National Intelligencer,
& WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

VOL. VIII. WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. No. 1248.

FIVE DOLLARS PER ANNUM. MONDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1808. PAID IN ADVANCE.

WASHINGTON CITY,

MONDAY, OCTOBER 10.

Accusation against the administration of Jeffersonian Republicans.

Intrigues in England and hostility to France.—Continued.—During the year 1793 the government of the U. S. had a very difficult duty to perform. At this period Gen. Washington was President, and Mr. Jefferson Secretary of State.

It was, at this interesting era, that Mr. Genet, as a fire-brand came among us. Those who were then conversant with political affairs have displayed a full recollection of the conduct pursued by the French minister, of his hardy attempts to commit the peace of the U. S. by endeavoring in the first place to induce the government to submit to the most flagrant violations of neutrality, and, after having failed in this purpose, to inflame the people of the U. S. against their government. As, however, a term of fifteen years has since elapsed, during which almost millions of our fellow-citizens have attained the age of manhood, it is shall probably render an acceptable service by stating these events somewhat in detail. The entire conduct of the American government, and more especially by Mr. Jefferson, who was its organ, in continuing to support the principles maintained, and the measures taken, collectively present the most irreproachable evidence of a mind exclusively impressed with considerations involving the welfare of its own country, and a determination to maintain an attitude towards France as well as England of fair neutrality, of right independence.

Let it be recollected that this was the critical period of neutrality when the wishes of the whole nation were in the highest measure excited, on the side of France; and when, if ever, it was a period, when the heart, from the common principle of human nature, is but too ready to believe the judgment. Mr. Jefferson firmly maintained, and pursued effectually to manifest partiality, neither side, but impressed with the rules of justice even, we have the strongest possible evidence that the genuine impartiality towards France, and hostility towards England is a base calumny.

To substantiate this statement, it is only necessary to resort to the correspondence between Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Genet, from the 22d of May to the 18th of September, 1793, which was in the same year submitted to Congress.

This correspondence is too long to notice in detail: it is sufficient, subject to have to say that through the whole of it Mr. Jefferson opposed the firm language of truth to the angry menace, and superficial reasoning of the minister.

On the 16th of August a letter was written by the Secretary of State to Mr. Morris, our minister in France, requiring the recall of Mr. Genet. In this letter a full summary of the whole correspondence is to be found, from which we offer the following extracts:

"In my letter of June 19th, I inclosed you the copies of several letters, which had passed between Mr. Fauchet, Mr. Genet, and myself, on the processes to which the vessels set out had given rise within our ports. The object of this communication was to enable you to explain the principles on which our government was conducting itself towards the belligerent powers; principles which might not in all cases be satisfactory to all, but were meant to be just and impartial to all. Mr. Genet had been then but a little time with us; and but a little more was necessary to develope to him a character and conduct so unexpected and so extraordinary, as to place us in the most disheartening dilemma, between our regard for his nation, which is constant and sincere, and a regard for our laws, the authority of which must be maintained; for the peace of our country which the Executive magistracy, charged to preserve; for its honor offended in the person of that magistrate; and for its claim rather grossly violated in the conversations and letters of this gentleman. In the course of these transactions it has been a great comfort to us to believe, that none of them were with his intentions or expectations of his employers. These had been too recently expressed in acts which nothing could disclaim, in the letters of the Executive council, in the letters of the minister of the National Assembly, and in the general demeanor of the nation towards us, to ascribe to them illusions of a contrary character. Our first duty, therefore, was to draw a strong line between their intentions, and the proceedings of their minister; our second, to lay those proceedings faithfully before them.

"On the declaration of war between France and England, the United States being at peace with both, their situation was so new and unexpected by themselves that their duties were not, in the first instant, visible of the new duties resulting thereform, and of the restraints which they impose even on *their dispositions* towards the belligerent powers. Some of them (meaning full citizens, and transient sojourning citizens) that they were free to indulge those dispositions, to take side in the other party, and enrich themselves by depredations on the commerce of the other, and were soliciting enterprises of this nature, as there was reason to believe, in the mind of the minister, and where it should take an erroneous direction, difficult to be redressed, to the great disquietude of us and their country, the President thought it expedient, through the medium of the minister, to inform our fellow-citizens that we were in a state of peace with all the belligerent powers, that in that state it was our duty neither to aid nor injure any, to abstain and warn them against acts which might involve us in war, and particularly those of positive hostility, for the punishment of which we have reserved to ourselves the right to put them on their guard also as to the risks they would run, if they should attempt to carry articles contraband to any. This proclamation, ordered on the 19th and slightly on the 22d day of April, was sent to you in my letter of the 26th of the same month.

"On the day of its publication, we received through the channel of the newspapers, the first intimation that Mr. Genet had arrived on the 8th of the month at Charleston, in character of minister plenipotentiary from his nation to the United States, and soon after, that he had sent on to Philadelphia a vessel in which he came, and would himself perform the journey by land. His landing at one of the most distant ports of the Union from his points both of departure and destination was calculated to excite surprise, and shortly afterwards we learnt that he was undertaking to authorise the fitting and arming of vessels in this port, by listing men, foreigners and citizens, and giving them commissions to cruise and commit depredations on the peace with us, that these vessels were taking and bringing prizes into our ports, that he was hourly in expectation of their arrival, and was assuming to hold courts of admiralty on them to try, condemn, & authorise their sale as legal prizes, and all this before Mr. Genet had presented himself, or his credentials been received by the state of which he is accredited by him, without his consent or consultation, and directly in contravention of the state of things, which he, and declared to exist in the President's proclamation, and intimation on him to preserve till the constitutional authority should otherwise declare. These proceedings became immediately as was naturally to be expected, the subject of complaint by the representative of the foreign power against whom they would chiefly be against. The British minister presented several memorials on the subject, which gave the answer of May 15th hereinafter inclosed to you, correspondent with a subsequent one, of the same date, written to Mr. Hammondy the minister of France then in America, which we had received, and sent herewith. On the next day Mr. Genet reached this place, about five or six weeks after he had arrived at Charleston, and might have been at Philadelphia, if he had steered for it directly. He was immediately presented to the President, and received by him as the minister of the Republic, and on the conduct before stated, seemed to bespeak a design of feeling us into the war, without allowing us the exercise of any free will in the case, nothing could be more assuaging than his assurances to the President at his reception, which he repeated to me afterwards in conversation, and in public to the citizens of Philadelphia, in answer to an address from them, that his accession of our remote situation and other circumstances, France did not expect that we should become a party to the war, but wished to see us pursue our prosperity and happiness and peace."

Mr. Jefferson then enumerates the several points set up by Mr. Genet.

"1st. Mr. Genet asserts his right of arming in our ports, and of enlisting our citizens, and that we have no right to restrain him or punish them.

"2d. Another doctrine advanced by Mr. Genet is, That our courts can take no cognizance of captures, Whether *vessels held by them* prizes, are lawful prizes or not: That this jurisdiction belongs to those of their dominions where which have been lately erected by the National Assembly, into complete courts of admiralty.

"Both these doctrines are ally refused.

"3d. Mr. Genet, in his letter of 27th, has asserted the right of France, which he calls an English privateer, shall be immediately order off to depart from our ports, and that if she refuse to the 22d article of our treaty, which provides that it shall not in that case be lawful for privateers to bring their ships in our ports, to sell *what they have taken*, or purchase victuals, or water, but to depart as soon as the merchant vessels which has been many years employed in the commerce between France and the United States. She brought here a cargo of produce from that island, and was to have a cargo of *bonds*, brought out of the war when she left Jamaica, and for which she was fined with small French privateers, which she had for her defence, and took one of those vessels, and carried her into Jamaica. Mangin. She arrived here safely, without having had any rencounter of any sort. Can it be necessary to say, that a merchant vessel is not a privateer? That though she has a right to defend herself, and to pursue the course of her regular commerce, this no more makes her a privateer, than a human man following his plough, in time of war, with a knife or pistol in his pocket, is thereby made a soldier? The conception of a vessel is to trade, and not to plunder, that of a merchant vessel is commerce and self-preservation, not war.

"4th. The 17th article of our treaty leaves armed vessels free to conduct, and to sell their prizes, to dispose of and goods taken from their enemies, without paying any duty, and to depart with them wherever they please, except in the port of their commissions, which the captain shall be obliged to leave. It is evident, that this article does not contemplate a freedom to sell those prizes here, but, on the contrary, *a departure* to some other place, always to be expressed in their commissions, where their validity is to be finally adjudged."

"5th. Another source of complaint with Mr. Genet, is the sale of some English take French goods out of American vessels, which he says is prohibited by the treaty, and which ought to be prevented by us. On the contrary, we suppose it to have been long an established principle, that neutrals, goods, the property of the individual; and not in bellicent, and it does not believe, that they are by instruction from his employers. They had assured the British minister here that the vessels already armed in their ports should be forced to leave them, and that no more should be armed in them. Yet more had been armed, and the letter of their departure should be enforced, and the prizes made contrary to it should be restored or compensated. This is a thing why notified to Mr. Genet in my letter of August 7th; and, that he ought not conclude the promise of compensation to be of no concern to him and go on. In his course, he was reminded that it would be a fair subject of account against his nation.

"Mr. Genet, not content with using our force, whether we will or not, in the military line, against nations with whom we great peace undertakes also to direct the civil government; and particularly for the Executive and Legislative bodies, to prescribe what powers may, or may not be exercised by the one or the other. This in the letter of June the 5th he proposes to respect the political opinions of the President, *till the representatives shall have confirmed or rejected*. Thus, as if the President had undertaken to decide what belonged to the decision of Congress. In his letter of June 14th, he says more openly that the President ought not to have taken on himself to decide on this subject of the letter, but that it was of importance enough to have consulted Congress thereon; and in that of June 22d, he tells the President in direct terms that Congress ought already to have been occupied on certain questions which he had been too hasty in decidings thus matter of dispute, and not the President, the judge of the powers ascribed by the constitution to the Legislative, and distributes in his occasion when he should exercise the power of convening Congress at an earlier day than their own act had prescribed."

In the following expressions no commentary should be made:

"The philosophical proclaimed by the President."

"The opinions private or public of the President, and this Egis not agreeable to the sentiments of the people."

"The federal government has been easier, urged by I know not what influence."

"I cannot ascribe measures of this nature, but to extraordinary impressions, of which time and truth will triumph."

"They pursue with rage the French privateers by the orders of the President."

"This friend tends to accomplish the wishes of the chief of the king of England and of the other kings, his accomplices, to destroy by famine the French republic."

"The cowardly abandonment of the President."

"In vain the desire to preserve peace leads you to sacrifice the interest of France, to the interest of the moment; in vain the direct of other prejudiceates against honor in the people of America, and of the President, all this management, all these condescensions, all this humiliation, end in nothing. Our commerce is at sea, and the French too confident, are punished for having believed that the French nation, in fact, would shall be had some respect for its laws, some conviction of its force; and that it would not look like cowards in display. It is not possible for me to pass to you all my sensibility at this scandal, and the consequences of ruin of our commerce, to the oppression of our, and to the debasement and vitification of our nation."

"If our fellow-citizens have been deceived, it is as are not in a condition to know the sentiments of twenty people, speak; we have guaranteed it when we were slaves, we know how to be free, and to respectable being become free."

"We draw a well over the scandalous which these proceedings excite. No words can render them; but they ought not escape the sensibility of a friendly and impartial government, we hope