FOR THE STAR.

CIVIS No. II.

IN my former number it was stated, that the satisfaction demanded for the attack on the Chesapeake was "a formal disavowal of the deed, the restoration of the seamen to the ship from which they were taken—and as a security for the future, an abolition of impressments from vessels under the flag of the United States." It is certainly true, that by virtue of these institutions Mr. Monroe had no discression to seperate the future safety of our seamen, from the indemnification to be allowed in the case of the Chesapeake: And many and wise were the reasons of the president for uniting these interesting objects in one final negociation.

Since the peace of 1783, amidst the multitude of vexations to which our rising commerce had been constantly exposed, no object connected with it, had created such dire animosities between the two nations, as the impressment of seamen from under our flag; and against this practice every administration had remonstrated without effect. By England the right was asserted; by America it was uniformly denied, and contested: when the recent extension of that doctrine to vessels of war, heightened the sense of injury; and from the act, government were bound to infer, that there was no limit to a pretention, the admission of which annihilate our commerce, and again reduced us to a state of dependence.—Whether the conduct of Admiral Berkley was to be avowed, if necessary; or whether he proceeded merely by his own will, it is equally certain—that it arose out of the long assumed doctrine of impressment, and that complete remedy could only be expected by removing the original error. The president had also reasonable expectations that this could now be effected, as our ex-minister, Mr. King, had strongly remonstrated against the practice, and prepared the ministry to expect, that no negociation could be lasting or harmonious between the nations; unless the abolishment of impressments from under our flag, constituted a primary principle. Indeed, so sensible of this was Lord Hawkesbury, and Mr. Addington, that an article including these stipulations was in effect concluded between our minister and Lord St. Vincent, then at the head of the admiralty, on the approaching renewal of the late war. It was however finally frustrated by an exception of the "narrow seas:" an exception which if admitted, would only have *changed* the question; not *settled* the principle. On the utility of uniting the the two questions now under discussion, in a general arrangement, the following reasons of our minister are peculiarly forcible and just.—"My government "had presumed, that his majesty's government would have seen in the recent, and greater injury, a strong motion for bringing the whole subject "unto one view; and providing for it at "the same time: The excess of the latter outrage could not fail to revive in "the mind of the suffering party, a high "sense of former injuries, and it was "reasonable to infer, that the great injustice inseparable from the practice, "(of which the incident furnishes so "striking an example) would have produced between our governments the "most prompt and friendly co-operation in the means of suppressing it. My "government being sincerely desirous "to place the relations of the two powers "on the solid basis of permanent friendship, is satisfied as well from the *general* practice, as by the more awful "ADMONITON, derived from the late incident; that it can only be done with "effect, by mounting to the sourse of "the evil, and providing against it, an "adequate remedy."

This reasoning of Mr. Monroe produced on the British ministry, no departure from their original intentions, of not uniting with the affair of the Chesapeake, the general question of impressment. The event was, that negociation was broken off, and a special minister dispatched to the United States.

Before I examine the sincerity of this mission, a few remarks on the doctrine of impressments from neutral vessels may perhaps be acceptable. This right has often been asserted and enforced by the British government, and as often denied and resisted by the American nation. Whenever disputes accrue between independent sovereignties, the common rule adopted for their adjustment, is to refer the point in contest to the law of nations (their only empire,) and then abide the decision of that law. This is the usual course of procedure; but on the question now at issue, no decision or determination can there be found: the law of nations is silent on the subject, and municipal law can never reach it—hence this conclusion may fairly be infered; that the assumed right of Great Britain, is both novel and unfounded in principle. From Vattel's chapter on neutrality these general positions may be collected, that the sea is the common highway for all nations; and that neutral vessels there navigating, having no part in the quarrel, may trade with either belligerent, in its accustomed and usual manner. But least the *university* of the latter principle might lead to a system of favoritism, the following exceptions are introduced,—a neutral vessel shall not furnish to either of the belligerents the goods *cantraband* in war—a neutral vessel shall not enter a blockaded port; and the persons or property of the belligerents found by either, on board a neutral vessel are liable to capture, or confiscation. These are prohibitions to the general immunity of neutrals; and the conclusion seems irresistable; that independently on these exceptions, every thing on board a neutral vessel must be exempt from seizure or molestation.

I shall now conclude this point, by quoting some of the unanswerable arguments of Mr. Madison, in his official correspondence with Messrs. Monroe and Rose on this subject:—"The claim "of a belligerent to search for and seize "on board neutral vessels on the high "seas, persons under his allegiance does "not rest on any belligerent right under "the law of nations; but a prerogative "discord from municipal law, and in"volves the extravagant supposition, "that one nation has a right to execute "at all times, and in all cases its muni"cipal laws and regulations, on board "the ships of another nation, not being "within its territorial limits." "And "surely it can never be pretended that "the sovereignty of any nation, extends "in any case whatever, *beyond its own* "*dominions*, and *its own vessels on the* "*high seas*. Such a doctrine would just"ly alarm all nations, and more than a"ny thing would countenance the im"putation of aspiring to an universal "empire of the seas; if the law of alle"giance, which is a municipal law, be "in force at all on the high seas on board "foreign vessels, it must be so at all times "there; as it is within its acknowledged "sphere. If the reason alledged for it "be good in time of war, namely, that "the sovereign has then a right to the "service of all his subjects, it must be "good at all times, because at all times "he has the same right to their service "War is not the only occasion for which "he may want their services, nor is ex"ternal danger the only danger against "which their services may be required "for his security."

"Again—if the authority of municipal law can operate on persons in foreign vessels on the high seas, because if within the dominion of their "sovereign, they would be subject to "that law; and are violating that law "by being in that situation; now reject "the inference, that the authority of a "municipal law may equally be enforced on board foreign vessels on the high "seas against articles of *property* exported in violation of such law, or belonging to the country from which it "was exported? And thus every commercial regulation in time of peace as "well as war, would be made obligatory "on foreigners and their vessels, not only whilst within the dominion of the "sovereign, making the regulations; "but in every sea, and at every instance "when an armed vessel might meet with "them." Therefore neither the law of nations, municipal law, nor the dictates of reason or justice furnish any pretext for the practice of making impressments from American vessels on ths high seas.

I well know that the enemies of freedom, and the commercial greatness of the United States charge the president with a design to plunge our government into war with Great Britain, in defence of doctrines at least doubtful, or as some affirm to cover British deserters. This charge was never intended to canvass the true question in contest between the governments; *the right of protection and the duty of allegiance*; but it was designed to create popular clamor in England as well as in America, against the executive, for it was well ascertained on both sides of the atlantic, that a war avowedly to protect British deserters, would be deservedly reprobated. Yet if war must be the result of the position taken, let it be remembered, that it is not undertaken to support a dubious principle; or in defence of British deserters; *but to protect the rights and privileges of American citizens on the high seas.*

It is rather extraordinary, that some *pretended* American writers when considering the doctrine of impressment should have exhibited only ONE side of the picture—the right of England to prohibit expatriation—her right to seize her subjects on board our merchant vessels (altho' a marriage & actual residence in this country since 1784 could be proved);—And the peril of her situation in justification of the exercise of that right, are discanted on with all the force of eloquence, and warmth of sensibility: But the *corresponding* duty of America to protect her citizens; and the right THEY have to that protection, are deemed objects of quite inferior magnitude. Indeed, were the right of impressment admitted in its fullest extent, as to British subjects; yet the dreadful effects resulting to American seamen from its mode of execution would compel the adoption of some strong measure against its abuse; but when the exercise of that right is at best doubtful, and its consequences so fatal to personal liberty, government are imperiously bound to put an end to the practice. Take a view of the official report of the Secretary of State, and behold between 4 and 5000 American seamen lawlessly dragged from our ships of commerce and now enslaved by the minions of power—when arested, it is in vain to assert, that they are Americans, and exhibit their protections; the pleas is scoffed at, and denied—the paper designed by government for their protection is destroyed, and cast to the winds; and their complaints against such brutal outrage answered only by the stripe and the lash! If redress for such conduct is demanded by the government—this is virtually the reply. Old England has maritime rights superior to the other nations of Europe—THESE she must not, she will not abandon; altho' the sovereignty of America, her commerce, and the dearest rights of her citizens are all anihilated by their exercise. In the name of justice and humanity have these unfortunate seamen no claim to protection, no preservation against outrage and violence. We all agree that they owe allegiance to our government, and would justly be punished for its violation; Yet when they claim protection, *it is denied*, or what to them is the same thing; *it is not effectual.* Vain has been every attempt to negociate with effect on this interesting subject: And although I depricate the horrors of war, and feel the protection—rather than surrender this attribute of sovereignty, and leave the citizen to lawless captivity without redress; I would hazard the event.

CIVIS.

Queen-Anne's County, May, 1808.

(CIRCULAR.)

Treasury Department, May 6, 1808.

SIR—I informed you in my letter of the 28th ult. that the president considered "unusual shipments," particularly of flour and other provisions, of lumber and naval stores, as sufficient cause for detention of the vessel; pot and pearl ashes and flaxseed ought to have been added to the list—but he has given it in charge to me to call your attention still more forcibly to that object.—As it was the great leading object of the legislature in giving the power of detention, he considers it his duty in the execution of it, to give complete effect to the embargo laws. He recommends therefore, that every shipment of the above articles, for a place where they cannot be wanted for consumption, should be detained. He perceives no necessity at present for the transportation of flour and similar articles from one port of the Chesapeake and its waters to another port on the waters of the same bay; or from any port whatever to ports in the Chesapeake, Delaware or Hudson, or to other places which export such articles. And in order to prevent the inconvenience which the want of a sufficient supply might occasion, in some states, he has written a letter to the governors of New-Hampshire, Massachusetts, South Carolina, Georgia and Orleans, a copy of which is, by his order, inclosed for your information.

In order that he also may be enabled to judge of the manner in which the law and his instructions are carried into effect, you will be pleased to transmit, weekly, to this department, a statement of the vessels laden with articles of domestic produce, which shall have departed from the district during the week, shewing the species and quantities of articles, and the port of destination. Vessels not masted, or decked packets, and ferry boats, vessels which give no bonds, and those employed in carrying fire wood, manure, stones, and similar articles, need not be inserted in the statement.

I am, very respectfully,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed)
ALBERT GALLATIN.

To the collector of

(COPY.)

To the governors of Orleans, Georgia, South Carolina, Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

WASHINGTON, 6th May, 1808.

The evasions of the preceding embargo laws went so far towards defeating their objects, and chiefly by vessels clearing out coastwise, that congress, by their act of April 25th, authorised the absolute detention of all vessels bound coastwise, with cargoes exciting suspicions of an intention to evade those laws. There being few towns on our seacoast which cannot be supplied with flour from their interior country, shipments of flour become generally suspicious and proper subjects of detention.

is one of the few places on our seaboard which needs supplies of flour by sea for its own consumption. That it may not suffer by the cautions we are obliged to use, I request of your excellency, whenever you deem it necessary, that your present or any future stock should be enlarged, to take the trouble of giving your certificate in favor of any merchant *in whom you have confidence*, directed to the collector of any port, usually exporting flour from which he may choose to bring it, for any quantity which you may deem necessary for consumption beyond your interior supplies, enclosing to the secretary of the treasury, at the same time, a duplicate of the certificate, as a check on the falsification of your signature. In this way we may ensure a supply of the real wants of your citizens, and at the same time prevent those wants from being made a cover for the crimes against their country which unprincipled adventurers are in the habit of committing. I trust, too, that your excellency will find an apology for the trouble I propose to give you, in that desire which you must feel, in common with all our worthy citizens, that inconveniences encountered cheerfully by them for the interests of their country, shall not be turned merely to the unlawful profits of the *most worthless part of society.*

I salute your excellency,
With assurances of my
High respect and consideration.
(Signed)
TH: JEFFERSON.

From the National Intelligencer.

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

NO. I.

A momentous crisis has occurred in your affairs. The injustice of foreign powers has induced you to make a stand against their oppressions. In making this stand, you have chosen the least evil that presented itself, and have adopted a course of measures, defensive of your own interests, and only so far offensive against those of other nations as their own conduct renders them so.

A patricidal spirit has already dared to hold up these measures to ridicule and reprobation. Falsely calculating upon your want of public virtue, and upon your ascendant devotion to the paltry interests of the moment, those who are busy in exciting prejudice and diffusing falschood, flatter themselves on your want of discernment or fortitude. Yielding implicitly to the old monarchical dogma, that the people *always think and act as they feel*, they flatter themselves that the temporary distresses produced by the Embargo will render you hostile to it and those who gave it existence.

With you, fellow-citizens, it rests to refute or justify these predictions of faction; to decide, once for all, whether to maintain your liberties, and to place your republican institutions on an impregnable foundation, you have the spirit to bear a momentary deprivation of a part of your luxury and wealth; or, whether at the day of danger you are ready to shrink from the contest, and consent to be slaves, provided you are suffered to indulge, even in a moderate degree, your mercenary feelings. Can there be a doubt on this head? Is there a single American in heart who would not rather sacrifice a moiety of his property then sanction principles, an acquiescence in which would inflict present disgrace, and entail future slavery on his country?

This is the real question. It is not a mere concern of the day, a point of ordinary expediency; but a question of vital importance, one which as much involves the independence of the United States as the revolutionary scenes which led us through blood triumphantly to emancipation. France declares that you shall not trade to Britain, or in British commodities; and England declares all the trade, not interdicted by France, unlawful. She, moreover, has enacted decrees for licencing that portion of trade she tolerates, and for imposing upon it the most oppressive burthens;—burthens, which, in some instances, far exceed the original value of the articles taxed. What is this but oppression, in its most odious form, and what would acquiescence on our part prove other than the most abject submission and slavery?

Unlimited riches held on such terms would be infinitely worse than the enjoyment of liberty and indigence. For, however, in the first case we might want the gratifications of the sensualist, and some of the comforts of rational subsistence, we should retain conscience free from reproach, and an elasticity of spirit unbroken by a consciousness of crime. Of a nation composed of such independent minds, it might hereafter be said, to use the language of an elegant writer, "although the massy trunk was bent to the ground, no sooner did the hurricane pass away, than it again rose with fresh vigor and more lively vegetation." The father of a numerous offspring might console himself with the reflection that the hardships he was enduring for the good of his posterity, and that in leaving to them a country undebased by a disgraceful vassalage he left them an ample equivalent for a scanty patrimony.—In fact, in the eye of philosophy and reason, which look entirely to the aggregate of human happiness, what are the fleeting clouds, which for a short period cast a shade over human scenes, compared to that total darkness which so often springs from a radical error in the policy of nations? What are the temporary effects arising, from a suspension to reap the fruits which ought invariably to flow from good principles, compared to the permanent abandonment of those principles? The difference is as great as exists between an individual of general good health, who is occasionally exposed to disease and an individual of an habitually debilitated and broken constitution.

This very analogy, which comes home to the feelings of every man, is strictly applicable to our present situation. We have asserted and are contending for principles which are just in themselves, which no nation on earth has a right to deprive us of, and which we cannot relinquish without infamy. Shall we then consent to wear these humilating chains, because they are set off with baubles to dazzle our senses, or because a remnant of liberty is left, which is not likely to remain long, after submitting to such daring pretensions? For one, I say no. I would rather dig my own grave, and resign myself to voluntary death, than do an act which would inevitably degrade me in my own eyes, and my country in the eyes of the world.

In subsequent numbers I shall enter more fully into this subject, and others connected with it.

AN AMERICAN WHIG.

PHILADELPHIA CITY *TOWN MEETING.*

At a numerous and respectable meeting of the democratic citizens of the city of Philadelphia, convened by public notice, and held in the apartment of the supreme court, in the State-House.

THOMAS LEIPER, esq. in the chair.
WM. DUANE, and JOHN L. LEIB, esq. Secretaries.

Two resolutions were offered to the chair: The first proposing a concurrence with the nomination of JAMES MADISON for PRESIDENT, and GEORGE CLINTON for VICE-PRESIDENT, by the majority of members of congress at Washington.

And the second proposing a concurrence with the nomination of SIMON SNYDER for GOVERNOR of this commonwealth, by the convention at Lancaster.

It was moved to postpone the consideration of the resolution to a day unnamed—thereupon some debate arose, and the question being put for the postponement, the *ayes* were 25 only—and the vast show of hands against the postponing, rendering it unnecessay to count, the motion for postponement was lost.

And the question upon the resolutions being taken, they were carried without further opposition.

THOMAS LEIPER, Chairman.
Attest,
JOHN L. LEIB, } Secretaries.
WM. DUANE, }

It is a matter of much satisfaction to the republicans of this district, that in the discussions of yesterday on the merits of the candidates before the public for distinguished stations, there was no effort, *pro or con*, to depreciate the *fame* or *reputation* of the patriots whose names were brought into view for the most eminent stations in the republic; and that the questions were discussed wholly upon *public, democratic* and *liberal principles*;—without prejudice against the men on either side;—and with a preference avowed and argued on the plain score of principle; there can be no doubt of a similar result throughout the state; and all the expectation of those who had built upon their power to excite incurable divisions have totally failed.

LATEST FOREIGN NEWS.

The New-York *Mercantile Advertiser* of the 14th instant, containing London news of the 5th April, received at that place by the ship Alleghany, captain Morris, in a passage of 32 days from Greenock, in Scotland. Glasgow papers to the 8th of April also came to hand.

The intelligence represents the inhabitants of Lisbon to be in a very deplorable state, and the Russian fleet in the Tagus in great want of supplies. Reports prevailed of the re-assemblage of a French army on the heights of Boulogue. Mr. NOURSE and Lieutenant LEWIS, in the Osage from the United States of America, have arrived at l'Orient, (in France.) Rumors existed in London (but they were not credited) that Sir Richard Strachan, with eight sail of British ships of war, had attacked the Rochfort and Carthagena squadrons in Palmas Bay, in the Island of Majorca; that he took or destroyed nine sail, at the expence of his own life, two captains, and 1800 men killed and wound; one British ship blown up, and one sunk by the batteries.

Captain Lovett arrived at New-York on the 12th instant, in 36 days from St. Lucar, in Spain. He informs that the Prince of Peace was beheaded on the 5th of April, that he had been exposed in public, loaded with chains, and that the houses of all his officers were destroyed. Prince Ferdinand was crowned king, and Bonaparte was hourly expected at Madrid with 50,000 troops. The seige of Gibraltar was no more spoken of. St. Lucar was blockaded by eight or ten English sail of the line: provisions very high; flour fifteen dollars, and rising.