National Intelligencer & WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

VOL. VIII. WASHINGTON CITY, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. NO. 1212.

FIVE DOLLARS PER ANNUM. WEDNESDAY, JULY 20, 1808. PAID IN ADVANCE.

WASHINGTON CITY.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 20.

We invite the attention of our readers to the interesting performances under the signature of *Aristarchi*. It contains truths of the first importance, most seasonably told.

FOR THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

To the people of the United States.

I am one of those, who believe that you are the true and absolute proprietaries of this country, that you have a right to promote and are in duty bound to maintain its happiness. This may appear to be self-evident, and so simple, that it may produce a smile, when I say it down in such form as a preliminary article. Yet the proper position does not appear to me unnecessary at a time, when some at least seem to reason too much on the ground of external matters.

The present circumstances of *the human race* are certainly unprecedented. There is nothing like the situation and prospects of the nations of the earth, in the history of the world. It is a season for self-examination—for an examination, not of our conscience, for a deliberate consideration of the past and presents in order that we may make the best of what is to come. Let us be wise and just, and fear not.

Foreign proclamations, orders and decrees, surprise nearly all our trades, and jeopardize the remainder. Our persons are not safe, when out of our territory.

No relaxation from the dictation of these proclamations, orders, and decrees, are from detentions, arrests and seizures have yet occurred. On the contrary they are increased, multiplied and extended, in the express order of mere interest, power, revenge, and mutual destruction of belligerent by belligerents.

No American will deny that arbitrary and illegitimate regulations, of some or other of the belligerent nations, produce the seizures, which occur, of our persons, and property, which take place abroad. Who then of the foreign powers have thus offended against our rights, interests and persons, committing thereby vast wrongs, and setting an evil example to the world? This is an all important subject of examination, because it will teach us, by the exils already committed against us, not to depend upon reason and justice from the same quarter, without a firm conduct.

It is intended to examine and consider the evidences of hostility, rivalship, and encroachment upon our rights, interests, and national standing where with England has enriched and aggrandised herself, injured and insulted us, and brought the instrument upon us, both by her own foreign allies, and her foreign enemies.

The rivalship of our Great Britain, manifestly lies in its two Houses of Parliament. In that place the most open repetitions of the treaty of peace of 1783 took place. The ministry that made it, was violently expelled from office, and the *Ins* and *Outs* of dissatisfaction was manifested at the limits and boundaries agreed upon between us and Great Britain. The treaty was ratified, it is true, but the western posts were detained *with the intention to dismember our country*. The following statement, admissions and assertions made in print by the late Alexander Hamilton, esq. prove the fact. In the 4th par. 3rd, and 8th. page of Mr. Hamilton's pamphlet, under the signature of *Camillus* in the 1795, he states and asserts, that "there is *just ground* to suspicion, *strongly supported by various concurring circumstances*, that Great Britain has entertained the project of *contracting our dominion at the Ohio*." This (says Mr. Hamilton positively) has appeared.

"1st. In Canada."

"2nd. At the British garrisons."

"3d. At the Indian towns." Hence our Indian wars and expences; and loss of Indian trade.

"4th. At Philadelphia"—the seat of our government, where Mr Hamilton lived and was in the secrets of our councils!

3. "At London" the seat of the British government. This testimony is solemn and conclusive. Spain, we know, adverted to this conduct and to these views of the British government in her councils, operations and plans. England thus contributed to mislead Spain, or to confirm her in her hostile projects of the same kind.

The printed statement prepared in Canada by Isaac Ogden, Esq. for the information of *the British Prince Regent*, to show *the whole state of affairs in America and the best plan of British conduct therein*, it was proposed and recommended to add *Canada as a rod over the U. States*. This state paper was published of course by the permission of the British prince or government.

British agents and emissaries have been instructed into our Indian country to the injury of our trade there—to the increase of our expences—and so as to accomplish the end of expensive and bloody wars. The English were therefore accomplices *before the fact*; and as their dead bodies have been found with fraudulent co-ors on them, they have been *partakers in the crime*. They have waged war against us in these cases to *dismember our country and to monopolize trade*, before the dawn of the French revolution.

The English government in 1786 made a treaty of commerce with France, whom they call their natural *enemy and rival*. *Never which would protect their enemies goods*. This they refused to us *always*—and with prejudices and aversions of nations; for the report of 1791 to their privy council, after referring to this British treaty with France, observes that it should never be conceded to the U. States of America, that free ships should *protect their goods*, thus acting less beneficially towards us than towards their oldest, nearest, mortal rivals and to the same enemy, by the mutual commerce, navigation and seamen was the plain and undeniable reason and to the same enemy they have at all times impressed our sailors and passengers, and foreign ships of every nation aiding our trade and navigation.

The English have taken (and often knowingly) American and other seamen foreign to G. Britain, neutral and belligerents, from our ships, and forced them to their guns, subjecting us thereby to quarrels with other powers, and deep criminalities, personal and public. This is a real and most offensive cause of the dissatisfaction and collision of France and Spain towards us. England knowing this evil, evades all cure, all measures of security or protection to this evil.

England in November 1792, *broke the ice*, in the case of perverting neutrals, and in the conduct of her cruisers to the injury of those neutrals and of one of the powers at war. England (the neutral) based a prohibition in opposition to their own laws and to their treaties with France and the neutrals, restraining neutral trade from carrying British and neutral goods to France; though they were allowed to go at the same time to the ports of Austria and Prussia, who were at war with France. This was the first aggression. Like the first blow in the case of an affray, it threw *the breach of the peace* upon the side of Great Britain. It painted France in retaliation. It rendered retaliation a just and well defined concern. For it and many other acts of the same nature and tendency in the remainder of the war, at the beginning of 1793, France on the first day of February of that year declared war against Britain, including the rights of neutrals to the intentional injury of France, *as the cause*. Thus France in first fairly complied with Britain, and did not retaliate upon us. Our vessels went and came unmolested by France, as our seamen passed thro' all seas unimpressed by her. She did not attempt to search our vessels for American, or British, or French, or other seamen. Even their own French seamen were suffered to be employed in our vessels, which were protected, as to France, by the law of nations, though we had not one armed ship on the ocean, and though the navy of France disputed the empire of the seas with that of England until the action of June, 1794, between D'Orvilliers and Howe. The British officers, long before that time, had impressed Americans, English, Dane and other foreigners out of our vessels, so as deeply to wound and highly to incense France. *This* consort produced the French decrees to treat Americans (neutrals) found in the British sea army (their men of war) fighting against their neutral duties, against France, as pirates. This irritation, this quarrel, this act of remedy or retaliation, England brought on us—*and continues to give cause for it*. Our wounds are very deep and desperate, and require the *probe of truth*. We are disgraced forever—perhaps ruined, if we are not able to unprovoked in severity and justice.

In the month of January, 1793, England, *at peace with France*, set her cruisers to take vessels of Hamburg, Denmark and Sweden, in their voyages from Hamburg to France! As these neutrals suffered England to treat them so, France, retaliating after the fear of famine, ordered *retaliation* on England by war and on those neutrals, by taking their cargoes for France, but *she ordered those cargoes to be paid for, and did pay for them*; and France, by this act, *set the example* she would desist from thus abusing and perverting neutrals to the ruin of those, who refused to take part in from retaliation. It is however a real and important truth, that France did not retaliate any of those goods thus carried in.

On the 1st March, 1793, England and Spain (joined afterwards by Spain, Austria and Prussia) undertook a confederacy against France, unlawful, irritating and ruinous act, of *a solemn treaty engagement to prevent all the supplies, which England gave France, as a measure of ruin and insult to belligerent France, and of utter barrenness and sterility of Britain, the destruction of their commerce and rights.*

France was to lose all advantage of neutral supplies in the exchange of sales to neutrals, and all advantage of the revenues arising on neutral imports and exports, and neutrals were deprived at once of all benefits from French supplies and consumption, and from French commerce. The principles of this treaty were death to neutral agriculture and trade.

The 1st article of the treaty of the treaties of March (and posies) in 1793, made by England with Russia, Spain, Prussia, Austria, are so strong, so full, and so comprehensive, that it was take all the subsequent regulating decrees of France, of Berlin, Milan, Bayonne, &c. they do not go further; nor so far.

In the month of May, 1793, the French government took a deep alarm *for their subsistence*, from the real and internal revolution oppressed them at that time, and they found that that great maritime rivals, Britain, Russia and Spain, and the neighboring people of the Netherlands, Germany and Spain, all combined to keep from them supplies of provisions, by land and sea, by prohibiting their own peoples from being sent to France, and by engaging to use all their endeavors to prevent supplies of bread or any thing else from reaching the neutral country. Alarmed, injured, insulted, and vitally endangered by this unlawful violation of the rights of belligerents, and by this abuse and perversion of the neutral trade, supplies and rights, France was driven to defend herself from ruin than in revenge or retaliation, under the treaties of the same neutrals, thus unlawfully prohibited their ordinary trade with her enemies, and by which they armed into France; *not as prize*, but to feed her people and to be paid for at the prices of the ports, as aforesaid. If there were any thing either unjust or unkind in this act, it is plain and undeniable, that the treaty of England with Russia and her anterior practices from the 15th of November preceding, brought it on. France, left to her natural trade, and not seeing the neutrality of other states borne down, by England, was not driven to this measure. She had a better right to take the cargoes of neutrals (paying fairly for them) to feed her children, than Britain had to prevent the neutrals from independently going to trade in innocent goods with France, in order to starve her. The retaliation of such a measure on England, (France indemnifying the neutrals) was agreeable to the known law of nations. But the question is—*was produced this retaliating measure of the French government?* The answer is—England. She is the committer of the original aggressions on neutrals, and the cause of the defensive retaliations of France.

In June, 1793, England, provoking the continuance of such measures of France, and avowing it to be in execution of her March treaty with Russia, issued her June orders of council, to stop all cargoes of provisions bound in neutral vessels to France. It was done to defeat the French struggles for liberty, and American independent trade and navigation. She had before stopt other neutrals. England relying in that "superiority at sea," which her Russian treaty gave, and which has aggravated her rage of her enemies, and bent upon the monopoly of commerce, put forth these orders of June, 1793. To compliate her deliberate sins against neutrals and against her belligerent adversary, Britain secured an immunity to her ministers for any order of council, however contrary to the law of nations, the common law of England or her parliamentary statutes. The 26th section of the English act of the 13th of June, 1793, indemnifies her ministers for every possible violation of neutral rights and trade, under orders in council; and for every possible violation of the usages of war among belligerents under those orders. The constitution of England was thus changed—destroyed—in order to destroy her enemy, who is pretended to be an aggressor on such a heavily and despotic enemy, by a much later act of November, 1807. In every attempt to destroy an enemy, neutrals are attempted to be deprived, during the war, of all the protections of the law of nations—*the law of nations*. The bear vote of a *Tudor parliament*, that an executive proclamation of the king of England could repeal its acts, was to be realized as to us, or would be, if we suffered the Americans! Never go to sea on such mean conditions. Probe now to the *bottom this cancer* on your foreign interests—your independence. The heart sickens with indignant sighs, when the insolent and pertinacious perpetrator of such gross aggressions, barely insults our wrongs by pretending to a right of remedy—"Tis time for these things to end.

The autumn of 1793 established one more gross violation of neutral rights by the British government. All neutral supplies for the French armies, even of innocent goods destined to unblockaded ports to which we could supply the French armies, in August of August, 1794, were directed to be seized by the *secret* order of the British king in council. Mad and despotic Britain! (tis by such acts, repeated often till the summer of 1806, that you brought upon yourself the ire of the neutral world the Berlin decree of the 11th of November, 1806. Your subsequent acts of 1807 have brought on the Milan and Bayonne decrees, and the American states, too effectually embroyed by the mad aggressions of neutral trade through your aggressions and the retaliations of your foes, are rendered hostile *a country of agriculture and manufactures alone*.

The Americans consider for yourselves the historical truths here offered to view: ask yourselves, why England, France, in peace, ever arrested your commerce with England against French laws, as England did by us and France in 1793? Ask yourselves, whether it is proved on such authority as that of Hamilton, that France in 1795 formed the project of dismembering your country, as Britain did? Ask yourselves whether France, in 1793, agreed with Russia to aggress upon you in a manner unexampled, by engaging to deprive you of all commerce with England?

It is very true that France has made many severe decrees, deeply affecting neutral trade. Heaven knows, that we do not mean to commence France in *any* wrong; but England has unfortunately pressed upon your consideration *the doctrine of retaliation* upon belligerents, and *the right* of one power at war to draw from neutrals those benefits, which the other belligerent habitually takes, and which the neutral is unwilling or unable to prevent. *This Chapter is deducate in the extreme.* "Is fitter for men in power correctly to consider the use to discern in this place: "Tis one, however, which *extreme may not evade, nor prudence overlook*. "Tis time to examine and *continue* all truths, and to act firmly by the rule of right. *The wrong over must be brought to a greater convey, or the plough and the hoe, the anvil and the loom will be our sole employments.* Commerce Is suspended till Britain returns to the law of nations—*the law of morals*. "Till then England and Algiers—Scotland and Tunis—the united imperial kingdoms of the British Isles and the piratical states of wretched Barbary must occupy the main. Britons, frown not! "Tis your governments, who have made this miserable condition of the commercial world. It cannot be concealed—It cannot be denied. England has made a Tephet of the ocean. She has destroyed the trade of the world by her attempts to monopolize the whole. She owes her greatness to the import of materials she can no longer procure by her interdicted trade—to manufactures she can no longer sell—to a navigation which she cannot, by carrying trade, which is annihilated—to a navy which has nothing to conquer—to a surrounding world, which has shut her from its dominions.

JURISCOLA.

At a meeting of the citizens of Washington, convened by public notice at the Council Chamber, on Friday, the day evening, the 14th of July, 1808, the morning assemblage attending—

Dr. Cornelius Coningham was called to the chair; and J. B. Colvin appointed Secretary. It was, on motion,

Resolved, That an injured citizen has claim upon the consideration of every citizen; and that we feel and that we have cause to believe Gen. Jas. Wilkinson has suffered persecution for his patriotic efforts in the service of his country.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to frame an address to Gen. Wilkinson, to be signed and presented by the chairman, demonstrative of the sense of this meeting entertain of his public services and their confidence in his integrity and patriotism.

A committee was accordingly appointed, and an address reported to this meeting; it was being read and agreed to, the chairman with four other gentlemen was designated to wait on the general, present him with the same, receive his answer, and forthwith report the address and reply, together with an account of the proceedings of the meeting, to be published in the newspapers.

Signed by order of the meeting,
CORNELIUS CONINGHAM,
Chairman.

Attest,
J. B. Colvin, Secretary.

According to direction, the committee yesterday waited upon general Wilkinson with the following address, to which he returned the annexed answer:

Washington City, July 14, 1808.

Sir,

It is the peculiar duty of a free and enlightened people, to carefully examine with the severest scrutiny the conduct of public men, & regard with a jealous suspicion every public character, to pay the tribute of their esteem to every confidential citizen who has falsified the unbounded confidence reputation cast upon his fame. Justice and candor require, that while they punish with their censures, they should reward with their approbation; for unfortunate indeed is the lot of that country in which calumny only could be heard and the confidence of the people could not be declared.

Under these impressions the citizens of Washington have met to offer their sincere congratulations on the issue of the enquiry that was lately instituted on your conduct. As a respectable portion of the Union they were affected with the liveliest sensibility when they heard on the floor of the House of Representative the heinous charges that were adduced against so distinguished a soldier and citizen; and living on the immediate theatre of action, they watched with