

only call for a reciprocation of individual good wishes. They cannot form the basis of public obligation.

But the assertion takes more for granted, than there is reason to believe true.

Louis the XVI. no doubt took part in our contest from reasons of state; but Louis the XVI. was a humane kind-hearted man. The acts of his early youth had entitled him to this character. It is natural for a man of such a disposition to become interested in the cause of those whom he protects or aids; and if the concurrent testimony of the period may be credited, there was no man in France more personally friendly to the cause of this country than Louis the XVI. I am much misinformed if repeated declarations of the venerable Franklin did not attest this fact.

It is a just tribute to the people of France to admit, that they manifested a lively interest in the cause of America; but while motives are scanned who can say how much of it is to be ascribed to the antipathy which they bore to their rival neighbors; how much to their sympathy in the object of our pursuit? It is certain that the love of liberty was not a national sentiment in France, when a zeal for our cause first appeared among that people.

There is reason to believe too, that the attachment to our cause, which ultimately became very extensive, if not general, did not originate with the mass of the French people. It began with the circles more immediately connected with the government, and was thence diffused through the nation.

This observation, besides its tendency to correct ideas, which are calculated to give a false direction to the public feeling, may serve to check the spirit of illiberal invective, which has been wantonly indulged against those distinguished friends of America, who, though the victims to it; because their principles would not permit them to go the length of an entire subversion of the monarchy.

The preachers of gratitude are not ashamed to brand Louis the XVI. as a tyrant, and La Fayette as a traitor. But how can we wonder at this, when they inculpate a distrust even of a

In urging the friendly disposition to our cause, manifested by the people of France, as a motive to our gratitude towards that people, it ought not to be forgotten, that those dispositions were not confined to the inhabitants of that country. They were eminently shared by the people of the United Provinces, produced to us valuable pecuniary aids from their citizens, and eventually involved them in the war on the same side with us. It may be added too, that here the patronage of our cause emphatically began with the community, not originating as in France with the government, but finally implicating the government in the consequences.

Our cause had also numerous friends in other countries; even in that with which we were at war.—Conducted with prudence, moderation, justice, and humanity, it may be said to have been a popular cause among mankind; conciliating the countenances of Princes, and the affection of nations.

The dispositions of the individual citizens of France can therefore in no sense be urged, as constituting a peculiar claim to our gratitude. As far as there is foundation for it, it must be referred to the services rendered to us; and, in the first instance, to the unfortunate monarch that rendered them. This is the conclusion of nature and reason.

A further view of this subject is referred for another paper

PACIFICUS

No. VI.

THE very men who not long since, with a holy zeal, would have been glad to make an auto de fe of any one who should have presumed to assign bounds to our obligations to Louis the XVI. are now ready to consign to the flames those who venture even to think, that he died a proper object of our sympathy or regret. The greatest pains are taken to excite against him our detestation. His supposed perjuries and crimes are founded in the public ear, with all the exaggerations of intemperate declaiming. All the unproved and contradicted allegations which have been brought against him are taken for granted, as the oracles of truth, or no better grounds, than the mere general presumptions—that he could not have been a friend to a revolution which stripped him of so much power—that it is not likely the Convention would have pronounced him guilty, and confined him to so ignominious a fate, if he had been really innocent.

It is very possible that time may disclose faults and proofs, which will substantiate the guilt imputed to Louis; but these facts and proofs have not yet been authenticated to the world; and justice admonishes us to wait for their production and authentication.

Those who have most closely attended to the course of the transaction, find least cause to be convinced of the criminality of the deceased monarch. While his counsel, whose characters give weight to their assertions, with an air of conscious truth, boldly appeal to facts and proofs, in the knowledge and possession of the Convention, for the refutation of the charges brought against him—the members of that body, in all the debates upon the subject which have reached this country, either directly from France, or circuitously through England, appear to have contented themselves with assuming the existence of the facts charged, and inferring from them a criminality which, after the abolition of the royalty, they were interested to establish.

The presumptions of guilt drawn from the suggestions which have been stated, are more than counterbalanced by an opposite presumption, which is too obvious not to have occurred to many, though I do not recollect yet to have met with it in print.—It is this: If the Convention had possessed clear evidence

of the guilt of Louis, they would have prosecuted it to the world in an authentic and unquestionable manner. Respect for the opinion of mankind, regard for their own character, the interest of their cause made this an insuperable duty; nor can the omission be satisfactorily ascribed to any other reason, than the want of such evidence.

The inference from this is, that the melancholy catastrophe of Louis XVI. was the result of a supposed political expediency, rather than of real criminality.

In a case so circumstanced, does it, can it consist with our justice or our humanity, to partake in the angry and vindictive passions which are endeavored to be excited against the unfortunate monarch? Was it a crime in him to have been born a Prince? Could this circumstance forfeit his title to the commiseration due to his misfortunes as a man?

Would gratitude dictate to a people, situated as are the people of this country, to lend their aid to extend to the son the misfortunes of the father? Should we not be more certain of violating no obligation of that kind—of not implicating the delicacy of our national character—by taking no part in the contest—than by throwing our weight into either scale?

Would not a just estimate of the origin and progress of our relations to France, viewed with reference to the mere question of gratitude, lead us to this result—that we ought not to take part against the son and successor of a father, on whose side we depended the assistance which we received—that we ought not to take part with him against the nation, whose blood and whose treasure had been, in the hands of the father, the means of the assistance afforded us?

But we are sometimes told, by way of answer, that the cause of France is the cause of liberty; and that we are bound to assist the nation on the score of their being engaged in the defence of that cause. How far this idea ought to carry us, will be the subject of future examination.

It is only necessary here to observe, that it presents a question essentially different from that which has been in discussion. If we are bound to assist the French nation, on the principle of their being embarked in the defence of liberty, this is a ground altogether foreign to that of gratitude. Gratitude has reference only to kind offices received. The obligation to assist the cause of liberty, has reference to the merits of that cause, and to the interest we have in its support. It is possible, that the benefactor may be on one side—the defenders and supporters of liberty on the other. Gratitude may point one way—the love of liberty another. It is therefore important to just conclusions, not to confound the two things.

A sentiment of justice more than the importance of the question itself has led to so particular a discussion, respecting the proper object of whatever acknowledgment may be due from the United States for the aid which they received from France during their own revolution.

The extent of the obligation which it may impose is by far the most interesting enquiry. And though it is presumed, that enough has been already said to evince, that it does in no degree require us to embark in the war; yet there is another and a very simple view of the subject, which is too convincing to be omitted.

The assistance lent us by France was afforded by a great and powerful nation, possessing numerous armies, a respectable navy, rendering it a match for the forces to be contended with.—The position of Europe was favorable to the enterprise; a general disposition prevailing to see the power of Great Britain abridged.—The co-operation of Spain was very much a matter of course, and the probability of other powers becoming engaged on the same side not remote.—Great Britain was alone and likely to continue so.—France had a great and persuasive interest in the separation of this country from Britain. In this situation with much to hope and not much to fear, she took part in our quarrel.

France is at this time singly engaged with the greatest part of Europe, including all the first rate powers, except one, and in danger of being engaged with all the rest. To use the emphatic language of a member of the National Convention—she has but one enemy and that is ALL EUROPE. Her internal affairs are without doubt in serious disorder.—Her navy comparatively inconsiderable. The United States are a young nation; their population though rapidly increasing, still small—their resources, though growing, not great; without armies, without fleets—capable from the nature of the country and the spirit of its inhabitants of immense exertions for self-defence, but little capable of those external efforts which could materially serve the cause of France. So far from having any direct interest in going to war, they have the strongest motives of interest to avoid it. By embarking with France in the war, they would have incomparably more to apprehend, than to hope.

This contrast of situations and inducements is alone a conclusive demonstration, that the United States are not under an obligation, from gratitude, to join France in the war. The utter disparity between the circumstances of the service to be rendered, and of the service received, proves, that the one cannot be an adequate basis of obligation for the other.—There would be a want of equality, and consequently of reciprocity.

But complete justice would not be done to this question of gratitude, were no notice to be taken of the address, which has appeared in the public papers (the authenticity of which has not been impeached) from the Convention of France to the United States; announcing the appointment of the present Minister Plenipotentiary. In that address the Convention

informs us, that "the support which the ancient French Court had afforded the United States to recover their independence, was only the fruit of a base speculation; and that their glory offended its ambitious views, and the Ambassadors of France bore the criminal orders of stopping the career of their prosperity."

If this information is to be admitted in the full force of the terms it is very fatal to the claim of gratitude towards France. An observation similar to one made in a former paper occurs here. If the organ of the nation, on whose will the aid given us depended, acted not only from motives irrelative to our advantage, but from unworthy motives, or as it is stated, from a base speculation—if afterwards he displayed a temper hostile to the confirmation of our security and prosperity, he acquired no title to our gratitude in the first instance, or he forfeited it in the second. And the nation of France, who can only claim it in virtue of the conduct of their agents, must together with him renounce the pretension. It is an obvious principle, that if a nation can claim merit from the good deeds of its sovereign, it must answer for the demerit of his misdeeds.—The rule to be a good one, must apply both ways.

But some deductions are to be made from the suggestions contained in the address of the Convention, in reference to the motives which evidently dictated the communication. Their zeal to alienate the good will of this country from the late monarch, and to increase the odium of the French nation against the monarchy, which was so ardent as to make them overlook the tendency of their communication, to disarm their votaries among us of the plea of gratitude, may justly be suspected of exaggeration.

The truth probably is, that the base speculation charged, amounts to nothing more than that the government of France, in affording us assistance, was directed by the motives which have been attributed to it, namely, the desire of promoting the interest of France, by lessening the power of Great Britain, and opening a new channel of commerce to herself—that the orders said to have been given to the Ambassadors of France to stop the career of our prosperity are—resolvable into a speculative jealousy of the ministers of the day, lest the United States, by becoming as powerful and great as they are capable of becoming under an efficient government, might prove formidable to the European possessions in America. With these qualifications and allowances, the address offers no new discovery to the intelligent and unbiassed friends of their country. They knew long ago that the interest of France had been the governing motive of the aid afforded us; and they saw clearly enough, in the conversation and conduct of her agents, while the present constitution of the United States was under consideration, that the government of which they were the instruments, would have preferred our remaining under the old form, for the reason which has been stated. They perceived also, that these views had their effect upon some of the devoted partisans of France among ourselves; as they now perceive, that the same characters are embodying themselves with all the aid they can obtain, under the like influence, to resist the operation of that government of which they withstood the establishment.

All this was and is seen, and the body of the people of America are too discerning to be deceived by the dark about it. Too wise to have been misled by foreign or domestic machinations, they adopted a constitution which was necessary to their safety and to their happiness. Too wise still to be ensnared by the same machinations, they will support the government they have established, and will take care of their own peace, in spite of the injudicious efforts which are making to detach them from the one, and to disturb the other.

The information which the address of the Convention contains, ought to serve as an instructive lesson to the people of this country. It ought to teach us not to over-rate foreign friendships—to be upon our guard against foreign attachments. The former will generally be found hollow and delusive; the latter will have a natural tendency to lead us aside from our own true interest, and to make us the dupes of foreign influence. They introduce a principle of action, which in its effects, if the expression may be allowed, is anti-national. Foreign influence is truly the GREAT ENEMY to a republic. We cannot be too careful to exclude its entrance. Nor ought we to imagine, that it can only make its approaches in the gross form of direct bribery. It is then most dangerous, when it comes under the patronage of our passions, under the auspices of national prejudice and partiality.

I trust the morals of this country are yet too good to leave much to apprehend on the score of bribery. Careless, condescensions, flattery, in unison with our prepossessions, are infinitely more to be feared; and as far as there is opportunity for corruption, it is to be remembered, that one foreign power can employ this resource as well as another, and that the effect must be much greater, when it is combined with the other means of influence, than where it stands alone.

PACIFICUS.

Washington, July 4, 1793.

At the laying of the corner stone of the Hotel to be built by lottery in the Federal City, upwards of 1500 people were present, and walked from thence in procession, preceded a lodge of Free-masons, to a dinner, the principal dish of which consisted of an ox roasted whole. A number of toasts were drank on the occasion, and the day concluded with much harmony.

N. B. The principal front of the Hotel will extend one hundred and twenty feet, and the assembly room will be 40 by 60. The whole will form the most magnificent building in America, perhaps in any other country.

HALIFAX, (N. S.) June 25.

Last Thursday evening major general Ogilvie arrived here in the Alligator frigate from St. Peters, also 5 transports, having on board between 5 and 600 prisoners, and some stores.

The governor of St. Peters was brought here in the Alligator, and is at liberty to walk about the town.

The prisoners look extremely healthy, and appear to have been treated with the greatest humanity and kindness.

AUGUSTA, (Geor.) June 20.

We are authorized to mention, that official communications have been received from the President of the United States, by our government, forbidding Georgia to enter into any offensive war with the Creeks. These orders authorize the raising of one company of cavalry and one of infantry, each to consist of one hundred men, to be commissioned by the Governor of this State, and under Continental pay whilst in actual service.

It is said that a schooner has been lately fitted out at Savannah, under a French commission, to cruise against the British. This privateer is commanded by a Frenchman, manned chiefly by Americans, and owned by a Mr. Putnam.

July 27. General Pickens will set out in the course of this week from Hopewell, in South-Carolina, for Philadelphia.

WINCHESTER, (Vir.) July 8.

By a gentleman from the Creek nation, we are informed, that the cause of the aggressions of that nation, on the Cumberland settlers, is by certain traders selling the Indians, that country was thrown away by Congress, and they could do them mischief with impunity. What motive could these traders have for infusing such sentiments into savages? none, we can conceive, but that of buying horses very cheap, which the Indians deal from that place.

On the morning of the 12th inst. about the break of day, Capt. John Beard, who had the command of a company of mounted infantry, consisting of fifty six; made an attack on the Hanging Maw's family, and other Indians, who were invited there by order of government.

Major King and Daniel Carmichael, were at the Hanging Maw's at the time, and report that Beard's party had killed Scantee, Fool Charley, one of the chiefs of Hittower, Betty, the daughter of Kitakiska, and several others; among them a white man, named William Roseberry. The Hanging Maw and his wife both wounded, and Betty, the daughter of Nancy Ward. Major King and Daniel Carmichael say that it was with great risque of their lives, they escaped through the fire of these enraged whitemen, and also at their particular entreaty, they spared the rest of the Hanging Maw's family, and did not burn his house.

We hear that Capt. Beard was positively restricted by Gov Blount's orders, from crossing the Tennessee, and to confine his pursuit to that party of Indians, who had lately killed the two Gillums, or a horse-stealing party in the same neighborhood.

BALTIMORE, July 10.

The Committee appointed to examine the situation of the French fleet arrived in this harbor, and to ascertain the number of passengers, and the relief necessary to be given them, Report,

THAT they visited 13 of the ships, and found on board 351 passengers, exclusive of people of colour and negroes, of which number about 100 are women and children—that the passengers in other ships arrived and expected are probably equal to the above number, of which they have advised an accurate report to be made to the Consul of the French Republic.—That the distresses of these unhappy people has not been exaggerated, or perhaps equalled, by the information already given to the public.—That an exertion of great humanity is indispensably necessary in the town of Baltimore, to