

Mr. McTear

NORTH-CAROLINA GAZETTE.

[VOL. XI.]

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1796.

[No. 569.]

PHILADELPHIA, Nov. 18.
IMPORTANT.

TO relieve in some degree the impatience of the public as to Mr. Ader's last note to our Executive we promised an outline of its contents. We fulfill the task with as much accuracy as is compatible with the brevity we are obliged to observe and the intricacy of the subject.

The minister of the French republic through the whole of his note speaks as acting under the express orders from the Executive Directory.

After expressing the attachment of his government for the American people he complains in the name of the Directory, of a violation on the part of our Executive of the 17th article of the treaty of 1778.

The first part of that article stipulates that the French shall be at liberty to bring their prizes into our ports without its being lawful for any of our officers to take cognizance of their validity. In contempt of this stipulation he states that several French prizes brought into our ports have been seized, tried and restored to their original owners, with various degrees of delay, vexation, injustice and injury.

He complains, that the English were suffered to arm in our ports in various instances, and that the complaints of agents of the French republic ever proved ineffectual in stopping them. Persons suspected of having assisted in arming French privateers were immediately thrown into prison, while those concerned in arming British vessels were never molested. The Executive in these instances exhibiting an evident partiality for the English and no regard for the maintenance of their neutrality.

The second stipulation in Art. 17th, prohibits all English ships that shall have made French prizes from entering our ports.—Our Executive have in their construction of this stipulation, confined its prohibitory effect to British vessels attempting to come in with their prizes. The Minister protests in the name of the Directory against the propriety of this construction. He considers it as an attempt to add to, not to explain, the article. Even on the supposition, that the article is doubtful, he insists on the impropriety of an *ex parte* construction. He cites sundry examples of English ships of war having entered our ports, contrary to this stipulation, having made them convenient stations the better to annoy the French, and having, even contrary to the forced interpretation given to the 17th article by our executive, brought their prizes into our ports and there refitted them to cruise against the French.

The minister next adverts to Jay's mission. He states that France was deceived by the declarations of our executive when that business was set on foot: and that the Directory considers the British treaty as depriving France of all the advantageous stipulations intended to be secured to her by the treaty of 1778; as tending to render the neutrality of America advantageous to England to the detriment of France.

This treaty abandons the modern law of nations, which even England had sanctioned in its treaties and we in every prior commercial treaty with European nations. It gives the English the facility of obtaining the transportation of naval stores and warlike implements whithersoever they please under the shelter of the American flag; while this facility is denied to France; and thus it changes during the war the respective footing of the belligerent powers with respect to us. The treaty he further states, cuts off the supplies in provisions which France looked for from this country, by stipulating that the British may in every situation seize our provision vessels bound to the ports of their enemies.

In short he considers it as a breach of our neutrality, unless the French be allowed to partake in the advantages it holds out to Great Britain. He also claims this participation in pursuance of the 2d article of the treaty of '78 which grant the French all the advantages of commerce and navigation enjoyed by the most favoured nations. And in this point of view the orders of the French vessels of war to treat the American flag in every respect as we shall suffer it to be treated by the English have been issued.

The Minister proceeds to protest in the name and by the orders of the Executive Directory against the violation of the 17th article. He claims replevy of all seizures, and the annulling of all judicial acts with respect to French prizes, and protests against all opposition to the sale of prizes.

He protests against the violating of the same articles by our committing into our ports British armed vessels, and against the interpretation put by our executive upon that article.

He declares, that the directory considers our Treaty with Britain as a violation of their Treaty with us; and as equivalent to a treaty of alliance with that nation; and, in consequence, orders him to suspend his ministerial functions here.

The Directory declare, that they do not wish this measure to be considered in the light of a rupture, but as a mark of their sense of injury, which is to last until they can obtain satisfaction. They reiterate their expressions of friendship for the People notwithstanding the wrongs of the executive.

The Minister concludes by stating, that the French Republic always had it at heart to cultivate harmony by a mutual interchange of good offices; but that our administration have as constantly endeavoured to break under the ties which connect the two nations. Early under the Republic, the French Colonies were opened to us; the ports of France also on the same footing as their own vessels. When England violated the neutral flag, France obliged to make use of reprisals, exempts from the measure the Americans; and tho' forced for a while, must against their inclination, to withdraw the exemption, they early renewed it.

While France was thus, even during the tempest of a revolution treating the Americans with marked attention what, asks the note, were the Executive of the United States employed in? They were questioning whether they would acknowledge the Republic or receive their ambassador; whether they should consider the treaty, the price of American liberty, as binding, whether the envoys from exiled and rebelling princes should be received; an ambiguous proclamation of neutrality was framed; French privateers were harassed; England was suffered to sport with our neutrality, and to cut up our commerce to the detriment of France, English ships of war were admitted in our ports; the advances of France for a renewal of the treaty of commerce were eluded under the most frivolous pretences, while our executive courted the British and solicited a treaty by which prostituting our neutrality we sacrificed France to her enemies.

And this whilst a review of late events, whilst every object around, still remind us of the tyranny of Britain and the generous assistance of France. The note concludes by calling on Americans to remember, that if generous minds are alive to injuries, they can forgive; and that the French when they are treated as friends, will still be found faithful friends and generous allies.

* The supplies which France expected in her colonies were cut off; by our virtually acquiescing in the principle, that a declaration from a British commander placed them in a state of blockade.

Extract from Essays published in the New-York Minerva.

BUT the French are not the only political fanatics. The whole combination against France was at first projected, and for several years, prosecuted by fanaticism. Edmund Burke was the leader, and was to the crusade against France, precisely what Peter, the Hermit, was to the crusade against the Infidels; who held the Holy City in bondage.

The alarm which spread among the privileged orders, in consequence of the French principles of liberty and equality, resembled the alarm which overspread the christian world in consequence of the conquests of the Turks; and that which the Romish church experienced, at the propagation of Luther's doctrine in the 16th century. Opposition to principles always spreads them, if they are well founded. Hence the folly and madness of resisting the progress of opinions by force.

The privileged orders, consisting of princes, nobles, priests and the regular clergy, foresaw in the propagation of French principles, an annihilation of their distinctions. Instead of leaving the French to themselves, they set up a hue and cry throughout Europe, that they dissolved *enemies of all social order*, that they dissolved the bands of society, and were to be opposed as the common pest of the human race.

Wisdom and policy would have pointed out a very different mode of treating the novel doctrines of the French reformers. If the principles of the French nation, in producing so dangerous a principle to civil society, as the crusading princes pretended, they should have let them alone; for the operation of them upon the French nation, in producing all manner of crimes and disorders, would have proved the best antidote against their propagation in other countries. Indeed the wild notions of the Jacobins and their terrible effects have actually done more to retard the progress of regeneration in Europe, than all the military force of Europe and Asia combined, could have effected. *Error* will always fall to the ground, without resistance. *Truth* was never yet suppressed by force, but is especially aided in its progress and establishment, by the efforts of opposition. In either case, the princes and nobility of Europe, had they been wise for themselves should have remained quiet.

But wisdom has not characterized the privileged classes of men in any age or country. They determined to extinguish the light of the revolution. The event however, will be, that truth will shine with more lustre, in consequence of the additional light that has been shed upon the surrounding nations, by the collisions of the immense conflict.

In every point of view, the foolish and abominable and nefarious conspiracy against France, will ultimately contribute to a general reformation in Europe.

In the first place, the combination itself was so iniquitous in principle, and so daring an invasion of the fundamental rights of nations, that of self-government, as actually to justify all the charges against the feudal system—it has only served to increase the odium against the tyranny of the privileged orders—it has spread the detestation before existing among philosophical men, and stimulated even men of business to wish for an extermination of the old orders of society, who thus abuse their power.

In the second place, the war against France has excited discussion, and diffused a spirit of investigation more generally in Europe, than books and philosophers would have done in half a century. It has spread the principles of Locke, Sidney, Price, Priestly, Voltaire, and others, friends of freedom, among a greater number of people, in five years, than all the printing presses before, had done in a century.

In the third place, the war has augmented