very wary as to its choice of a foe. . . . Still, I think that the Government of the United States will not be very dangerous by its ambition. That it will sweep its coast of every hostile hold; that Bermuda, and all such places, will come into the possession of the Americans, in the course of the next half century, no man can doubt, who has seen how sagaciously they have already arranged their frontiers, and who knows how to estimate their growing strength.—In 50 years America will contain 50 millions.”

Truly, Mr. Author, as you thus pretty broadly express what your intentions are, when you have the power, would it not be advisable for us to extract the incipient sting, when we now have the power to do so;—for so impotent are you as an offensive