National Intelligencer & WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

VOL. VIII. WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH. NO. 1152.

SIX DOLLARS PER ANNUM. WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 1808. PAID IN ADVANCE.

National Intelligencer.

No American, animated by the faintest glow of patriotism, can read the following well-penned essays, without being penetrated with deep mortification at contemplating the candid & just acknowledgements of a Briton with the indulgent and unfounded representations that seem in this country almost habitually to emanate from party spirit. Whatever malignancy has crept in its favorite purpose of destroying the character of those who represent the great majority of the nation is seized and managed with eagerness, and apparent delight that by whatever lawless or fatal effects it may produce on the national character or prosperity. It is forgotten that we are all embarked in the same bottom, & it does not seem to be realized that our fate will be a common one. Nothing can exhibit, in more striking colors, the delirium of either personal or party resentment than the blindness with which it persues an end, which can only be gained on the destruction of him who indulges it.

We earnestly invite our readers to a careful and deliberate perusal of these papers. They indisputably establish two points: the utter futility of the charge of submission to French power; and the disposition on the pretext on which Britain grounds her gigantic invasions of maritime rights.

To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.

SIR,

I have observed with much regret, that the message of the President of the United States, has been received among us, rather in a strain of acrimonious invective, than in the spirit of temperate and candid inquiry. The discussion is of such importance, as to demand the mediation of our most deliberate and unbiassed judgement, and our angry passions are, therefore, the most unfit counsellors that we can summon to our aid. We have been long accustomed to regard Mr. Jefferson as the inventor-in-chief of this country, and I fear that, under the influence of this impression, we apply to the message the character we have framed for the man, in a rule of construction, and a ground of reproach. If there be nothing in the message abstractly viewed, to warrant the severity of our censures this mode of interpretation is to say no more of it, unchariitable, and if we receive it all, to the prejudice we ascribe to him, it should be, to applaud the dominion that he has exercised over his private resentments in our discharge of a public duty. I attribute the extreme force of this message by the liberal and enlightened politics of our country, in some degree, to an undue, although amiable preponderance of authority, being, principally, an ignorance of several important circumstances, that go to explain his silence on the subject of French aggressions. I shall therefore beg leave to confine to their consideration a statement of facts, collected from unquestionable authority, and which I shall assume, however, to be proved by some general observations on the parts of his message, that have given most dissatisfaction.

I shall advert in the first instance, to the literary censorship that has been usurped over this paper. If I were disposed to embrace the defence of the author's style, I should certainly plead to the jurisdiction of such self-created tribunals as those of our ministerial editors, who, themselves, appear to have sworn eternal enmity to lucid order and grammatical purity. But I am no master "of the whole extension of language," and shall not, therefore, undertake a formal vindication either of American style in general, or of that of the message. I must, however, be permitted to add that I cannot discover in the production now under review, a solitary word, or combination of phrase, that is not habitually employed by the most classic and classical writers of England on the contrary I think I recognizes throughout, the stamp of a pregnant, vigorous intellect; great occasional splitude of expression, and felicity of arrangement, qualities that so eminently distinguish the celebrated Junius.

The most important accusations preferred against the message is, that it betrays strong symptoms of rancor against England, and partiality to France. Our ministerial pritins have urged this point so strenuously, and indulged in so much invective, that I cannot but stope to hit for conjecture, about the nature of the end to which their labors are directed. They have, perhaps fallen upon the ingenious device of making the most of the occasion, in order to kindle up an indignation against the government and people of the United States, and thus league our feelings with the great experiment of universal warfare. I question, however, this system of conduct, in regard of the public, and proceed to state, that after a most diligent and dispassionate examination of the message, I am unable to find in it a single determinate indication of hostility to this government, or partiality for France. It is but a plain, calm narrative, with no warmth of colorings or latitude of inferences. The President commences, by a simple detail of the causes, the progress, and the result of the Chesapeake affair, and concludes with a comment, and certainly not in the language of violence or acrimony, on the outrage of France nolens occurs, but a remote allusion to the famous decree of November. The President adverts, in the beginning of his message, to "successive invasions on the principles of public law," but this part, evidently alludes to certain acts of the British government. When we consider his situation, however, it will cannot be acknowledged, that there is nothing novel or obscure in this language—nothing that implies any particular congeniality of sentiment, or recent convergence of views with the French Empire. We obviously alludes to our attempts on colonial commerce, our interdiction of the coasting trade, our impressment of American seamen, and to all our multiplied restrictions on neutral navigation, which have given rise to so much earnest and doubtful discussion under the administration of Washington & Adams, and which these his predecessors, uniformly reprobated, as subversive of the public rights of the nations, and resisted, as encroachments upon sacred and indefeasible rights. The President moreover, in his extraordinary mission to this country, was to lay the seed of discord that has hitherto lain so long, in the *promise of neutral and belligerent forbearance*, and in his subsequent letter proper to introduce this topic to Congress, by a summary of the causes which had induced the mission to France. The President also calls the attention of the Legislature to our rights and duties, as a neutral power, and conformably to the principles invariably professed, and constantly practised by the American government, stiles it a violation of maritime rights. To mention it was an indispensable duty, and I leave it, as an American President, he could have done so in any other manner. The order does intercept all neutral trade between port of the United States and France. It is stated in its preamble *to be a measure of retaliation on France, justified by the excesses of the enemy, not by its practice of former hostilities.* It is therefore, *British* and *French* aggressions, *a new law of the ocean*, and submission to it, was not a matter of course. It was free to such as the Sovereign of Congress, and in order to assist their deliberations, the President states, without aggravation, the injurious effects on the American trade in the Mediterranean—a consideration of obvious importance.

Enough, I think, has been now said, to derive the unfavorable inference that arises from the silence made in the Message to Congress. But as we were anxious to whether the indication which Mr. J. P. has thus given of his sentiments, ought to be considered as a sufficient justification. His silence on the subject of the French decree of 1806, is the chief ground of our discontent; which I shall attempt to remove by showing in the first place, *that the general tenor of the Mr. G. did receive on soon after the promulgation of the Decree, and subsequently, and under circumstances that it was not to be carried into effect, without injurious results.* If this position can be substantiated, and it can be, *we proceed, that the decree has not been enforced* in such of its provisions, as infringe neutral rights, the propriety of Mr. Jefferson's conduct, in this, should imagine, enable to every understanding.

Before I exhibit the nature of the measures suggested above I shall premise that the U. S. although some such has been given, could justifiably have abstained from making the remonstrance the decree, until they saw it carried into effect. The event was highly improbable, and is so described by the late administration, in their representation of his majesty's sentiments on the subject. The American government, from existing relations between them and France, were entitled to consider the decree as not intended for the government of Europe alone. Their convention of 1800, and the 12th article of the Consulate of Bonaparte, was irreconcilable with ordinary jurisprudence, and they could well conclude that it was not his intention to violate positive engagements. The French rulers of the Convention, that I have just cited, contained a stipulation for free trade, by treaty, and between the parts of the contracting Powers, in the case of war, declares England in a state of blockade, and thereby regularly subjected the neutral commerce to our ports. Gen. Armstrong, the American minister at Paris, although well acquainted with the circumstances of the case, that no such decree had been promulgated, was explanation without delay. He undertook, on the 20th of the month, to report to the minister of marine, who was particularly charged with the execution of the decree, upon the subject, and in consequence of an interpretation prejudicial to our commerce, and requesting, upon a solution of the doubts which they were thought, which I conceive, on the 30th the same month, the minister of marine sent the following reply, which I have translated from a French copy, now before me, published at Paris.

"PARIS, 8th Dec. 1806.

"To the Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States.

"I have the honor of reply to the note which you did me the honor to communicate to the Grand Judge.

"I am of opinion that the imperial decree of the 21st November, does not, in its present shape, alter the regulations now in force in France, on the subject of neutral navigation, or consequently affect the convention of the 30th September, 1801, with the United States.

"But, although by this answer I have shewn, that from your representations, tend to me by your excellency, I think I ought to add, that *it is necessary to the existing laws, will not accrue to the prejudice of the neutral flag, and that America vessel cannot be taken as aug. in the decree, and consequently, in turning from an English port, since, conformably to the 7th article of the treaty, the English ships, which enter in France, then merely exclude from our ports, the vessels belonging to the English colonies.*—4. That is the regular, and the only, sense in which the said decree are in the nature of a general law, that naturally apply to foreign nations, and, in the 5th place, that the decree, in question, is not, in the relations, as to that part which concerns the communication of citizens of the United States with France.

"I beg your excellency to accept the assurance of my high consideration.

(Signed) DECRES."

I am credibly informed that verbal explanations to the same purport were given, but nothing, in fact, could be more explicit than this communication. It was transmitted by the minister of marine himself to the United States, *it serves as a rule of conduct to* to French cruisers in the West Indies, and *it was the only decree communicated to the American government by General Armstrong*, dated 12th September last to an American merchant, who had occasion to make use of them before the court of prizes at Paris, and must be well known to our minister.

It is also a matter of notoriety, that orders, in conformity to the above explanation, were sent to all Yew cruisers, and that American vessels bound to our ports are every day boarded by French gentlemen, and suffered to pass without molestation. No instance has occurred, at least until within a very recent date, that Mr. Armstrong could not have been apprised of the fact at the time of writing his message, in which the decree has been differently construed, in one case, during the last winter, capture on the ground of the general blockade, and collected, under the consideration of the court of prizes at Paris, and was expressly adjudged to be unlawful.

VERITAS.

To the EDITOR of the MORNING CHRONICLE.

SIR,

I recently solicited your attention to a succinct view of the assurances given by the United States, relative to the operation of the decree of Nov. 1806, and shall, today, invite your indulgence in favor of some additional remarks on the same subject. Our most prominent speculations on this, demonstrate an ignorance of the true principles of neutrality, that is, no, altogether incomprehensible, when reflect, that it was written by a person of a character too prominent to have pleaded in ordinary judicatories, or commercial vigilance. The result of General Armstrong's application was a positive and unequivocal assurance to American consuls of the principal ports in France, continually, and have been reached this country. If I may judge from the facility, with which we receive and propagate even the most-idle rumors. This supposition is confirmed by a fact that cannot have escaped the recollection of our merchants. When the imperial decree was first promulgated to us, premiums of insurance on neutral vessels were considerably enhanced, but soon fell to their antecedent levels, in consequence of the arrival of letters from Paris and Holland, communicating, upon the authority of the American minister at Paris, the explanation detailed in your paper of yesterday. It was this will in a manner, produce a distance correlative of the opinions to which I contain. On the 30th, I shall be induced relative to this affair. The Spaniards, as Mr. Jefferson mentions in his message, enacted a similar decree, and, in a few instances, had actually taken vessels, and carried to ports in contradiction. As soon, however, as the indications of the French government, concerning the original measure, were laid before them by the American Charge d'Affaires, at the court of Madrid, a construction, merely on extending with that of the French minister of marine, was adopted, and immediately followed by the liberation of the captured vessels. The case of the American ship the Superbrown, taken into Spain under the Spanish decree, and other wards released upon a change of system, fully well known to Liberty.

As long as the convention of 1801, and the interpretation of the minister of the marine assisted in their full force, the decree was as a dead letter with the French cruisers, and produce nothing in that article which excludes from French ports, all vessels having clearances only touched in England. The United States are not, however, ignorant, that at least this exclusion, although somewhat detrimental to their interests. It is but a mere matter of regulation, and an exercise of territorial sovereignty, sanctioned by the universal law of nations usage. France has an undoubted right to regulate trade as her *corp parts*, in the phrases; and the case is widely distinct from an order of council, *modifying positive secondary rules of law*, *seas*. America might resist the one as an usurpation, and yet, it would be demonstrate against the other, as an improvement but hardly tolerable. The position is in one case a point of *honor*; in the other, a mere question of convenience. Should the nature of regulation be entirely dictated by *wishes*, *ends*, *spirit*, and *principles* of a just and wide-spreading injury, it might probably warrant the resistance. This provision of Bonaparte has, however, no such appendages, and is, in fact, the same in principle as the one of Great navigation laws, prohibiting the importation of any commodities from foreign bottoms. The exclusion of British manufactures and produce was the object in view; for the attainment of which, the necessary expedients of which about which much senseless clamor has been raised, excluded by the French government, and in the same principle, was it but just to acquiesce in them.

While the rights and interests of America were thus solemnly guaranteed by the Emperor, and a temporary abstinent practice, Great Britain could not, with reason, complain of her inactivity. Exclusive of the motives derived from general reasonings, she has every indicement to conclude, that we did not require or expect her to make opposition to the decree, and actually enforced against her trade. To this practice effect is the declaration of his majesty's sentiments on the subject, conveyed in a note addressed to Messrs. Monroe and Pinkney, the American commissioners, and signed by our plenipotentiaries, Lords Holland and Auckland.—I shall quote the language of the note, as illustrative of my position. "If, however, the enemy should carry these threats into execution, (alluding to the decree) and if neutral nations should, contrary to all appearances, acquiesce in such usurpation, his majesty might, probably, be compelled, however unwilling, to, retaliate in his just defence, and to issue orders to his cruisers to adopt towards neutrals any hostile system, to which those neutrals shall have submitted from his threats."—In this formal annunciation of the feelings and intentions of our government, we claim but a contingent right of retaliation; we render submission to the decree *strongly enforced*, the only conditions upon which we are to be driven to adopt towards neutrals, a similar hostile system. I need not here suggest, how far the phraseology of this note is from Tyrtæus justification to our late orders of council.

As opinion appears to be generally prevalent in this country, that America has almost constituted a subject submission to insults and injuries from France, and has therefore, no right to complain, when we choose to follow the supposed example of our rival neighbor, and hold the cup of humiliation to her lips. Without attempting to do the obvious fallacy of this conclusion, I shall proceed to shew the accuracy of the supposition, on which it is grounded. I shall, first, shew slight information on this point from the best authorities, and then, from the proceedings that France, during the last two years, has given no serious cause of complaint to the government of the United States. She appears, on the contrary, to have acted with a moderation, that bespoke a fear of established system of violence, by not only conciliating their feelings, and their interests, but, by, in the first instance, pursuit points, indeed, could the interest of the United States come into collision with her views, and the principal differences have arisen, a disposition to accommodate, or to yield to the wishes of with propensities and efficacy. The American minister at Paris has been permitted to occupy a ground not contrary to the principle of the principle of the great powers of Europe, and, has been constantly spoken and stated with a freedom, and a boldness, unknown to his character as the representative of a powerful and independent Nation. Proceeding in the ground, will, instant of proceeding from Europe, Both the Government and public intercourse with the government, he is treated with a deference, a sweet flattering which is accompanied with the superciliious attitude assumed towards his colleague in Spain.

If, then, the rights and interests of America, have not been sacrificed, in one instance, that could have been known to Mr. Jefferson at the time of writing his message, and, if, from his predecessors, to point out any public conduct, which, it be contended, that it was incumbent on him to say more in relation to France than he has done, it is, it is consistent with the principles of commerce, of sound policy, of prudent concern, to have foreseen, by intimation, against a power, so intimable in her hostility, or to have summoned Congress to legislate on a question, of such prospective evil? The Decree of Nov. and the explanations consequent upon it had been, at the time of writing his message, previously communicated to the legislature; but, it was, in consequence in the, or alteration had been previously given in the Decree or practice of France; and it would argue the most contemptible of the character of an American Statesman, if, it appears, that he could, under such circumstances, have, at this time, and under such circumstances, as Bonch does a jury, for a recommendation of their verdict.

Before I leave the subject of the decree, I shall, direct the attention of the reader to a circumstance of the most moment connected with the explanation of the decree, as that, which, I, shall, shall be remarked, that by his mode of interpretation, the decree, is, neither, to be granted to, or any precise exception made to, the coasts of the States. All neutrals are declared equally unseasonable, inasmuch as the decree is said to be, in change, or to be commanding French laws relative to maritime rights. Thus is American, in, the, front, of the charge of collusion. If this, however, had not been the case, Great Britain will not be seriously alleged, that, it was to throw down the gauntlet to Bonaparte, and, involve the Continental war, merely in cause, by the decree, of a violation of maritime rights, and, on some distant and defenceless nation unprotected. I know not, what authority we could exact so severe a penalty. Still, equal plausibility might the French Emperor demand her to open the memory of justice, of mercy, of private friendship and public security, which he alleges to have been outraged and violated in the heart of Continental Europe. Such a question system of policy would have excluded submission and equipment the U. States, since the era of their independence, for many years have elapsed, and, Austria, have become