

# THE RALEIGH MINERVA.

RALEIGH, N. C.—PUBLISHED (WEEKLY) BY LUCAS AND A. H. BOYLAN.

[ON \$2.50 CENTS IN ADVANCE.]

[THREE DOLLARS PER YEAR.]

Vol. 16.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 16, 1811.

No. 802.

## Political.

### MR. PICKERING'S ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES. NO. XIX.

*Yellow Citizens,*

In my first address I anticipated the scurrility which would be the vehicles of slander and falsehood have since teemed. And it in giving you some traits of the characters of your rulers for the last ten years, & of the leaders of democracy, my sole or primary view had been to hold them up as objects of scorn and contempt, their principled advocates, might, with at least "the probable appearance of a probability," have ascribed it to unjustifiable resentment or malice. But apart from the public mischiefs, from the deep injuries brought upon our country by the misconduct of these men, they would not have attracted so much of my attention as to have drawn from me a single expression of reproach or censure. If their mismanagement of public affairs could have been ascribed to weakness, then commiseration and regret that these had been entrusted to incompetent hands would alone have been expressed. But they have been held up to your view as men of enlightened minds, and your two Presidents particularly as political luminaries of the first magnitude, and patriots of the purest order. Hence they have received your implicit and unbounded confidence.—And hence the evils which oppress the country. And hence the necessity of exhibiting these men in their true characters; to convince you that they were never entitled to your confidence; and that this must be withdrawn, or the country, ever now on the edge of the precipice, will be plunged into an abyss of ruin. I will therefore proceed in my work; regardless of calumny, and of all the personal consequences of a determined opposition to fraud, deception and treachery, wherever they appear, and to that baseness of fear and servility which, in rulers, may be equally fatal to the liberties and independence of our country. The subject of the following address will be

### PRESIDENT MADISON'S SUBSERVIENCY TO FRANCE.

At the close of my last address I remarked that the subserviency of our rulers to the views of France, of which I had indeed given ample proof, was as it respected Mr. Madison in particular, now confirmed by Mr. Smith, late Secretary of State, in the pamphlet he had just published in vindication of his resignation.—This attachment, and devotion of Mr. Madison to France are of an ancient date.—The French Minister in Philadelphia, in the last years of our revolutionary war, had acquired such an ascendancy in Congress (of which Mr. Madison was then a member) as almost to dictate the resolutions they should adopt. So far as they were peculiarly interesting to France. It was the French influence in Congress which procured the disgraceful instructions to our Ministers Messrs. Adams, Franklin & Jay, to make the most candid and confidential communications upon all subjects, to the Ministers of our generous ally the King of France, to under take nothing in the negotiations for peace or truce, without their knowledge and concurrence, and ultimately to govern themselves by their advice and opinion.—From the fatal consequences of this absolute submission to the French Court, the United States were saved by the penetrating wisdom, inflexible integrity and patriotism of Mr. Jay. For Dr. Franklin was disposed to be governed by the instructions, and Mr. Adams was in Holland, until after the basis of the treaty of peace between the United States and Great Britain had been formed by Mr. Jay, with the British minister Mr. Oswald.—I have formerly mentioned, that when (Mr. Adams arrived in Paris, he heartily co-operated with Mr. Jay. Dr. Franklin had also previously concurred with Mr. Jay—after, the latter, refusing to degrade himself and his country, by placing both in the power of the French Minister, had induced the British Government to send Mr. Oswald a new commission, empowering him to treat us, not as Colonies, but as the independent United States of America.

But although the terms of the treaty of peace thus obtained, were advantageous to the United States, perhaps beyond the expectations of the most sanguine, yet many Members of Congress were extremely dissatisfied.—because the French Court were displeased—because the treaty had been made without the advice, and contrary to the interested opinions and wishes of the French Ministers—and because our negotiators regarded the dignity and great interests of their country, more than instructions by which, both were laid out at the feet of the Ministers in France.

Among these partisans of France in the Congress of that day, no one, perhaps, was more conspicuous than Mr. Madison. And were his conduct at that time fully displayed, his servility now would appear to be a continuation of his early attachment and devotion to France, at the expence of the honor and interests of his country.

My information on the subject is to this effect; that there were three points for which the independent patriots of the day strenuously contended. First that our independence should be considered as a given point, and that G. Britain should at the outset, treat with us as independent States; it being considered that to enter on a negotiation with our this admission, would be to descend from the high and honorable ground of independence, to the former condition of colonies, & also being the means of prolonging the war; for the direct ob-

ject of our alliance with France being "to maintain effectually, the liberty, sovereignty and independence, absolutely and unlimited, of the United States;" as soon as that object should be obtained.—In other words, as soon as Great Britain should acknowledge and treat with us as independent, the United States would have no reason on their own account, to continue the war, while France and Spain which finally became a party in the war, might have, and in fact had other objects of their own to accomplish, by a continuance of the war; and therefore the French Court so earnestly endeavoured to prevent our insisting upon the admission of our independence as a preliminary to our commencing a negotiation with Great Britain. Two other points were in like manner insisted on by the same independent patriots,—our rights to the fisheries and our claim to boundaries, which were, westward, as far as the Mississippi; with the free navigation of that river. And a member of the old congress has stated to me, that against these most important claims, the French minister in Philadelphia remonstrated by memorials to congress; that Mr. Madison supported these memorials; and that to prevent our negotiators in Paris insisting on those three points, the disgraceful instructions before quoted were ultimately given; by which they were ignominiously placed under the direction and their country at the mercy of the French prime minister, the Count de Vergennes; and "That when the treaty [of peace] emitting and securing those great points was received, he [Mr. M.] was the leader of the opposition in congress to its being ratified; because those points were obtained without the concurrence and against the views of Vergennes. And that he [Madison] even contended that it should be sent back to France for the consent of Vergennes before ratification."—That there was a zealous opposition to the ratification of the treaty, on the grounds above mentioned is unquestionable. A vote of censure against Mr. Adams and Mr. Jay was not obtained: but conversing once on this subject, and mentioning a report made by the then Secretary for foreign affairs (Chancellor Livingston) against the treaty, or the conduct of the negotiators, Mr. Adams told me that he actually received a letter of reproof from the Secretary; and that it was then among his papers at Quincy. Why the French government was so strenuously opposed to the concessions of the three points above mentioned on the part of Great Britain, will hereafter be shown.

The same spirit of devotion of abject servility towards France, combined with hostility to England, has since been conspicuous in Mr. Madison. It was manifested in the virulent opposition given by him and his associates, (doubtless having Mr. Jefferson as their guide and head) to the treaty of amity and commerce with Great Britain, negotiated by Mr. Jay in 1794. The French government affected to consider it as equivalent to the treaty of alliance with Great Britain, to which the rights and interests of French were sacrificed; than which nothing was more unfounded and false.—The same spirit is manifested in the whole of Mr. Madison's correspondence while Secretary of state, in "his enlightened and zealous participation" in Mr. Jefferson's system of measures; and in his continuing to pursue them since he succeeded to the Presidency.

In his answer to the Tammany Society of Baltimore, dated May 25, 1809, Mr. Jefferson said—"The hope you express, that my successor will continue in the same system of measures, is guaranteed as far as future circumstances will permit, by his enlightened and zealous participation in them heretofore, & by the happy pacification he is now effecting for us." This happy pacification (as I have heretofore remarked) was the deceitful arrangement with the British minister, Mr. Erskine, for settling the affair of the Chesapeake, and the revocation of the British orders in council. I called it *deceitful*, because I believed that the offensive and insulting clause which, we have understood, actually prevented its ratification by the king of Great Britain, was inserted on purpose and in full expectation that it would produce that effect.—We now find by the pamphlet of Mr. R. Smith, that the offensive clause was, contrary to his ideas of propriety, proposed and insisted on by Mr. Madison himself.

While so ready to use offensive and insulting language to the British government; or, to use the words of Mr. Smith, to address to sentiments "not reconcilable to that dignified decorum which the comity [courtesy] of governments in their intercourse with each other ought to observe;" we have now the evidence of Mr. Smith, that Mr. Madison forbade the sending to gen. Armstrong even the moderate animadversions which he had prepared, upon the most insulting letter that was ever addressed by one government to another—the letter of the French Minister, the duke de Cadore, of Feb. 14th, 1810; in which, after a train of contemptuous reproaches, he characterized those who administer our government, as "men without just political views, without honor, without energy."

To the grossest of insults Mr. Madison would not hazard expressing to that government the slightest resentment or sensibility; nor make the least complaint of the perfidious seizure of millions of American property in French ports; seizures whose atrocity was aggravated by the groundless pretences and palpable falsehoods, by which the French minister attempted to justify them. Instead of giving scope to the just resentments which such a letter could not fail to excite in every independent mind; and to the indignant language of a man feeling for his own honour and

for the dignity and interests of his country, which his duty as chief magistrate imperiously required him to assert and maintain, he contented himself with a very pitiful evasive paragraph, inserted by his special direction in a letter from Mr. Smith to gen. Armstrong, his minister at the French court. Here it is:—"As the John Adams is daily expected, and as your further communications by her will better enable me to adapt the actual state of our affairs with the French government the observations proper to be made in relation to their seizure of our property, and to the letter of the duke of Cadore of the 14th February, it is by the president deemed expedient not to make at this time any such animadversions. I cannot however for fear informing you, that high indignation is felt by the president, as well as by the public, at this act of violence on our property, and at the outrage, both in the language and the matter of the letter of the duke de Cadore, so justly portrayed in your note to him of the 10th of March."

This paragraph I call evasive, because by postponing the strong and dignified remonstrance and demand of reparation which the insult and injury required to be instantly made, it was evidently intended by this course, finally to omit doing either. And why, seeing Mr. Madison was not insensible to the insult and injury, would he put off for a moment and finally omit (as from Mr. Smith's statement we are authorised to conclude he has omitted) to vindicate the honour of our government and the rights of our plundered citizens. To what can such ignominious subserviency to France, such unspeakable baseness and servility be ascribed? To what, but a pusillanimity which utterly disqualifies him for the high station he occupies or a treachery which demands his impeachment and removal? Who that is not alike base or treacherous, or both, can approve his conduct, and support and praise such a man? Who not alike contemptible can withhold his contempt?

The character of the seizure of American property above referred to, demands a special consideration. The robberies and piracies committed by the orders of the French emperor, and the instance of his wanton destruction of our vessels and their cargoes by burning and sinking them on the high seas, (an outrage which the gentle Mr. Madison calls "the most distressing of all the modes by which the belligerents exert force contrary to right") have been so numerous and for so long time familiar to us, they have ceased to excite surprise, and almost to rouse resentment.

On the last of March 1809, when the Jeffersonian Napoleon embargo—the delight of the French emperor—the object of scorn and contempt to England—and to ourselves only terrible and ruinous—had been fourteen months in operation; our rulers convinced of its inefficacy in regard to Great Britain, and dreading the consequences of popular discontents which had rapidly increased; yet too proud to acknowledge the folly of the measure, sought a retreat in the non intercourse law—a law which forbade all commercial intercourse with G. B. and Ireland, their colonies or dependencies, & with France and her colonies or dependencies, or with any place in possession of either; while it opened the doors of commerce to all the world beside. And to render this prohibition complete, it was enacted that all vessels sailing under the flag of Great Britain or France which after the 20th of May 1809, should enter the ports of the United States, should be seized and condemned. But it was known to our rulers, while they affected, in the terms of the law still absolutely to restrain our commerce with those two powers, that they would receive indirectly all the supplies they could desire from the United States, and that by the usual management in trade we should receive from them such of their products and manufactures as should be very necessary for us.

In words this measure wore the appearance of equality and impartiality towards the two belligerents; but like every other measure of the kind, it was equal and impartial only in appearance. France had no merchant vessels to enter our ports; Great Britain had many; and it was against G. Britain exclusively that this prohibition was calculated to bear. Further, the "dependencies" of Great Britain were her colonies and conquests, over which she exercised direct and positive dominion. France possessed some similar "dependencies" but she had also other dependencies, of greater extent and importance—countries and states which she had conquered or by fraud and violence had seized, whose immediate rulers were kings appointed by the French emperor himself. Such were Spain, Naples and Holland; countries our executive rulers chose, in violation of the truth of facts known to them and the world, to consider and treat as independent states; while their pagan kings implicitly obeyed their creator Bonaparte, and decreed justice or injustice at his will. But this very cunning contrivance to favour France (for that I believe was its object more than to enlarge the sphere of our commerce) by facilitating the introduction of all the supplies it needed and which the U. States could furnish, proved to our merchants a snare in which were surprised and caught some millions of their property—never to be set free. For after the lapse of a year (to wit on the 23d of March 1810) the French emperor, at Rambouillet, issued a decree, founded on this non-intercourse law, ordering to be seized and sold all American vessels which had entered or should enter the ports of France, and her dependencies after the 20th May 1809. And the French minister, the duke de Cadore, assigned to gen. Armstrong the provisions of the non inter-

course law and the manner of its execution by our executive, as the emperor's reasons for his Rambouillet decree. He says "the emperor had applauded the general embargo.—"The act of the 1st of March has raised the embargo, and substituted for it a measure the most injurious to the interests of France. This act, of which the emperor knew nothing until very lately, interdicted to American vessels the commerce of France, at the time that it authorised that to Spain, Naples and Holland; that is to say—to the countries under French influence: [in other words, the dependencies of France]—and denounced confiscation against all French vessels which should enter the ports of America. Reprisal was a right and commanded by the dignity of France."—See the duke de Cadore's letter of Aug. 5, 1810, to general Armstrong.

In a former letter (that of February 14, 1810) the Duke had told Gen. Armstrong—"That as soon as his majesty was informed, [the non intercourse law of March 1, 1809] he considered himself bound to order reprisals on American vessels not only in his territory, but likewise in the countries which are under his influence. In the ports of Holland, of Spain, of Italy, of Naples, American vessels have been seized because the United States have seized French vessels." The nature of reprisal is well known, & was emphatically expressed to General Armstrong on this occasion—"If you [the United States] confiscate French property under the law of non intercourse, they will confiscate your property under their Rambouillet decree."

I am well aware that the reasons assigned by the French minister for the Rambouillet decree, are but false pretences. *Lying*, formal, organized lying is a part of the French emperor's system of government, as the plunder of American commerce is within the scope of his policy. But those who still affect to believe in his promises—who, like the President and Congress of the U. States pass laws and issue proclamations founded on the promises and declarations of Napoleon, whose open violation of the law of nations and of his treaty with the U. States, Mr. Madison had himself publicly stated; whose utter disregard to truth, whose perfidy and complicated crimes can in modern times find no parallel; and which have been manifest to them and to the world; such men I say who have had the evidence of his falsehood & perfidy before their eyes; evidences received and read by the president, and by him laid before Congress; such men cannot consistently object to the emperor's iniquitous perversion of their own acts, and offering them as reasons for his robberies; for they still continue to trust him.

Among the papers laid by the President before congress at the commencement of the last session, was a letter of July 5, 1810, confirming what had been said in his letter of June 5th from Mr. Secretary Smith to Gen. Armstrong, in which is the following passage—"As has been heretofore stated to you, a satisfactory provision for restoring the property lately surprised and seized [under the Rambouillet decree] by order or at the instance of the French government, must be combined with a repeal of the French edicts, with a view to a non intercourse with G. Britain—such a provision being an indispensable evidence of the just purpose of France towards the United States. But notwithstanding this determination of the President on the 5th of June and July, without any restoration of the property so surprised and seized; and without any provision for such restoration; nay after a positive declaration by the French government that it was taken as a reprisal, and that "the law of reprisal must govern," that is, absolute confiscation. Notwithstanding all this, and without any actual repeal of the French decrees, and only upon the declaration of the most faithless of human beings, that those decrees would be repealed on certain conditions, one of which (the previous revocation of the British orders in council) it remained exclusively with the British government to perform, but which Mr. Madison knew would not be performed (because as early as the 31st of Aug. 1810—the British secretary of state wrote to our minister in London that before such revocation of the orders in council could take place, "the repeal of the French decrees must actually have taken effect")—notwithstanding all these things, Mr. Madison issued his proclamation declaring that "the edicts of France violating the neutral commerce of the U. States had [on the 1st of Nov. last] been so revoked as to cease to have that effect!" Thus proclaiming to the U. States and to the world as a fact what he did not know to be a fact; on the contrary, what the official evidence in his possession required him to believe was not a fact; and in proclaiming which as a fact he must knowingly have disregarded the essential provision of the law of congress under which he professed to act, and from which alone could be derived the authority to declare the non intercourse law to be revived agnst Great Britain.

Let us now see in what manner Mr. Madison gives to Congress information of the atrocious Rambouillet decree, by which millions of American property have been seized and confiscated. Having mentioned the (pretended) revocation of the Berlin and Milan decrees, he says—"It would have well accorded with the conciliatory views indicated by this proceeding on the part of France, to have extended them to all the grounds of just complaint which now remain undisturbed with the U. States. It was particularly anticipated that, as a further evidence of just dispositions towards them, restoration would have been immediately