

...a sacrifice of
on our reputati-
se. But "our poli-
ardly endurance of every
France can offer, is glossed
ul term, as if the world, or our
be kept from a knowledge of our de-
and pusillanimity. That tone of invective,
the Executive is so fluent, when he is com-
ing of British perfidy, which to the day of his
he will never substantiate, is wholly suppressed,
he alludes to the robberies committed by Bona-

Not only so, shame to our country that can
bear it, he apologizes for the spoiler. He tells you,
these depredations were only a misapplication of the
principle of reprisals, combined with a misconstruction
of a law of the United States." This is an imposition
so gross and ridiculous that it puzzles us to conceive
how Mr. Madison could reconcile it to himself so far
to disgrace his own character, as to utter such a pre-
text. The circumstance which renders the conduct of
Bonaparte most egregiously "a misapplication of the
principal of reprisals," is that there is not the least ana-
logy in the measures of the respective governments, in
the very point, which alone could have originated the
plea of reprisal. His law is retrospective—ours pro-
spective. Our innocent merchants who had violated
no existing law were stripped of this property. We
only debarred Frenchmen from our ports in future.—
Let our law be examined. There is not a man, woman
or child in the United States, or France, able to read,
who can misconstrue our law. On the essential point,
as to the question, it is as plain as words can make it,
if it did not declare French property already in our
ports forfeited, then the seizures made by Bonaparte of
American property in his ports, could not be retaliato-
ry: and this he well knew.

And what indignation is expressed by our President at
this enormous act of indiscriminate rapine? Reader, look
at his language, "It was particularly anticipated (*we
do not believe it, or if it was anticipated, it was mon-
strous weakness*) that as further evidence of just disposi-
tions towards the United States, restoration would
have been immediately made of the property of our ci-
zens seized under a misapplication of the principle of
reprisals, combined with a misconstruction of a law of
the United States.—*This expectation has not been ful-
filled*—It has not been fulfilled, and there is an end
of it!! If a man had ordered a partridge for dinner
and were served with a cold chicken, he would say as
much and probably more.

Citizens of the United States what justice can you ex-
pect, what reparation for your wrongs, when the elect-
ed and sworn guardian of your rights thus turns his
back upon you, and apologizes for the tyrant who
wrongs you by a pretence which he cannot believe him-
self, and which Bonaparte will read with the most so-
vereign contempt? Think of your situation. Think
how low you are fallen. Think what must be the con-
sequences of such a state of humiliation. Your rights
and your property to an incalculable amount the prey
of an unrelenting despoiler, and your guardian his abet-
tor!!—But we sicken at the thought—we leave the
subject for your solemn consideration.

The next subject of our notice is "the laboured ar-
gument to justify his application of the non-intercourse
act, to Fox's blockade of 1806, contrary to the inten-
tion of Congress, and dictated by the letter of the Duc
de Cadore to General Armstrong."

There are two substantial reasons why the non-inter-
course act should not apply to Great-Britain, if she
should revoke her Orders in Council, issued in conse-
quence of Bonaparte's decrees. One is, that it was the
intention of our Legislators, when the non-intercourse
act was passed, to effect the repeal of those Orders in
Council, and no mention was made, in the debates on
the subject, of the blockade of 1806. It would be an
absurdity which no man will commit, to pretend that
the law was to be kept in force and our trade to Great-
Britain to be interdicted, after the Orders in Council
should be repealed. This is so true, we are confident,
that Mr. Madison's perversion, though it may be justi-
fied by his partizans, who would always sacrifice the
prosperity of our country to their hatred of England,
will strike even democrats with surprise. It is what
they had not contemplated—what they did not expect.
Mr. Madison therefore extends the "purview" of the
act, to what was never its object, that he may have a
pretext for still interdicting our very lucrative com-
merce with Great-Britain, even should the Orders in
Council be repealed. As to his motives for so wanton
an injury to our national prosperity, we leave them to
the public, without animadversion, except what relates
to "the hand of Napoleon," which it will soon come
in course to mention.

Another reason why the non-intercourse act should
not be enforced with respect to Great-Britain, on ac-
count of the blockade of 1806 is one, which our rea-
ders will have anticipated, if they have perused our re-
peated remarks on that blockade, with the attention,
we wished. Fox the great partizan of America, our
democratic friend whose elevation to the ministry was
the prayer of every jacobin in this country, thought
proper, for some reason, which we pretend not to di-
vine, to call the measure announced to Mr. Monroe in
1806 a blockade. It never was a blockade, and this
we are ready to prove by the most unquestionable tes-
timony—the official definition of the measure, as com-
municated to Mr. Monroe, compared with what every
one knows to be a blockade. A blockade is where a
belligerent interdicts the trade of neutrals, to a port of
the enemy. To justify the capture and condemnation
of the turning away of neutral property, entering such
port, which operation is really and truly the blockade,
the port must be actually invested with a marine force.
Now if neutral commerce is not interdicted, it is clear

that the port is not blockaded, whether there be an in-
vesting force or not. It is not even declared blocka-
ded. And this was the case. We repeat it, and refer
our readers for proof to the document, which, to sub-
stantiate this argument at different times we have twice
published—the very paper communicated to Mr. Mon-
roe, which used the term blockade, contained likewise
such specific qualifications, as did away entirely the
nature and essence of blockade. Neutral vessels were
expressly allowed to enter ports of the enemy within
the whole range of coast mentioned, except certain
ports which had been, and continued to be closely in-
vested, where a rigid blockade would be enforced.—
The only circumstances affecting our commerce, differ-
ent from a state of general peace, were, that within the
other range of coast, mentioned by Mr. Fox, contra-
band of war, and neutral vessels trading from one ene-
my's port to another, were interdicted. This is not a
blockade. Contraband of war has been forfeited by
public law, time immemorial. It is founded on the
right of blockade, but is itself a distinct general prin-
ciple, which all nations admit as a common advantage.
The other, the interdiction of neutral trade from one
enemy's port to another, has likewise been set up by
Great-Britain, as a general principle; and if the cor-
rectness of it be questioned, it must be on the ground
that it is not valid as a general principle. In proof
that this was not made an exception, by Mr. Fox, as
growing out of a state of blockade, we need but bear
in mind these facts, that the principle was asserted as
a general one, before his Order of 1806, and vessels
having been captured on that ground, in the Mediter-
ranean, where it was not pretended a blockade existed.

The result of this examination then is this; that what
has been called by the apologists for Bonaparte, the
British paper blockade of 1806, was in no shape a bloc-
cade, even on paper: for the measure, taken by the
British government at that time, did not propose the
least restriction on neutral trade going into the ports
of the enemy, as arising from a state of blockade. As
this was so explicitly stated in the body of the docu-
ment communicated to Mr. Munroe, it excited no alarm
in this country, after the circumstances were under-
stood, and our legislators did not think it even a sub-
ject worth mentioning. They never thought of a non-
intercourse act, on this account. Now let the public
judge with what prosperity Mr. Madison, conjures up
this phantom; as a reason for perpetuating the non-in-
tercourse act against Great-Britain, should the Orders,
in reference to which that act was made, be done away.

So true is it, that the act of Congress was universally
understood to require nothing of the British govern-
ment but the repeal of the late Orders in Council, that
the democratic party have fully committed themselves
on this subject. It will be remembered, that Bonaparte
attached as a proviso to his promise that the Berlin and
Milan decrees should cease to operate on the 1st of
November, the very step now taken by Mr. Madison.
That the federal prints, I mean those which can be cal-
led political, said the promise was conditional, and re-
quired of the American government to demand more of
Great-Britain, than the repeal of her Orders of 1807
and 1809. This was denied by the Whig and all the
leading democratic papers. They affirmed that the
Duc de Cadore's letter implied, that the revival of the
non-intercourse act against Great-Britain would be
sufficient. Their denying the construction of the fede-
ralists that further concessions were to be obtained of
England, is proof therefore, that they considered the
non-intercourse act as not referring to anything but
the Orders in Council. But the Duc de Cadore's let-
ter plainly did extend further; and to this we are to
impute Mr. Madison's laboured attempt to conceal his
cowardly obedience to the requisitions of the Tyrant, and
bring the measure of 1806 within the "purview" of
the act of Congress. The true cause of this perversion of
the intention of our legislators, was so disgraceful, that
the President durst not give the Duc de Cadore's letter
among the documents accompanying his Message; for
as he takes almost the very words of that minister, in
his allusions to the previous measures of England, it
would have shewn a little too plainly, who dictated the
discovery that the instrument bearing date May 1806
came within the purview of the non-intercourse act, if
he had suffered Cadore's letter and his Message to go
together.

We trust the American people at large will ere long
perceive what has long been obvious to every attentive
and impartial observer,—that the measures of our go-
vernment towards Great-Britain, are dictated by the
Emperor Napoleon. Never have we had, and never
can we have stronger evidence than this; and never can
we have an accommodation with Great-Britain, so long
as our President, regardless of the interests and pros-
perity of his country, receives his instructions from the
Duc de Cadore, and shapes his policy by them. What
is the Fox measure of 1806 to us? In what respect
would it affect our interest, our rights or honor if en-
forced to the end of time? In none whatever. It can-
not be but a pretext, in case others fail, for carrying on
Bonaparte's Continental System, here, and destroying
that commerce with Great-Britain and her dominions
which has given new life to our country, wealth to in-
dividuals and a large revenue to government.

The next paragraph we proposed to examine, in the
President's Message, was the insidious and dastardly
intimation to Congress to abstain from any discussion
of the outrages committed by the Danes.

The President ventures to mention, though not in
very strong language, the "fresh and extensive depre-
dations" committed on our commerce by vessels under
the Danish flag. The memorials of suffering merchants
in different parts of the Union were probably before
him, when he wrote, and rendered it impossible to pass
over the subject in total silence. He informs us "the
measures pursued in behalf of our injured citizens, not

ish
essor
mmu-
lornet,
he sub-
tention
er, that
ented in
e, there-
kson, of
receipt of
uspended,
of absence,
e Legation.
truction may
actory change
eat-Britain, the
es is left to your
1) R. SMITH.

OF DECEMBER 14.
MESSAGE.

...corded with the conciliatory
...proceeding on the part of France
...Duc de Cadore's Letter] to have extended them to
...nds of just complaint, which now remain
...with the United States. It was particular-
...ated that as a further evidence of just disposi-
...wards them, restoration would have been im-
...ly made of the property of our citizens seized
...misapplication of the principle of reprisals,
...ed with a misconstruction of a law of the Uni-
...tes. This expectation has not been fulfilled."
...slight, so tremblingly cautious is this notice of the
...unded robberies which have been committed upon
...icans in France and her dependencies, a reader
...acquainted with the history of our wrongs would
...orm no conception of their nature or extent.

When by intrigues at Washington, or the singular
weakness of Mr. Erskine, that minister was induced to
take instructions from Mr. Secretary Smith, and vio-
late these transmitted to him from his own government,
and an arrangement was made as dictated by Mr.
Smith, Mr. Madison filled a column in his subsequent
Message, with the most illiberal reflections against the
government of Great-Britain, manifesting to the whole
world either the grossest ignorance of the obvious dic-
tates of reason and of the established law of nations, or
a malignity against that government, which would but
disgrace the chief magistrate of any nation. He did
not hesitate to accuse the British ministry of
perfidy, though he must have known, they were justifi-
ed in disavowing Erskine's agreement by every ex-
pounder of national law extant; and seemed to feel as
though he could not say enough to enflame the rage of
the vulgar, ignorant and prejudiced, against a nation,
which on that score, had given as no cause of just com-
plaint. On the contrary, their arrangements for
shielding American property from capture, which had
been sent to the continent by our merchants, in conse-
quence of the sham arrangement, with Erskine, afford-
ed a rare proof of national liberality.

Now observe the contrast both in cause and effect.
Our Congress, having kept on a general embargo, un-
til the people of the United States would bear it no lon-
ger, and having found that Bonaparte approved of an
interdiction of our commerce to his dominions, provid-
ed Great-Britain was embraced (*for this approbation
was expressed by him officially*) changed the embargo
into a non-intercourse law as it respected Great-Bri-
tain and France. But in consequence of this act, no
property, French or English was to be seized, unless,
after the promulgation of the law, and due notice given
of its existence, the law should be violated. The forfei-
ture then extended only to such property as might
enter our ports in defiance of the law. French citizens
therefore were exposed to no loss, and no objection
could possibly be raised against the equity of the mea-
sure. Indeed there is every reason to suppose our
"submission Congress" flattered themselves that this
measure like the embargo would meet the cordial ap-
probation of his Imperial Majesty.

But what does this outrageous plunderer?—After
receiving the non-intercourse act, he does not interdict
American commerce in future, but seizes all the Ame-
rican property then in his own ports, and in the ports
of his vassal kingdoms—all that for months previous
had arrived within his jurisdiction! This robbery un-
precedented in the annals of any civilized nation, em-
braced many millions of dollars, all of which he grasp-
ed under the insulting pretext of retaliating on our
non-intercourse act, which as we have already observed,
was wholly prospective in its operation!

For such atrocities as these, any nation under hea-
ven, that had the least respect to its character or its
rights, would have proposed no alternatives to France,