

THOMAS J. LEMAY,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS.

Subscription, three dollars per annum—in advance.
Persons residing without the State will be required to pay the whole amount of the year's subscription in advance.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

For every square (not exceeding 16 lines) this size type first insertion, one dollar; each subsequent insertion, twenty-five cents.
The advertisements of Clerks and Sheriffs will be charged 25 per cent. higher; and a deduction of 33 per cent. will be made from the regular price for advertisers by the year.
Letters to the Editors must be post-paid.

RALEIGH STAR, And North Carolina Gazette.

VOL. XXXII

RALEIGH N. C. WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1841.

NO. 26

DOCUMENTS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Mr. Fox to Mr. Webster.

WASHINGTON, March 12, 1841.

The undersigned, her Majesty's envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, is instructed by his Government to make the following official communication to the Government of the United States.

Her Majesty's Government have had under their consideration the correspondence which took place at Washington in December last, between the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Forsyth, and the undersigned, comprising two official letters from the undersigned to Mr. Forsyth, dated the 13th and 29th of December, and two official letters from Mr. Forsyth to the undersigned, dated the 26th and 30th of the same month, upon the subject of the arrest and imprisonment of Mr. Alexander McLeod, of Upper Canada, by the authorities of the State of New York, upon a pretended charge of arson and murder, as having been engaged in the capture and destruction of the Steamboat Caroline, on the 29th of December, 1837.

The undersigned is directed, in the first place, to make known to the Government of the United States that her Majesty's Government entirely approve of the course pursued by the undersigned in that correspondence, and of the language adopted by him in the official letters above mentioned.

And the undersigned is now instructed again to demand from the Government of the United States, formally, in the name of the British Government, the immediate release of Mr. Alexander McLeod.

The grounds upon which the British Government make this demand upon the Government of the United States are these: that the transaction on account of which Mr. McLeod has been arrested, and is to be put upon his trial, was a transaction of a public character, planned and executed by persons duly empowered by her Majesty's colonial authorities to take any steps and to do any acts which might be necessary for the defence of her Majesty's territories and for the protection of her Majesty's subjects; and that consequently those subjects of her Majesty's who engaged in that transaction were performing an act of public duty for which they cannot be made personally and individually answerable to the laws and tribunals of any foreign country.

The transaction in question may have been, as her Majesty's Government are of opinion that it was, a justifiable employment of force for the purpose of defending the British territory from the unprovoked attack of a band of British rebels and American pirates, who, having been permitted to arm and organize themselves within the territory of the United States, had actually invaded and occupied a portion of the territory of her Majesty; or it may have been, as alleged by Mr. Forsyth, in his note to the undersigned of the 26th of December, "a most unjustifiable invasion in time of peace of the territory of the United States." But this is a question especially of a political and international kind, which can be discussed and settled only between the two Governments, and which the courts of Justice of the State of New York cannot by possibility have any means of judging or any right of deciding.

It would be contrary to the universal practice of civilized nations to fix individual responsibility upon persons who with the sanction or by the orders of the constituted authorities of a State engaged in military or naval enterprises in their country's cause; and it is obvious that the introduction of such a principle would aggravate beyond measure the miseries, and would faithfully increase the demoralizing effects of war, by mixing up with national exasperation the ferocity of personal passions, and the cruelty and bitterness of individual revenge.

Her Majesty's Government cannot believe that the Government of the United States can really intend to set an example so fraught with evil to the community of nations, and the direct tendency of which must be to bring back into the practice of modern war, atrocities which civilization and Christianity have long since banished.

Neither can her Majesty's Government admit for a moment the validity of the doctrine advanced by Mr. Forsyth, that the Federal Government of the United States has no power to interfere in the matter in question, and that the decision thereof must rest solely and entirely with the State of New York.

With the particulars of the internal compact which may exist between the several States that compose the Union, foreign Powers have nothing to do: the relations of foreign Powers are with the aggregate Union; that Union is to them represented by the Federal Government; and of that Union the Federal Government is to them the only organ. Therefore, when a foreign Power has redress to demand for a wrong done to it by any State of the Union, it is to the Federal Government, and not to the separate State, that such power must look for redress for that wrong. And such foreign Power cannot admit the plea that the separate State is an independent body over which the Federal Government

has no control. It is obvious that such a doctrine, if admitted, would at once go to a dissolution of the Union as far as its relations with foreign Powers are concerned; and that foreign Powers, in such case, instead of accrediting diplomatic agents to the Federal Government, would send such agents not to that Government, but to the Government of each separate State; and would make their relations of peace and war with each State depend upon the result of their separate intercourse with such State, without reference to the relations they might have with the rest.

Her Majesty's Government apprehend that the above is not the conclusion at which the Government of the United States intend to arrive; yet such is the conclusion to which the arguments that have been advanced by Mr. Forsyth necessarily lead.

But, be that as it may, her Majesty's Government formerly demand, upon the grounds already stated, the immediate release of Mr. McLeod; and her Majesty's Government treat the President of the United States to take into his most deliberate consideration the serious nature of the consequences which must ensue from a rejection of this demand.

The United States Government will perceive that, in demanding Mr. McLeod's release, her Majesty's Government argue upon the assumption that he was one of the persons engaged in the capture of the steamboat "Caroline"; but her Majesty's Government have the strongest reasons for being convinced that Mr. McLeod was not, in fact, engaged in that transaction; and the undersigned is hereupon instructed to say that, although the circumstance itself makes no difference in the political and international question at issue, and although her Majesty's Government do not demand Mr. McLeod's release upon the ground that he was not concerned in the capture of the "Caroline," but upon the ground that the capture of the "Caroline" was a transaction of a public character, for which the persons engaged in it cannot incur private and personal responsibility; yet the Government of the United States must not disguise from themselves the fact that Mr. McLeod was not engaged in the transaction must necessarily tend greatly to inflame that national resentment which any harm that shall be suffered by Mr. McLeod at the hands of the authorities of the State of New York, will infallibly excite throughout the whole of the British Empire.

The undersigned, in addressing the present official communication, by order of his Government, to Mr. Webster, Secretary of State of the United States, has the honor to offer to him the assurance of his distinguished consideration.

H. S. FOX.

The Hon. DANIEL WEBSTER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. Webster to Mr. Fox.
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Washington, April 24, 1841.

The undersigned, Secretary of State of the United States, has the honor to inform Mr. Fox, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of her Majesty's Majesty, that his note of the 12th of March was received and laid before the President.

Circumstances well known to Mr. Fox have necessarily delayed, for some days, the consideration of that note.

The undersigned has the honor now to say, that it has been fully considered, and that he has been directed by the President to address to Mr. Fox the following reply.

Mr. Fox informs the Government of the United States, that he is instructed to make known to it, that the Government of her Majesty entirely approve of the course pursued by him, in his correspondence with Mr. Forsyth, in December last, and the language adopted by him on that occasion; and that that Government have instructed him "again to demand from the Government of the United States, formally, in the name of the British Government, the immediate release of Mr. Alexander McLeod;" that "the grounds upon which the British Government make this demand upon the Government of the United States, are these: that the transaction on account of which Mr. McLeod has been arrested and is to be put upon his trial, was a transaction of a public character, planned and executed by persons duly empowered by her Majesty's colonial authorities to take any steps and to do any acts which might be necessary for the defence of her Majesty's territories, and for the protection of her Majesty's subjects; and that consequently those subjects of her Majesty who engaged in that transaction, were performing an act of public duty for which they cannot be made personally and individually answerable to the laws and tribunals of any foreign country."

The President is not certain that he understands, precisely, the meaning intended by her Majesty's Government to be conveyed, by the foregoing instruction.

This doubt has occasioned, with the President, some hesitation; but he inclines to take it for granted that the main purpose of the instruction was, to cause it to be signified to the Government of the United States, that the attack on the steamboat "Caroline" was an act of public force,

done by the British colonial authorities, and fully recognized by the Queen's Government at home; and that, consequently, no individual concerned in that transaction can, according to the just principle of the laws of nations, be held personally answerable in the ordinary courts of law, as for a private offence; and that upon this avowal of her Majesty's Government Alexander McLeod, now imprisoned, on an indictment for murder, alleged to have been committed in that attack, ought to be released, by such proceedings as are usual and are suitable to the case.

The President adopts the conclusion, that nothing more than this could have been intended to be expressed, from the consideration, that her Majesty's Government must be fully aware, that in the United States, as in England, persons confined under judicial process can be released from that confinement only by judicial process. In neither country, as the undersigned supposes, can the arm of the Executive power interfere, directly or forcibly, to release or deliver the prisoner. His discharge must be sought in a manner conformable to the principles of law, and the proceedings of courts of judicature.

If an indictment, like that which has been found against Alexander McLeod, and under circumstances like those which belong to his case, were pending against an individual in one of the courts of England, there is no doubt that the law officer of the crown might enter a *nolle prosequi*, or that the prisoner might cause himself to be brought up on *habeas corpus*, and discharged if his ground of discharge should be adjudged sufficient, or that he might prove the same facts and insist on the same defence or exemption on his trial.

All these are legal modes of proceeding, well known to the laws and practice of both countries. But the undersigned does not suppose, that if such a case were to arise in England, the power of the executive Government could be exerted in any more direct manner. Even in the case of ambassadors, and other public ministers, whose right of exemption from arrest is personal, requiring no fact to be ascertained, but the mere fact of diplomatic character, and to arrest whom is sometimes made a highly penal offence, if the arrest be actually made, it must be discharged by application to the courts of law.

It is understood that Alexander McLeod is held as well in civil as on criminal process, for acts alleged to have been done by him, in the attack on the "Caroline"; and his defence, or ground of acquittal, must be the same in both cases. And this strongly illustrates, as the undersigned conceives, the propriety of the foregoing observations; since it is quite clear that the Executive Government cannot interfere to arrest a civil suit, between private parties, in any stage of its progress; but that such suit must go on to its regular judicial termination. If, therefore, any course, different from such as have been now mentioned, was in contemplation of her Majesty's Government, something would seem to have been expected, from the Government of the United States, as little conformable to the laws and usages of the English Government as to those of the United States, and to which this Government cannot accede.

The Government of the United States, therefore, acting upon the presumption, which it readily adopted, that nothing extraordinary or unusual was expected or requested of it, decided, on the reception of Mr. Fox's note, to take such measures as the occasion and its own duty appeared to require.

In his note to Mr. Fox of the 26th of December last, Mr. Forsyth, the Secretary of State of the United States, observes; that "if the destruction of the 'Caroline' was a public act, of persons in her Majesty's service, obeying the order of their superior authorities, this fact has not been before communicated to the Government of the United States by a person authorized to make the admission; and it will be for the court which has taken cognizance of the offence with which Mr. McLeod is charged to decide upon its validity when legally established before it." And adds, "the President deems this to be a proper occasion to remind the Government of her Majesty, that the case of the 'Caroline' has been long since brought to the attention of her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; who, up to this day, has not communicated his decision thereupon. It is hoped that the Government of her Majesty will perceive the importance of no longer leaving the Government of the United States uninformed of its views and intentions upon a subject, which has naturally produced much exasperation, and which has led to such grave consequences."

The communication of the fact that the destruction of the "Caroline" was an act of public force, by the British authorities, being formally made to the Government of the United States, by Mr. Fox's note, the case assumes a decided aspect.

The Government of the United States entertains no doubt that, after this avowal of the transaction, as a public transaction, authorized and undertaken by the British authorities, individuals concerned in it ought not, by the principles of public

law, and the general usage of civilized States, to be held personally responsible in the ordinary tribunals of law, for their participation in it. And the President presumes that it can hardly be necessary to say that the American people, not distrustful of their ability to redress public wrongs, by public means, cannot desire the punishment of individuals, when the act complained of is declared to have been an act of the Government itself.

Soon after the date of Mr. Fox's note, an instruction was given to the Attorney General of the United States, from this Department, by direction of the President, which fully sets forth the opinions of this Government on the subject of McLeod's imprisonment, a copy of which instruction the undersigned has the honor herewith to enclose.

The indictment against McLeod is pending in a State court, but his rights, whatever they may be, are no less safe, it is to be presumed, than if he were held to answer in one of the courts of this Government.

He demands immunity from personal responsibility by virtue of the law of nations, and that law in civilized States is to be respected in all courts. None is either so high or so low as to escape from its authority in cases to which its rules and principles apply.

This Department has been regularly informed by his excellency the governor of the State of New York, that the chief justice of that State was assigned to preside at the hearing and trial of McLeod's case, but that, owing to some error or mistake in the process of summoning the jury, the hearing was necessarily deferred. The President regrets this occurrence, as he has a desire for a speedy disposition of the subject. The counsel for McLeod have requested authentic evidence of the avowal by the British Government of the attack on and destruction of the "Caroline," as acts done under its authority, and such evidence will be furnished to them by this Department.

It is understood that the indictment has been removed into the supreme court of the State by the proper proceeding for that purpose, and that it is now competent for McLeod, by the ordinary process of *habeas corpus*, to bring his case for hearing before that tribunal.

The undersigned hardly needs to assure Mr. Fox, that a tribunal so eminently distinguished for ability and learning as the supreme court of the State of New York, may be safely relied upon for the just and impartial administration of the law in this as well as in other cases; and the undersigned repeats the expression of the desire of this Government that no delay may be suffered to take place in these proceedings which can be avoided. Of this desire Mr. Fox will see evidence in the instructions above referred to.

The undersigned has now to signify to Mr. Fox that the Government of the United States has not changed the opinion which it has heretofore expressed to her Majesty's Government of the character of the act of destroying the "Caroline."

It does not think that that transaction can be justified by any reasonable application or construction of the right of self-defence under the laws of nations. It is admitted that a just right of self-defence attaches always to nations as well as to individuals, and is equally necessary for the preservation of both. But the extent of this right is a question to be judged of by the circumstances of each particular case, and when its alleged exercise has led to the commission of hostile acts within the territory of a Power at peace, nothing less than a clear and absolute necessity can afford ground of justification. Not having up to this time been made acquainted with the views and reasons at length, which have led her Majesty's Government to think the destruction of the "Caroline" justifiable as an act of self-defence, the undersigned, earnestly renewing the remonstrance of this Government against the transaction, abstains for the present, from any extended discussion of the question. But it is deemed proper, nevertheless, not to omit to take some notice of the general grounds of justification stated by her Majesty's Government on their instruction to Mr. Fox.

Her Majesty's Government have instructed Mr. Fox to say, that they are of opinion that the transaction which terminated in the destruction of the "Caroline," was a justifiable employment of force, for the purpose of defending the British territory from the unprovoked attack of a band of British rebels and American pirates, who, having been "permitted" to arm and organize themselves within the territory of the United States, had actually invaded a portion of the territory of her Majesty.

The President cannot suppose that her Majesty's Government, by the use of these terms, meant to be understood as intimating that these acts, violating the laws of the United States and disturbing the peace of the British territories, were done under any degree of countenance from this Government, or were regarded by it with indifference; or, that under the circumstances of the case, they could have been prevented by the ordinary course of proceeding. Although he regrets that, by using the term "permitted," a possible infer-

ence of that kind might be raised, yet such an inference, the President is willing to believe, would be quite unjust to the intentions of the British Government.

That, on a line of frontier, such as separates the United States from her Majesty's North American Provinces, a line long enough to divide the whole of Europe into halves, irregularities, violence, and conflicts should sometimes occur, equally against the will of both Governments, is certainly easily to be supposed. This may be more possible, perhaps, in regard to the United States, without any approach to their Government, since their institutions entirely discourage the keeping up of large standing armies in time of peace and their situation happily exempts them from the necessity of maintaining such expensive and dangerous establishments. All that can be expected from either Government, in these cases, is good faith, a sincere desire to preserve peace and do justice, the use of all proper means of prevention, and that if offences cannot, nevertheless, be always prevented, the offenders shall still be justly punished. In all these respects, this Government acknowledges no delinquency in the performance of its duties.

Her Majesty's Government are pleased, also, to speak of those American citizens, who took part with persons in Canada, engaged in an insurrection against the British Government as "American pirates." The undersigned does not admit the propriety or justice of this designation. If citizens of the United States fitted out, or were engaged in fitting out, a military expedition from the United States, intended to act against the British Government in Canada, they were clearly violating the laws of their own country and exposing themselves to the just consequence, which might be inflicted on them, if taken within the British dominions. But notwithstanding this, they were certainly not pirates, nor does the undersigned think that it can advance the purpose of fair and friendly discussion, or hasten the accommodation of national difficulties, so to denigrate them. Their offence, whatever it was, had no analogy to cases of piracy. Supposing all that is alleged against them to be true, they were taking a part in what they regarded as a civil war, and they were taking a part on the side of the rebels. Surely England herself has not regarded persons thus engaged as deserving the appellation which her Majesty's Government bestows on these citizens of the United States.

It is quite notorious that, for the greater part of the last two centuries, subjects of the British Crown have been permitted to engage in foreign wars, both national and civil, and in the latter in every stage of their progress; and yet it has not been imagined that England has at any time allowed her subjects to turn pirates. Indeed in our own times, not only have individual subjects of that Crown gone abroad to engage in civil wars, but we have seen whole regiments openly recruited embodied, armed, and disciplined in England, with the avowed purpose of aiding a rebellion against a nation with which England was at peace, although it is true that, subsequently, an act of Parliament was passed to prevent transactions so nearly approaching to public war, without license from the Crown.

It may be said that there is a difference between the case of a civil war arising from a disputed succession, or a protracted revolt of a colony against the mother country, and the case of the fresh outbreak, or commencement of a rebellion. The undersigned does not deny that such a distinction may for certain purposes, be deemed well founded. He admits that a Government called upon to consider its own rights, interests, and duties, when civil wars break out in other countries, may decide on all the circumstances of the particular case upon its own existing stipulations; on probable results, on what its own security requires, and on many other considerations. It may be already bound to assist one party, or it may become bound, if it so chooses, to assist the other, and to meet the consequences of such assistance.

But whether the revolt be recent or long continued, they who join those concerned in it, whatever may be their offence against their own country, or however they may be treated, if taken with arms in their hands in the territory of the Government, against which the standard of revolt is raised, cannot be denominated pirates, without departing from all ordinary use of language in the definition of offences. A cause which has so foul an origin as piracy cannot, in its progress, or by its success, obtain a claim to any degree of respectability or tolerance among nations; and evil wars, therefore, are not understood to have such a commencement.

It is well known to Mr. Fox that authorities of the highest eminence in England, living and dead, have maintained that the general law of nations does not forbid the citizens or subjects of one Government from taking part in the civil commotions of another. There is some reason, indeed, to think that such may be the opinion of her Majesty's Government at the present moment.

The undersigned has made these remarks from the conviction that it is important to regard established distinctions, and to view the acts and offences of individuals in the exactly proper light. But it is not to be in-

ferred that there is, on the part of this Government, any purpose of extenuating, in the slightest degree, the crimes of those persons, citizens of the United States, who have joined in military expeditions against the British Government in Canada. On the contrary, the President directs the undersigned to say that it is his fixed resolution that all such disturbers of the national peace and violators of the laws of their country, shall be brought to exemplary punishment. Nor will the fact that they are instigated and led on to these excesses by British subjects, refugees from the provinces, be deemed any excuse or palliation; although it is well worthy of being remembered that the prime movers of these disturbances on the borders are subjects of the Queen, who come within the territories of the United States, seeking to enlist the sympathies of their citizens, by all the motives which they are able to address to them on account of grievances, real or imaginary. There is no reason to believe that the design of any hostile movement from the United States against Canada has commenced with citizens of the United States. The true origin of such purposes and such enterprises is on the other side of the line. But the President's resolution to prevent these transgressions of the laws is not, on that account, the less strong. It is taken, not only in conformity to his duty under the provisions of existing laws, but in full consonance with the established principles and practice of this Government.

The Government of the United States has not from the first, fallen into the doubts, else where entertained, of the true extent of the duties of neutrality. It has held that, however it may have been in less enlightened ages, the just interpretation of the modern law of nations is, that neutral States are bound to be strictly neutral; and that it is a manifest and gross impropriety for individuals to engage in the civil conflicts of other States, and thus to be at war while their Government is at peace. War and peace are high national relations, which can properly be established or changed only by nations themselves.

The United States have thought, also, that the salutary doctrine of non-intervention by one nation with the affairs of others is liable to be essentially impaired, if while Government refrains from interference, interference is still allowed to its subjects, individually or in masses. It may happen, indeed, that persons choose to leave their country, emigrate to other regions, and settle themselves on uncultivated lands, in territories belonging to other States. This cannot be prevented by Governments, which allow the emigration of their subjects and citizens; and such persons, having voluntarily abandoned their own country, have no longer claim to its protection, nor is it longer responsible for their acts. Such cases, therefore, if they occur, show no abandonment of the duty of neutrality.

The Government of the United States has not considered it as sufficient to confine the duties of neutrality and non-interference to the case of Governments whose territories are adjacent to each other. The application of the principle may be more necessary in such cases, but the principle itself they regard as being the same, if those territories be divided by half the globe. The rule is founded in the impropriety and danger of allowing individuals to make war on their own authority, or by mingling themselves in the belligerent operations of other nations, to run the hazard of counteracting the policy, or embroiling the relations of their own Government. And the United States have been the first among civilized nations to enforce the observance of this just rule of neutrality and peace, by special and adequate legal enactments. In the infancy of this government, on the breaking out of the European wars, which had their origin in the French Revolution, Congress passed laws with severe penalties for preventing the citizens of the United States from taking part in those hostilities.

By these laws, it prescribed to the citizens of the United States what it understood to be their duty, as neutrals, by the law of nations, and the duty, also, which they owed to the interest and honor of their own country.

At a subsequent period, when the American colonies of an European Power took up arms against their sovereign, Congress, not diverted from the established system of the Government, by any temporary considerations, not swayed from its sense of justice, and of duty, by any sympathies which it might naturally feel for one of the parties, did not hesitate, also, to pass acts applicable to the case of colonial insurrection and civil war. And these provisions of law have been continued, revised, amended, and are in full force at the present moment. Nor have they been a dead letter, as it is well known, that exemplary punishments have been inflicted on those who have transgressed them. It is known, indeed, that heavy penalties have fallen on individuals, citizens of the United States, engaged in this very disturbance in Canada, with which the destruction of the Caroline was connected. And it is in Mr. Fox's knowledge, also, that the act of Congress of 10th of March, 1838, was passed for the precise purpose of more effectually restraining military enterprises, from the United States into the British provinces, by authorizing the use of the most sure and decisive preventive means. The undersigned may add, that it stands on the admission of very high British authority, that during the recent Canadian troubles, although bodies of adventurers appeared on the border, making it necessary for the people of Canada to keep themselves in a state prepared for self-defence, yet that these adventurers were acting by no means in accordance with the feelings of the great mass of the American people, or of the Government of the United States.

This Government, therefore, not only holds itself above reproach in every thing respecting the preservation of neutrality, the observance of the principle of non-intervention, and the strictest conformity, in these respects, to the rules of international law, but it doubts not that the world will do it the justice to acknowledge, that it has set an example, not unfit to be followed by others, and by its steady legislation, on this