

Gazette of the United States.

A NATIONAL PAPER, PUBLISHED WEDNESDAYS AND SATURDAYS BY JOHN FENNO, No. 34, NORTH FIFTH-STREET, PHILADELPHIA.

[No. 134 of Vol. IV.]

WEDNESDAY, September 11, 1793.

[Whole No. 456.]

FOR THE GAZETTE.

TO THE SIEUR GENET,
Minister of France.

CLOATHED with a diplomatic character, and received, by the first functionary of the United States, as the accredited Minister from a great nation, you sustain, sir, an office to which the policy of the American republic, religiously observant of the universal law of nations, affords eminent immunity. Regarding you in this high character, a republican now claims to address you.

To announce, in this address, the name by which I am personally known, might be arraigned as ostentatious: neither is it required by the usages of the American press. But the man of honor, sir, disdains to communicate through the press what he would not avow at the command of propriety. And, although ideas of delicacy may now advise me to conceal my name even from the printer, I spurn the idea of shrinking from the charge should justice and honor forbid such concealment. Yet, while my language does not offend against the principles of liberality, I trust that I may fairly claim to be the sole depository of my own secret.

Deriving no personal emolument from the fiscal system of the United States, and holding no office under their national government, I am not the dependant of any of the chiefs of departments, and living in a land of liberty, I disdain to be the slave of party. A plain man, I speak in the character of one of the people. Conscious that the sovereignty of the United States resides in the people, and that the authority of their government is an emanation from their will, I purpose neither to disregard the dignity of your representative office, nor to violate the decorum that becomes the character which I now personate before an enlightened public.

That you are not destitute of talent, is obvious from communications which the press has submitted to the public eye. That you have been unfortunate since your arrival in America, is probable from the same communications. And God forbid, sir, that any part of the American people should, for this cause, offer you indignity!

You have been indeed unfortunate, if, erring through ignorance, and not from intention, you have prejudiced the cause which duty and disposition urged you to benefit. And to prevent your being thus beguiled by error, is not inconsistent with the principles of real friendship.

That you should err in your ideas of the American public, is a misfortune, against which an extensive acquaintance with the history of departed empires, or with the actual state of society in Europe, could not, alone, completely secure you. In the United States, sir, the human character has assumed a form superior to whatever authentic history has recorded of Greece, or Rome; countries in which ferocious manners characterized a rigid aristocracy, and profligate populace, who struggled for domination, and alternately outraged the law of moral order: And to convince you that the speaker's opinion is consonant to that of a philosopher whose talents ought to command your respect, I refer you to Jefferson's "notes on Virginia." The feudal despotisms of Europe, in which hereditary usurpation has emasculated the energies of mind and yet reigns over tyrants and slaves, are strangers to that force of character which resides in the citizens of America. And the French ardor for liberty yet wants that temperance of mind which characterizes the republicans of the new world.

Feeling in the cause of liberty that ardor of spirit which distinguishes your nation, and arriving among a people whose love of liberty is the strongest sentiment of their soul, you seem, sir, to have been ignorant, how much the American passion for liberty is under the discipline of an exalted reason. The American passion for liberty is not the Roman pride of domination; a criminal pride, that claims liberty for one nation, and denies it to a conquered world. No! The American citizens are friends to the cause of universal liberty, which, in their estimation, is inseparable from the equitable empire of law. And the adherence to that liberal order which the law of republicanism prescribes is estimated, by them, as being friendly to virtue, and requisite to the good of universal society. Glorifying in republican principles, persuaded that all the tyrannical thrones of Europe must ere long fall before the united forces of philosophy and liberty, they proudly claim for themselves that national independence which they acknowledge to be the right of all the nations of the globe. And, while they exult in the hope of the universal funeral of monarchy, they recognize, within the circle of their own empire, no sovereign but themselves.

The first functionary of this sovereign, sir, is that veteran patriot, WASHINGTON. To him is unanimously confided the helm of empire. Yet, if he is guilty of violating that constitution which cloathes him with the executive power and prescribes the rule of his

duty, if he is faithless to that high trust to which he has sworn to be faithful.—do I injure you, thou first citizen of America, by supposing an impossibility?—If I say, even Washington is thus guilty, he knows, and we all know, that he is constitutionally responsible. But, as to this point, the people of the United States want no foreign interference: and our fair swords will never permit him, or any other man, in this country, to be arbitrarily accused, arraigned, and ordered to death, by a tyrant who bears the name of National Convention. As the only sovereign, the people know that the legitimate power of their constituted authorities essentially emanates from their will, which is announced in the constitution. And sir, as they have provided for the constitutional punishment of their highest officer if guilty of high crimes & misdemeanors, they, on the other hand, as men of honor feel themselves pledged to support him in the performance of his constitutional functions: and, as men who are not dastards, they must and will thus support him. As to the constitutionality of the measures which the President has adopted, relative to France, and her enemies, I see no cause to charge him with having misconducted. No man, I am confident, who has correctly developed the principles of universal law, if he will honestly speak his opinion, will say, that the President's proclamation was unconstitutional. The book of universal nature, being a *chef d'œuvre*, is the only work which the American people recognize as being of indisputable authority in all political questions. And I presume, that, after fully consulting this authority, you would not be able to prove from it that the President has misconducted as to France. Except that I am not an orator as you are, and if a man who never had an office at Versailles, and who in the simplicity of nature speaks right on, were adequate to maintain an argument against the Minister Plenipotentiary of France, I should hope, were it proper and necessary, to be able specifically to maintain the present sentiments against even yourself.

The measures of the President being constitutional, his enlightened fellow citizens, as men of principle, would support him, had he never been the Chief of their patriot army. Independently of their attachment to the first of Generals, their personal and public honor is, by the very principles of the social contract pledged to support their own officer in executing the service which their country has assigned him. And they know that the principles of political arrangement and national prosperity prescribe the establishment of public authorities, as being requisite to the beneficial administration of their common affairs, as essential to their capacity of acting in concert, and as indispensably necessary to the maintenance of their own independent sovereignty.

Sir, the sovereign of the United States acts by constituted representatives, and not otherwise. This sovereign, as such, simply wills: And it is done.

On mature deliberation, the American sovereign, in adopting a general constitution for the empire, has determined not to have "any direct correspondence" with foreign powers. And the President, as the organ of the whole American nation, immediately represents the whole people for the purposes of national intercourse. Their sovereign will, as manifested in the national constitution, has pronounced, that it is neither wise, nor beneficial to admit any application from foreign States except through the organ of the executive. Their general plan of policy being delineated in the constitutional chart, its specific execution is committed to the respective authorities, who are the constituted organs of the sovereign in the business of administration. The American sovereign, sir, has such a sense of his own character that he disdains the idea of being personally called upon to act in questions that merely concern the actual administration of affairs.

The principles of liberty forbid the sovereign, who wills, to also act. Philosophy forbids it: National dignity, and justice, forbid it.—The necessary principles of republicanism forbid it.—And, notwithstanding the example of the French National Convention, it is not in the power of the collected talents of all Europe, to make the enlightened sovereign of America guilty of thus outraging the principles of liberty, philosophy, dignity, justice, republicanism. We refuse to negotiate except through the agency of our executive; not because we fear the President as our master, for he has no such character, and we have no such fear; nor because we are such idiots or cowards as to think the power of government superior to our own, for we know that the power of government is derived from our delegation; but we refuse any other mode of national negotiation, because we judge this mode to be wisest, best, just—and, especially and above all, because such is our sovereign will. And should the maintenance of this will require the sword of the people, you and all mankind may be assured, that it must not, will not, and shall not sleep in the scabbard.

Such, sir, are sentiments which the American people hold forth to nations. And, from those

sentiments, the French ought not to desire or expect America to depart, although her sovereignty should be invaded by all the powers of Europe, followed by the rest of the world, like hell with blackest infurrection, at their heels!

Judge then, sir, what must be the sentiments of Americans, on examining the published letter which you have recently addressed to the chosen representative of the whole American nation! A plain man as I am, expect not that I should speak on this subject with that sublime and impassioned eloquence which has been cultivated in France more than in any other modern nation! Therefore, permit me to speak plainly, and freely, as I feel, and because I feel I without undertaking, however, to pronounce a panegyric on myself, a business at which Americans are not expert, I leave it to others, to estimate whether I evince any portion of "the energy and frankness which ever characterize a true republican."

Unfortunate indeed may you be deemed, if you have been led, from any cause whatever, to indulge the visionary idea of a separation between the President, and the people of America. And yet, sir, you appear, from your own words, to have indulged this idea. For if, since the President's departure, the federal government has offended against the views of the people, and against their principles of honest faith, as to France, the President is at the head and front of the offending. Would you, by publishing the late official communications relative to this subject, be understood to charge him, sir, with being unfriendly to the cause of liberty?—with wishing to be the Sultan?—with a design, by his construction of treaties, to aid the league of powers against France? Or would you be understood to charge him with fearing the power of Britain, or any other nation, and with pusillanimously deserting the character of America? He has been proved, sir, not only in the calm hour of peace, but amidst the storm of war.—And no inconsiderable part of his countrymen have been proved by his side. Yet, if you think the young Americans, who have never tried "the flinty and steel couch of war," are dastards; and if you would know how the fact is; if too you think that such conduct on your part will promote the objects of your mission; let their fathers be insulted! you may then know whether the sons are dastards.

Do you then mean to publicly charge the President with violating the obligations of our national faith? To him, to you, to us, the charge is seriously interesting.

Have not our judicial officers, by their opinion, sanctioned his interpretation of existing treaties? And are not the judges the constitutional expositors of all our laws of every description? And are not treaties part of the law of the land? After our judges have expounded the law, do we recognize, as relative to our own conduct, any ulterior tribunal of adjudication? And do you imagine, that any foreigner whatever shall, within the circle of our empire, be eventually permitted to act, in any case whatever, in opposition to such interpretation? Do you deem it advisable to appeal, on a national question, from our constituted authorities, whose decisions we acknowledge to be obligatory on ourselves, to us who have constituted those authorities? The procedure, sir, would not accord with the established order of things in this country. But if, while sustaining the character of minister plenipotentiary, you choose to avail yourself of that general liberty which every person has of publicly stating whatever any printer will publish, there is no law in the United States which can, in the first instance, prevent the thus calling upon the American people to judge of the conduct of the President. But such a mode of procedure, in a question between our nation and a foreign power, being of the nature of a "direct correspondence" with the foreigner, is not conceived by the people, "to be within the line of propriety or duty." Our sacred regard, however, to the liberty of the press, renders the procedure practicable. And if a foreign minister should, before the tribunal of public opinion, thus impeach our highest officer of disloyalty to his sovereign, that sovereign will indeed decide on the merits of the appeal, and with a spirit worthy of an enlightened sovereign. If the officer has been guilty of befriending tyranny, guilty of violating his official duty and our pledged faith by sacrificing the honest interests of our friends to those of their enemies, we must and will be satisfied. If our national integrity be appealed to, and national justice is publicly demanded against Washington, by our honest swords we declare, that, if constitutionally proved guilty, he shall be punished. Although he has grown grey in the service of his country, yet we have the firmness to steel our hearts for the moment, and to dare be just even against him. But by the same swords, which we hope will never have cause to blush for their owners, we further declare, that the foreign minister, who thus severely invokes our justice, makes an experiment upon us which he must never repeat; For, on this subject, no foreign power shall use us for sport. And if you have ever once thought of adopting such a measure, let me, if you are pausing on the banks of the Rubicon, request you to consider its consequence. In case of its adoption, yourself or Washington, must be condemned. Should you demand of us to sit in solemn judgment on the man who commands our united hearts, you must in the event, feel either his, or your, political damnation! Should you publicly appeal Washington of national disloyalty, be sure you furnish damning proofs against him! be sure, you

prove him false to his trust! Or by the wrath of injured friendship, * * * * *

Sir, you have been received as minister plenipotentiary from a nation whose friendship we value, and purpose to deserve. Yet, as proud as delicate on the subject of friendship, the American mind can feel the implications contained in your letter to the President of the United States. Then, sir, if you would not alienate the mind of America, for ever, on this theme, the language of reproach! Goad not the spirit of Americans, by accusing their common representative and friend of cold indifference to the cause of liberty! nor charge him with want of fidelity to their public engagements! It is the pride of the American nation, sir, to observe its treaties of commercial amity, and yet be just to every nation under heaven: Its firmness too is equal to its pride.

If you value the American estimation of the French, it is hoped, that you will never, in future, mention the disinterested friendship of France to this country in the very same sentence in which you complain that the American government has not, by way of requital, manifested a regard for your interest: for, except in relation to the under part of mankind such as are to be well-wishers of the Americans, it is not the American fashion to talk of gifts which are to be paid for.

It is further mentioned, for your reflection, that the American researchers have not yet discovered, in any of the regions of science, that the obligations of gratitude are perfectly compulsory like those of justice. Nor has moral philosophy as yet taught them, that it is a proof of delicate generosity to speak of measures under the professed idea of being generous; and yet, at the same time, demand a specific retribution. It is presumed, that the humane Americans, who never enquired whether any of the unfortunate fugitives from one of the French islands were called aristocrats, but at once honored themselves and their country by their generous beneficence to them all, will never give cause to doubt the professed motives of their conduct, by urging their generosity as the basis of a legal demand. This, however, is a subject, sir, on which I leave you to feel sentiments which wounded delicacy cannot easily express.

A L F R E D.

EXTRACTS,

From the Columbian Centinel.

Notwithstanding the great diversity of political sentiment on many subjects, all concur in opinion, that the prosperity of our country disappoints the wishes of her enemies, and surpasses the hopes of her most sanguine friends.

The husbandman finds an high price, and increasing demand for the products of his soil. The mechanic has constant employ, and full compensation for his labour and skill. The merchant visits every part of the globe, in successful pursuits of gain; and while the nations of Europe are engaged in destroying each other, his ships can alone supply them with the bread that feeds, or the apparel that covers them.

Free from restraint, and welcomed to every shore, the American seaman can securely, and almost exclusively, carry the produce of the world, and command a recompence equal to his wishes. In Europe, the sailors are employed in navigating their ships of war—the artisans, instead of fabricating the conveniences of life—the husbandmen, instead of tilling the soil, and producing subsistence for themselves, and others, are busied in mutual destruction. Americans enjoy almost a monopoly of feeding and carrying for the richest, and most populous nations of the earth. This enviable condition the people of the United States know well how to estimate: and, in justice to themselves and posterity, cannot, will not put at hazard. They have too lately experienced the horrors of war, and too dearly paid for peace and good government, to risk their present tranquility.

From the COLUMBIAN GAZETTEER.

In the days of contest between the characters of Whig and Tory, it was often asked, (and sometimes very gravely) to which of them we should suppose the Apostle Paul adhered—and a positive answer to this would have decided the opinion of most who made that enquiry.

The same implicit confidence is given at the present day, to the decisions of those of the first standing in the State, and a proportionable degree of it is always bestowed on men of eminence in every station; this, by many is supposed to be a very rational mode of judging, in cases where one is not sufficiently acquainted with the merits of a cause to judge of it himself.—But there is a different class of mankind who suspect the judgment of all who go in a higher walk of life, and that from a strange idea, of which they seem to be very fond, that goodness and greatness are incompatible, and that no one can be wise who knows more than themselves, or honest who holds more property.