

E

364

.5

A28





Class E 364

Book .5
A 28

A Forbes

*new coll Boston
AN
Ling.*

ADDRESS

TO

FEDERAL CLERGYMEN,

ON THE

SUBJECT OF THE WAR

PROCLAIMED BY THE

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

JUNE 18, 1812,

AGAINST THE

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT-BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

BY SOLOMON AIKEN, A. M.

Pastor of the first Church in Dracutt.

BOSTON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

1813.

E 364
.5
A28

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO WIT :
District Clerk's Office.

BE IT REMEMBERED, That on the ninth day of March, A. D. 1813, and in the thirty-seventh year of the Independence of the United States of America, SOLOMON AIKEN, of the said District, has deposited in this Office the title of a book, the right whereof he claims as Author, in the words following, *to wit* :

An Address to Federal Clergymen, on the subject of the War proclaimed by the Congress of the United States, June 18, 1812, against the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. By SOLOMON AIKEN, A.M. Pastor of the first Church in Dracutt.

In conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, entitled, "An Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of Maps, Charts and Books, to the Authors and Proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned;" and also to an Act entitled, "An Act supplementary to an Act, entitled, an Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of Maps, Charts and Books, to the Authors and Proprietors of such copies during the times therein mentioned; and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving, and etching historical and other Prints."

WILLIAM S. SHAW, } *Clerk of the District*
 } *of Massachusetts.*

By transfer
Nov. 30, 19. 5

ADDRESS
TO FEDERAL CLERGYMEN.

Reverend and respected Gentlemen,

IT is our lot to live in a period of time, in which are experienced many convulsions and political revolutions in the states and powers of the earth; but in none of them are we more interested than in the separation of the United States from all political connexion with Great Britain. This was an event which excited the attention of an admiring world. The circumstances under which it took place, were such as directed the astonished eye to the hand of him, who is the great Arbiter of the nations of the earth, for its accomplishment. The commencement of our revolutionary war found the patriots of this country without military discipline, without arms, without ammunition. They being stimulated with a love and sense of liberty, made their appeal to the supreme Ruler of the universe, for the rectitude of their cause; and contended with England at a time when the powers of Europe trembled at her frowns. The event was glorious; it terminated in our freedom, sovereignty and independence. Those same revolutionary patriots, who achieved our freedom, lived to form and put into operation constitutions of government, as free perhaps as the present state of man will admit—republican forms of government, rendering the administrators thereof, at short periods, dependent on the people for the tenure of their offices; by which we have a government of laws and not of men. This is the definition of a republic, which the late President Adams gave to his friend, the Hon. George Wythe of Virginia, in a letter addressed to him in 1776. Speaking of Britain he ob-

serves, "The wretched condition of this country, however, for ten or fifteen years past, has frequently reminded me of their principles and reasonings. They will convince every candid mind, that there is no good government but what is republican ; that the only valuable part of the British constitution is so ; because the very definition of a republic,* is *an empire of laws and not of men.*" In setting up such a government in view of all the kingly and oppressive governments of the world, great apprehensions were entertained by our patriots for its success, justly conceiving, that we should meet with all that opposition which the envy or jealousy of monarchical powers would cast in our way of enjoying and reaping the undisturbed benefits of our liberal and free forms of government. But more especially were they apprehensive of meeting opposition from that power from which they had revolted. In their view it was unreasonable to suppose, that she would let us rest for any length of time, in the unmolested enjoyment of our peace and liberty ; and that England made peace from necessity, that she might gain strength for the renewal of the contest. These are the ideas suggested in a sermon delivered in Salem by Dr. Whitaker, May, 1783, contemplating the question whether the states should admit of the return of the tories among us. He observes page 46, second edition, "The restoration of the tories among us will expose us to innumerable and constant dangers which will naturally result from having in our bowels a multitude of subtle enemies, void of all honor and virtue, who, as they never will be reconciled to us, will plot our ruin, and lie ever on the watch for the most favorable advantage to avenge themselves, by betraying us into the hands and under the tyranny of Great Britain, in order to recommend themselves to places of honor and profit under their now avowed sovereign. Some may imagine that they will gratefully acknowledge the favor, and become good subjects of these states, if permitted to return. But what ground for such a fancy ? Is it com-

* Farmer, page 91.

mon to find gratitude such a powerful principle in the human heart? It is a true proverb, that he who injures cannot forgive. We may as well hope for Satan's cordial friendship to mankind, as that of the tories to these States : for

“Never can true reconciliation grow,
“Where wounds of deadly hate have pierc'd so deep.*”

And in page 48, the Doctor observes,

“SHOULD they [the tories] return, they will probably soon engross the chief wealth of these States ; and as wealth usually begets power, they will,” as before asserted, “easily possess themselves of the chief seats of government, pervert our councils, and reduce us, by their arts, to that subjection to Great Britain, which the power of her arms could not accomplish.† It is too manifest that Great Britain is far from approving our independence. Necessity compelled her to a cessation of hostilities. The check given her the last year, by preventing British goods from coming among us, reduced her to shift the plan of subjugating us ;” for this is still her object, “her recourses here were by this cut off, and she reduced to the greatest distress. Her only safety lay in a present cessation of hostilities ; this would give her respite to repair her strength, till a more favorable opportunity should offer to attain her wished for end, the enslaving America.” That England would force the United States into another war with her, was the most sanguine expectation of the late President Adams at the time of negotiating the peace on the conclusion of the last war. This he expresses in a letter dated July 6, 1812, to his honorable friend and corres-

*MILTON.

† “They must be infatuated who imagine that Britain will, for a long time, be reconciled to our separation from her. We ought to be very jealous that every art in her power will be used to reduce us under her dominion ; many are the plots already laid, and artifices used to this end. But the principle, I apprehend, is to procure the return of the tories among us, as being the most suitable tools by which to work our ruin.”

pendent Mr. Elkanah Watson. "To your allusion to the war, I have nothing to say, but that it is with surprise that I hear it pronounced, not only by newspapers, but by persons in authority, ecclesiastical and civil, and political and military, that it is an unjust and unnecessary war : that the declaration of it was altogether unexpected, &c. How it is possible that a social and moral creature can say that the war is *unjust*, is to me utterly incomprehensible. How it can be said to be unnecessary, is very mysterious—I have thought it both just and necessary for five or six years. How it can be said to be unexpected, is another wonder—I have expected it more than five and twenty years, and have great reason to be thankful that it has been postponed so long. I saw such a spirit in the British islands, when I resided in France, in Holland, and in England itself, that I expected another war much sooner than it has happened ; I was so impressed with the idea, that I expressed to lord Lansdowne, formerly lord Shelburn, an apprehension that his lordship would live long enough to be obliged to make, and that I should live long enough to see another peace made between Great Britain and the United States of America. His lordship did not live to make the peace, and I shall not probably live to see it, but I have lived to see the war that must be followed by a peace, if the war be not eternal." According to these apprehensions and predictions of those sages, we have never ceased to experience the hostilities of England towards us. She laid foundations for our perplexity and her annoyance of us, and they were in operation immediately on the close of the war for our independence ; the greatest and most effectual of which was her making provision for the tories to return and dwell amongst us, which was the sentiment and fears of Dr. Whitaker. Contrary to his wish, it took place ; and Britain has never suffered us to be without our just complaints of her ; immediately upon the close of the war, she availed herself of taking our men from our vessels, under pretext of their being deserters from her service, the similarity of the two nations so exactly agreeing. On this ground, promp-

ted by the superiority of her naval force, she took the utmost liberty, which has been a most serious matter of complaint on our part from that early day to this. This has been acknowledged by all parties among us, as well by the friends of Britain, as those of the independence of the United States. England availed herself of a pretext to delay and not fulfil the articles of peace with us ; but retained the posts on our frontiers, and facilitated the depredations of the hostile savages on our defenceless citizens, women and children. England has ever sought pretexts to depredate upon our commerce, and cramp our rising prosperity. This in one instance was effected in her making war with France, and intermeddling with her internal concerns, in the first stages of the French revolution. This, as England wished to have it, flung the trade of neutrals into a degree of confusion and uncertainty, a state always desired and sought for by England, as favorable to her spirit of depredation and robbery.

THAT England has never ceased to manifest this unfriendly, hostile disposition towards us, is in the memory of our citizens, found in the journals of Congress, and acknowledged by all parties. Among a cloud of witnesses I shall quote only the testimony of the Rev. Dr. Osgood, as being full to the purpose. In his thanksgiving discourse on the 19th of November, 1795, page 23, we read, "At the close of the war which secured our independence, though hostilities ceased, yet the rancorous passions, which had been so long in full swell, could not immediately subside. A sense of recent injuries on the one part, and accustomed haughtiness and insult on the other, were a constant stimulus to actions bordering on an infringement of the pacification. Chagrined with disappointment in the object of the war, and mortified with the advantages which they had been forced to concede at the peace, the British government were on the watch for a plausible pretext to evade or delay the complete execution of the treaty." They availed themselves of what they considered as an infraction of the treaty on our part, to excuse a yet greater

on their's, in keeping possession of the western posts, and thereby facilitating the inroads of hostile savages upon our defenceless frontiers. Thus a controversy, threatening to open fresh wounds yet not closed, was begun, and with mutual recriminations, but with no hope of end or settlement, carried on to the commencement of the present war. When the British again armed at all points, our commerce floating unprotected on the wide ocean, in the midst of their fleets, cruisers and privateers, was, to an old enemy, an object too tempting to be suffered to pass unmolested. They knew their own strength and our weakness, had little fear of retaliation, and of course were not scrupulous in what manner they treated us. Their spoliations were sudden, insidious and intolerable."

THIS is the testimony of Dr. Osgood, concerning the British treatment of us, previously to the treaty of 1794, commonly known by Jay's treaty. But what relief have we experienced since? If it were as the Dr. says, that "her spoliations were" then "sudden, insidious and intolerable," how much more so have they been since? It has been a constant theme of complaint from that time to this. The measures, which England has taken to annoy us, to cramp our rising prosperity, and to regain what she lost in our revolt from her, with those leading to the ultimatum, our final subjugation to her, I shall consider.

THE impressment of our seamen, takes the lead in her cruel and arbitrary group of injuries. This audacious, inhuman and afflictive practice, she early assumed; even from the time of acknowledging us independent; and with such unblushing rapacity has she done it, that it has ever been considered a just ground for a declaration of *war against her*. This is manifest by a recurrence to public documents, in our diplomatic correspondence with that nation, which will be seen in its place. To this declaration I may do well to add the sentiments of the late venerable President Adams, in his private, as well as public character. In his able and lucid dissertation on the subject of the impressment of our

seamen, he says, "our citizens have as good a right to protection as British subjects, and our government is as much bound to afford it. What is the impressment of seamen? It is no other than what the civilians call *plagiat*, a crime punishable with death by all civilized nations as one of the most audacious and punishable offences against society. It was so considered among the Hebrews." "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death," EXOD. xxxi. 17. "If a man be found stealing any of his brethren, then that thief shall die," DEUT. xxiv. 7. The laws of Athens, like those of the Hebrews, condemned the plagiarist or manstealer to death; and the laws of Rome pronounced the same judgment against the same outrage. "It is not for me to say that any thing would furnish a sufficient ground for an embargo, for any long time. This I leave to the responsibility of the President, Senate and Representatives in Congress. But I say with confidence, *that it furnishes a sufficient ground for a declaration of war.*" "Not the murder of Pierce, nor all the murders on board of the Chesapeake, nor all the other injuries and insults we have received from foreign nations, atrocious as they have been, can be of such dangerous, lasting, and pernicious consequences to this country, as this proclamation,* if we have servility enough to submit to it."

GREAT BRITAIN has not only availed herself of our seamen, sufficient in number to man six 74 gun ships, but she has availed herself of our property also, by seizing our vessels upon the seas, without having regard to justice, law, or the usages of nations. Blockading territories where there was not a sufficient force applied to render it dangerous to enter, and without giving previous notice thereof, and putting her decrees in force from the time of enactment; for the want of sufficient force for the effectual blockade which she pretends, she has

* Having reference to the proclamation of his Britannic Majesty, calling home his native subjects, and ordering their impressment from foreign vessels—issued October 16th, 1807.

ordered her cruisers about, and into the mouth of our harbours to seize our out and homebound navigation. In this way, from us she may easily blockade the whole world. She has treated with contempt our territorial jurisdiction, and wantonly spilt the blood of our fellow citizens. At length she passed her Order in Council, requiring of us in our European voyages, to touch at one of her ports, unload, load up again, pay transportation duties, buy her licence, and proceed to the port it specifies—on the return voyage touch again, unload, “except the cargo shall consist wholly of flour, meal, grain, or any article or articles the produce of the soil of some country which is not subjected to the restrictions of the said order, except cotton, &c.”—see Orders in Council, the 25th of Nov. 1807, as communicated to Congress, Dec. 12, 1808. Look at the tables of duty, contained in the same report of A. B. and C. and you will find that England exacts of us more than five per centum on all our extra produce for a market to Europe ; and these duties to be augmented or diminished according to the wisdom of his Majesty. And if we should calculate the same in our return cargoes, as in the transit, we shall add five per cent. more, which we justly may save in the exception before made. Then in fact England in her Orders in Council requires of us ten per cent. tax on all our extra produce for a market. She requires this of us not from justice, but from the superiority of her naval power. Every other nation has as good a right to demand it of us, and we must grant it if we yield to this, where we have in our treaties with them stipulated to treat them according to the most favored nations, which is common in treaties. It would be highly condescending in his Britannic Majesty, if he would consent to appoint suitable officers in all our ports of exportation, to receive the duties on the outset of the voyage, and not require our vessels to take a circuitous rout to call at one of their ports ; and besides this, it would save our vessels all the labor, trouble and expense of unloading, and of loading up again. Is not this for re-colonization ? And does not the Prince Regent of the United Kingdom

make large strides to regain what his father lost by the revolt of the U. States? That the conduct of England towards us has been as here represented is manifest by public documents. See the President's message to Congress of June 18, 1812:—"British cruisers have been in the practice also of violating the rights and peace of our coasts. They hover over and harrass our entering and departing commerce. The most insulting pretensions they have added to the most lawless proceeding in our very harbors; and have wantonly spilt American blood within the sanctuary of our territorial jurisdiction." "Under pretended blockades, without the presence of an adequate force, and sometimes without the practicability of applying one, our commerce has been plundered in every sea." "In aggravation of these predatory measures, they have been considered as in force from the date of their notification; a retrospective effect being thus added, as has been done in other important cases, to the unlawfulness of the course pursued," and to render the outrage the more signal. These mock blockades have been reiterated and enforced in the face of official communications of the British government, declaring, as a true definition of a blockade, "that particular ports must be actually invested, and previous warning given to vessels bound to them, not to enter." "Not content with these occasional expedients for laying waste our neutral trade, the cabinet of Great Britain, at length, resorted to the sweeping system of blockade, under the name of Orders in Council, which has been moulded and managed, as might best suit its political views, its commercial jealousy, or the avidity of British cruisers."

So far has Britain extended the means of her monopoly of trade, as to prohibit the lawful trade of the United States with her enemy, and deceptively carry it on herself, under the flag and forged papers of the U. States, and some of these are reckoned among the vessels of the U. States which France has taken and burnt, and manacled their crews, which have been so liberally published in the federal papers in the U. States, recur to

the before mentioned documents. "It has become indeed sufficiently certain, that the commerce of the U. States is to be sacrificed, not as interfering with the belligerent rights of G. Britain, not as supplying the wants of her enemy, which she herself supplies; but as interfering with the monopoly she covets for her own commerce and navigation. She carries on a war against the lawful commerce of a friend, that she may the better carry on a commerce with an enemy, a commerce polluted by the forgeries and perjuries which are for the most part the only passports by which it can succeed." This of itself is a just cause of war, on the part of the U. States against England.---Another and highly sufficient cause of war against England is her influencing the savages to hostilities against us. In the message it is thus expressed—"In reviewing the conduct of Great Britain towards the U. States, our attention is necessarily drawn to the warfare just renewed by the savages on one of our extensive frontiers; a warfare which is known to spare neither age nor sex, and to be distinguished by features peculiarly shocking to humanity. It is difficult to account for the activity and combinations which have been for some time developing themselves among the tribes, in constant intercourse with British traders and garrisons, without connecting their hostility with that influence; and without recollecting authentic examples of such interpositions heretofore furnished by the officers and agents of that government."

HIS Britannic Majesty's issuing orders to encourage our citizens to violate the embargo laws, can be considered in no other point of view, than an hostile act against the U. States. These orders were given the 11th of April 1808, in the following words. "Our will and pleasure is, that you do not interrupt any neutral vessel, laden with lumber and provisions, and going to any of our colonies, islands, or settlements, in the West-Indies, or South-America, to whomsoever the property may appear to belong, and notwithstanding such vessel may not have regular clearances and documents on board; and in case any vessel shall be met with, and being on

her due course to the alleged port of destination, an endorsement shall be made on one or more of the principal papers of such vessel, specifying the destination alleged, and the place where the vessel was so visited; and in case any vessel so laden shall arrive and deliver her cargo at any of our colonies, islands, or settlements aforesaid, such vessel shall be permitted to receive her freight, and to depart either in ballast, or any goods that may be legally exported in such vessel, and to proceed to any unblockaded port, notwithstanding the present hostilities, or any future hostilities which may take place; and a passport for such vessel may be granted to the vessel by the governor, or other person having the chief civil command of such colony, island, or settlement.

G. R."

It seems by this order, that his Britannic Majesty contemplated the present war, or our submission to him, by saying, "notwithstanding the present hostilities, or any *future hostilities* which may take place;" so that for aught of any annoyance from England, whoever may be disposed, may now trade with his Majesty's colonies, islands, or settlements. If this order had not been issued till after the declaration of war against the United Kingdom, it would have a different appearance from what it carries.

DR. WHITAKER and President Adams were not deceived when they suggested their sentiment that England never lost all hope of subduing us. At the cessation of arms, she only changed the mode of warfare, and adopted one much more efficacious and fatal than open hostilities, viz. intrigue and division, well knowing the eternal truth, that "a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand." And never was there so fair an opportunity for her, nor a people so exposed as we were; every possible advantage for such a warfare, England possessed over us. Our former connexions, the similarity of our language, complexion, habits, customs and manners, are all circumstances facilitating such a purpose. Her emissaries might be conversant with us undistinguished, and by the return of the tories, the seed of division was

planted in the most favorable soil for its quick and luxuriant growth. The liberty of our press was taken advantage of, as the most powerful instrument to create discord. The friends of Britain experienced no want of money or means to facilitate the purpose; soon were their presses multiplied in every part of the Union, all in concert, and having the same general object in view. As circumstances would permit and prudence dictate, they were more and more open and bold in vilifying our prominent revolutionary characters, and in speaking of our republican forms of government with contempt to bring them into disrepute, comparing them to a "sow and farrow of pigs." Early were Hancock and Adams, the proscribed friends of this country, the objects of their resentment and detraction. The British have had opportunity, by all that accumulation of her friends which money would purchase, with their thousand presses, to write, utter and publish whatever they have pleased without restraint, both against our rulers and their measures. And in proportion as the British ministry could find support here, they would extend their pretensions towards us. Britain has done every thing she could to keep the commerce of the world in a state of tumult and perplexity. It has been her policy to trouble the waters of all the oceans, that she might fish in them, being sure of the booty, with her thousand hooks. For this she has made war with France, and with Spain, having a double object in view, not only that she might sweep the ocean of its commerce, the trade of the United States with that of other nations from the thousand pretexts which would shoot up from the bitter root; but to perplex the administration of our government, and thereby give us no rest, that she might weaken and divide us, and bring us totally subservient to herself. And for the better accomplishment of the object, it is manifest there has always been a perfect systematic understanding of the matter, between England and her friends in this country, both in and out of power, as they have always acted in concert. But more especially has it been the case with her friends in Congress. When

Britain would annoy and perplex our commerce upon the ocean under pretexts of blockades, which were as easily extended as words express them, then would her friends in Congress join issue, to perplex our councils. When war, embargo or submission were proposed, as the only alternatives, they would consent to neither. When called on for a substitute, they were silent. When England with her double face would negotiate, with high professions of a warm desire amicably to adjust all existing differences, with an apparent determination to do something which was right and equitable, and when all the time possible had been consumed, and come to the signing of the treaty, on their part was an inadmissible article added, to which our ambassadors, Munroe and Pinkney objecting, the treaty is forwarded to our chief executive. He also rejects it, and lays it not before the Senate. Then is there much said, that our government are hollow hearted, they reject a treaty which our ministers Munroe and Pinkney approved, they wish not for a settlement, they must please Bonaparte, &c. without bringing into view this inadmissible article. These representations, though totally unfounded, and a thousand others which are constantly circulated in the numerous British papers through the U. States, have and will necessarily have their effect upon the minds of many, who are not in a situation to investigate all subjects, and their minds are prejudiced, for it has been the policy of England and her friends in this country, in most places to be aforehand of any republican presses, and such previous prejudices, thereby formed against the administrators of our Government, by their thousand subtile misrepresentations, that many will not even read those papers which investigate subjects, and are calculated to undeceive them. And when their misrepresentations are exposed to the public, they seem to have no other effect upon their authors than to excite them to a reiterated unblushing republication of them, as if they were fully sensible that "a lie well stood to, is as good as the truth." By such means is our country flung into this most dangerous and unhappy situation in which it now is : and because we

were not driven to war, even from the beginning of Washington's administration, was not because we had not just ground for it. The sources of negotiation had become totally exhausted, while the unsufferable injuries we experienced were constantly augmenting. It was apparent that the British ministry were willing to keep up their deceptive insincere negotiations with us, for no better purpose than to obtain time unmolestedly to depredate upon our men and property, and gain friends among ourselves. Her war for years past has been more detrimental than open hostilities. If she had continued that war from that time to this according to her strength, I believe it would have been better for us. But she was politic. She changed her mode of warfare, and insidiously attacked us on the weak side, making use of gold and intrigue; and has now at length, after years of patience and expostulations in every administration, brought our government to open hostilities, who can have no other possible motive therefor than the defence of our national rights, sovereignty and independence, and this must be well known, for they are dependent entirely on the good sense and patriotism of this nation, not only to be supported in the contest, but for the tenure of their offices. And now, "strange to tell!" after all these injuries and insults being experienced with increasing aggravation from the British lion, and war proclaimed, he has in the view of some, who call themselves Americans, all at once put off his rapacious voracious qualities, and assumed the innocence and mildness of the lamb! Can the leopard so suddenly change his spots, and transfer them to his opponent? For now, Rev. gentlemen, you are in your publications ascribing righteousness to the government of Britain, and imputing iniquity to your own rulers. You say, preach and publish, that the war in which we are engaged, is unjust on our part, that it is wicked and murderous—that it proceeds from a rash madness in our rulers, to please the French emperor—that England has not given us sufficient provocation to excite our hostilities against her, that she is disposed to do justice in matters of difference with us—that those who abet and

lend their assistance to carry on the war, in personal service, or by the loan of their money, are guilty of blood—that you cannot pray for the success of our arms, &c. By your late publications which I have been able conveniently to obtain, I find that your principal arguments against the war, are similar to those made use of by the 34 addressers of Congress to their constituents, offering reasons for their negative, upon the question of war. This address seems to have furnished abundance of matter for later publications.

I SHALL now, Rev. gentlemen, endeavour fairly to meet the method taken, and the arguments used in opposition to the present war. And in this I beseech you, of your clemency, to hear me patiently, for I have undertaken an arduous task, to follow, arrest and bring before the public, gentlemen long winded and expert in devious ways. No sinister orators to gain a wicked end could do better than the opposers of the present war. They misrepresent as to matters of fact. This is evident with respect to the thirty-four members of Congress who became addressers to their constituents. In page 9th, they say; “Ever since the United States have been a nation, this subject (viz. of impressment,) has been a matter of complaint and negotiation, and every former administration have treated it according to its obvious nature, as a subject rather for arrangement, than for war: it existed in the time of Washington, yet this father of his country recommended no such resort.” This is true, gentlemen; but he considered it a just occasion of war notwithstanding, for in 1792, he thus writes to Mr. Pinkney who was minister in London, June 11th, “In order to urge a settlement of this point (impressment) before a new occasion may arise, it may not be amiss to draw their attention to the peculiar irritation excited on the last occasion, and the difficulty of avoiding our making immediate reprisals on their seamen here.” Thus although Washington did not recommend war, he considered it a just occasion of war, as it required reprisals of their seamen here—so have the addressers misrepresented Washington’s sentiments. And in another letter to Mr. Pinkney

dated the 6th of November following, Washington writes, "It is impossible to devolve to you the inconvenience of this practice, and the impossibility of letting it go on." Little could Washington then think it could go on for twenty years longer. Mr. Pinkney our minister at London in conversation with Mr. Bond who was appointed by lord Grenville to converse with him on the subject, in writing to our secretary in 1793, says, "I answered, unless we could come to some accommodation which might insure our seamen against this oppression, measures would be taken to cause the inconvenience to be equally felt on both sides." Does this look as if Washington considered the practice of impressment, no occasion of war? It is surely an hostile threat. And again, President Washington in writing by his secretary to Mr. King our minister in London, Sept. 10, 1796, tells him, "If the British government have any regard to our rights, any respect to our nation, *and place any value on our friendship*, they will even facilitate to us the means of relieving our fellow citizens." Is not this a clear declaration, that if the practice of impressment be not relinquished, and those impressed be not relieved, that they will no longer have our friendship; but that we shall assume an hostile attitude towards them? Compare the language of the addressers with those declarations of Washington. They say of him, "Yet this father of his country recommended no such resort," (viz.) war. This is but a subtle expression, full of deceit, true in words; but false in sentiment. The idea which their constituents will receive, is, that Washington did not conceive the continuance of impressment a just ground of war, which is certainly incorrect. The addressers again say, "it existed in the time of Adams, yet notwithstanding the zeal in support of our maritime rights, which distinguished his administration, *war was never suggested by him as the remedy*;" this is incorrect. Judge Marshall when acting as secretary of state under Mr. Adams, wrote thus to Mr. King, our minister in London, on the 20th September, 1800, "Should we impress from the merchant service of Great Britain not

only Americans, but foreigners, and even British subjects, how long would such a cause of injury, unredressed, be permitted to pass unrevenged? How long would the government be content with unsuccessful remonstrances and unavailing memorials? I believe, sir, that only the most prompt correction of, and compensation for, the abuse, would be permitted as satisfaction in such a case." The judge then urges a relinquishment of the practice, lest they "force our government into measures which may very probably terminate in an open rupture." Is it not apparent here, that *war was really suggested* as a remedy, under Adams' administration, notwithstanding the declaration of the addressers to the contrary?

THE addressers again say, "During the eight years Mr. Jefferson stood at the helm of affairs, it still continued a subject of controversy and negotiation, but it was never made a cause for war." Here is another of their deceptive sentences, true in words, but so managed as to convey false doctrine. "It was never made a cause for war"—True, because our government did not go to war, and not because they did not consider it a just ground for it. This is manifest by a recurrence to public documents. Mr. Jefferson, by his secretary, wrote to Mr. Pinkney our minister in London, on 20th May, 1807, that, "Without a provision against impressments, no treaty is to be concluded." Here the practice of impressment is considered an effectual bar to peace. It is made the *sine qua non* of a treaty; *none was* to be formed while the practice remained.

THE addressers again observe, "It was reserved for the present administration to press this topic to the extreme and most dreadful resort of nations." And good reason why, because this grievous complaint has been a just occasion of war in the uniform sentiment of every administration of our government; and the only effect of twenty years of negotiation and arrangements has been to increase the evil.

IN page 8, the addressers observe thus, "The claim of Great Britain pretends to no greater extent, than to take British seamen from private merchant vessels; in the

exercise of this claim, her officers take American seamen, and foreign seamen in American service, and although she disclaims such abuse, *and proffers redress when known*, yet undoubtedly grievous injuries have resulted to the seamen of the United States."

THIS proffering redress when known, is calculated to deceive the people, and is often made use of by the friends of England.

DR. OSGOOD in his solemn protest, &c. pages 10, 11, "With respect to the two first of these provocations, the impressment occasionally of some of our sailors, and an instance or two of outrage in our harbours, it has never been pretended that either of these was authorised by the British government." Before I proceed further, I will propose an amendment of this last sentence without altering a letter or word, and read it thus: 'it has never been pretended *by the British* government, that either of these was authorized.' The Dr. proceeds—"In every instance they were the irregular, unwarranted acts of individuals, subordinate officers, whose rashness and folly no government can at all times and every where restrain; the redress of these grievances however, *and compensation for such injuries, after proof of them has been fairly and fully exhibited*, HAVE NEVER BEEN REFUSED."

To shew the incorrectness of the Dr's. assertion and all similar ones, it is sufficient, only to exhibit a catalogue of reasons why our impressed seamen could not be delivered up when demanded. In this I shall be governed by that inserted in a letter addressed by Mr. John Quincy Adams, to Mr. Harrison Gray Otis, page 18; when the men are demanded he observes—"The lords of the admiralty, after a reasonable time for inquiry and advisement, return for answer, that the ship is on a foreign station, and their lordships can take no further steps in the matter, or that the ship has been taken, and the men have been received in exchange for French prisoners, or that the men had no protections," the impressing officers often having taken them from the men,* "or

* I ISAAC CLARK, of Salem, in the County of Essex, and Commonwealth of Massachusetts. on solemn oath declare, that I was born in the town of Randolph in the County of Norfolk, have

that the men are *probably* British subjects, or that they have entered and taken the bounty ;” to which the officers know how to reduce them, “or that they have been

sailed out of Salem aforesaid, about seven years ; that on the fourteenth day of June, eighteen hundred and nine, I was IMPRESSED, and forcibly taken from the ship *Jaue*, of Norfolk, by the sailing master, (his name was Carr) of his majesty’s ship *Porcupine*, Robert Elliot, commander. I had a protection from the custom house in Salem, which I shewed to Capt. Elliot ; he swore I was an Englishman, tore my protection to pieces before my eyes, and threw it overboard, and ordered me to go to work ; I told him I did not belong to his flag, and I would not do work under it. He then ordered my legs put in irons, and the next morning ordered the master at arms to take me on deck and give me two dozen of lashes ; after receiving them, he ordered him to keep me in irons, and give me one biscuit and a pint of water for twenty-four hours. After keeping me in this situation one week, I was brought on deck, and asked by Capt. Elliot if I would go to my duty ; on my refusing he ordered me to strip, tied me up a second time, and gave me two dozen more, and kept me on the same allowance another week—then ordered me on deck again and asked if I would go to work ; I still persisted that I was an American, and that he had no right to command my services, and I would do no work on board his ship. He told me he would punish me until I was willing to work ; and then gave the third two dozen lashes, ordered a very heavy chain put round my neck, (such as they had used to sling the lower yard,) fastened to a ringbolt in the deck, and that no person, except the master at arms, should speak to me, or give me any thing to eat or to drink, but one biscuit and pint of water for twenty-four hours, until I would go to work. I was kept in this situation NINE WEEKS, when being exhausted by hunger and thirst, I was obliged to yield. After being on board the ship more than two years and an half, and being wounded in an action with a French frigate, I was sent to the hospital ; when partially recovered, I was sent on board the *Impregnable*, a 98 gun ship. My wound growing worse I was returned to the hospital, when the American Consul received a copy of my protection from Salem, and procured my discharge, on the twenty-ninth day of April last.

There were seven impressed Americans on board the *Porcupine*, three of whom had entered.

ISAAC CLARK.

Essay, ss. December 28th, 1812.

Then Isaac Clark personally appeared, and made solemn oath that the foregoing declarations, by him made and subscribed, were true in all their parts. Before,

JOHN PUNCHARD, } Justices of the Peace
M. TOWNSEND. } and of the Quorum.

married, or settled in England. In all these cases, without further ceremony, their discharge is refused. Sometimes their lordships, in a vein of humor, inform the agent that the man has been discharged as *unserviceable*. Sometimes in a sterner tone, they say he was *an impostor*; or perhaps by way of consolation to his relatives and friends, they report that he has fallen in battle against nations in amity with his country. Sometimes they coolly return that there is *no such man on board the ship*, and what has become of him, the agony of a wife and children in his native land may be left to conjecture. When all these and many other such apologies for refusal fail, the native American seaman is discharged." What American but may be detained by one or the other of these apologies, especially if he be out of sight, as it is their policy to put them, losing no time to ship them from ship to ship, that their track may be lost; then they say, "*there is no such man on board.*" What will the public think of the declarations of the addressers and Dr. Osgood, in view of this list of apologies?

THE next thing I would take notice of, found in the writings of the British friends calculated to deceive the people, is, their endeavour to wipe off the odium from the British ministry in influencing the savages to hostilities against us. The addressers say in page 6— "Without any express act of Congress, an expedition was last year set on foot and prosecuted into the Indian territory, which had been relinquished by treaty on the part of the United States. And now we are told about the agency of British traders as to Indian hostilities." The argument of the addressers here, is simply this. There is no need of looking abroad for influence to put the savages in a hostile attitude against us; seeing, without any express act of Congress, an expedition was set on foot and prosecuted into the Indian territory, which had been relinquished by treaty on the part of the U. States." This argument goes to exculpate the British, and implicate our government. Thus this argument appears to be understood by the Rev. Mr. Channing; in his sermon July 23, 1812, page 9—"When I consider

what I blush to repeat, the accusation we have brought against England without a shadow of proof, that she hath stirred up the savages to murder our defenceless citizens on the frontiers."

THE Rev. Mr. Thayer retains the same idea also; see his sermon of August 20, 1812—"With a glowing pencil, a high official attempt was made to portray the outrage, the barbarities, the carnage, in which the savages on our frontiers were actors, and to represent them as stimulated to those cruelties by the government of Great Britain. 'I am pained at the heart, I cannot hold my peace,' on finding this 'railing accusation,' brought forward without proof, and apparently for the sole purpose of strengthening a prejudice and of enkindling a resentment, which have gone very far towards the destruction of our liberties."

BUT why should Mr. Channing blush, and Mr. Thayer's heart be pained at this executive suggestion? Is it because the idea wants proof, and therefore an imputation on our government, or because it is so full of proof, and an imputation on their friends the British?

THAT England has been capable of stirring up the savages against us, is no new doctrine. It is an acknowledged truth that she did so in our last war with her. This is one charge alleged against his Britannic Majesty, found in our declaration of independence. "He has excited domestic insurrections among us, and has endeavoured to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian savages, whose known rule of warfare is, an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions." If then, why may not the same persons do it now? Possibly some may endeavour to palliate, and say by way of excuse, that we were then at war with her. Let that be for an alter consideration. I believe we have ample evidence, of her counselling, aiding and assisting the savages in their wars with us since that time, when we were at peace with her, as they have been supplied with arms of British manufactory, and had artificial Indians as leaders among them; but in conjunction with what evidence the nature of the case will

admit, I will summon Dr. Osgood as a witness upon this case, who is reputed by you, with boldness, freely to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The Dr. appears with the sacred oath upon him, solemnly before GOD, even in his sanctuary. His affidavit is made and written in a testimony which he bore on the 19th day of November, 1795, thus, "Chagrined with disappointment in the object of the war, and mortified with the advantages which they had been forced to concede at the peace; the British government were on the watch for a plausible pretext to evade or delay the complete execution of the treaty. Too soon this pretext was afforded them." "They availed themselves of what they considered as an infraction on our part, to excuse a yet greater on theirs—in keeping possession of the western posts, *and thereby facilitating the inroads of hostile savages upon our defenceless frontiers.*"

HERE then, Rev. gentlemen, we see, that with this plenary evidence in this trial, more than two or three witnesses agreeing, and none contradicting, and all circumstances corroborating, the jury, the people, instantly bring in their verdict *guilty*, as it respects the British government, and find that they have been capable not only in time of war, but, also, in time of peace, of instigating the savages cruelly to murder, tomahawk, and scalp innocent families, mothers, and children, and that too, when they were in the best and most favorable situation to prevent it, viz. when they held possession of our military posts, on our frontiers! We will now, if you have patience, attend to the recent case. The charge runs thus, "In reviewing the conduct of Great Britain towards the United States, our attention is necessarily drawn to the warfare just renewed by the savages on one of our extensive frontiers; a warfare which is known to spare neither age nor sex, and to be distinguished by features peculiarly shocking to humanity. It is difficult to account for the activity and combinations which have for some time been developing themselves among the tribes in constant intercourse with British

traders and garrisons, without connecting their hostility with that influence; and without recollecting the authenticated examples of such interpositions heretofore furnished by the officers and agents of that government." In this charge the British government are taken on *suspicion*, it runs no higher than that, "it is *difficult* to account for," &c. Now on trial let us see whether there be not reasonable *grounds* for this *suspicion*. If there be not, the accuser is in the fault, and found over-jealous. The first circumstance which I shall name, as laying a foundation for this suspicion, I will give you, as I read it in the Universal Gazette, printed in Washington City, No. 760. "*And now,*" exclaim the addressers, "we are told about the agency of British traders as to Indian hostilities." That, to be sure, is an affecting thing; to tell such men as these pamphleteers show themselves to be, "*now,*" or at any time, about the "*agency of British traders*" in stirring up the Indians against us, is quite enough to wound their delicate sensibilities. But, nevertheless, when the federal gentlemen signed their address, *there had been printed and laid before them* a report from the war office, containing extracts of official letters addressed to that department, from officers commanding military posts, and others on the Indian frontiers, apprizing government of hostile combinations among the Indian tribes, fostered and fomented by the British. These letters embrace a period of four years, from the 24th of May, 1807, to the 23d of November, 1811; and the very first one is from Capt. Dunham, then of the U. States' army, dated at Michilimackinack, the same person of that name, who now publishes a virulent party paper, somewhere in the State of Vermont, and who, so long ago as 1807, wrote to the Secretary of War, that "there could be no doubt that the object and intention of this second Adam, (meaning the Prophet) under the pretence of restoring to the aborigines their former independence, and the savage character its ancient energies, is in reality, to induce a general effort to rally and to *strike somewhere a desperate blow.*" All the letters corroborate what is represented by Capt. Dun-

ham ; and most of them state in substance that “the powerful influence of the British has been exerted in a way alluring to the savage character.” The letters are from men of different politics, separated from each other by great distances, and all writing to the head of the War-Office, at dates unknown to each other. They cannot be suspected of combining to support, by false intelligence, measures of government not at the time in contemplation. It was upon authentic information of this kind that administration acted, when it ordered troops to Vincennes, whence they proceeded to the Wabash ; not with wantonly hostile intentions towards the Indians, as the addressers insinuate ; but, as a committee of Congress on Indian affairs reported on the 13th of June, 1812, in pursuance of the provisions of the act of Congress entitled “An act for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions, in order to establish a new post on the Wabash, and to march against and disperse [without bloodshed] the armed combination under the Prophet. In this part of their discussion, the addressers are guilty of one of those little verbal artifices, several of which are to be found in their performance : they say that the expedition to the Wabash was set on foot “without any express act of Congress ;” nor in truth, was there any “express” act made for the occasion ; the act in existence, relative to invasions, &c. fully justifying the measure.* The Prophet had assembled his

* The Wabash expedition of Nov. 1811, precisely corresponds with the policy of President Washington, in the year 1790. In his message to Congress, on the 8th of December, of that year, he says, “It has been heretofore known to Congress, that frequent incursions have been made on our frontier settlements by certain banditti of Indians, from the northwest side of the Ohio. These, with some of the tribes dwelling on and near the Wabash, have of late been particularly active in their depredations, &c. These aggravated provocations rendered it essential to the safety of the western settlements, that the aggressors should be made sensible, that the government of the Union is not less capable of punishing their crimes, than it is disposed to respect their rights and reward their attachment. As this object could not be effected by *defen-*

bands, ready to fall upon our frontiers : Gov. Harrison marched, not to make war, but peaceably to disperse the Indians if he could. The battle of Tippecanoe proves that the inclinations of the Indians were hostile, as the event shewed that they were well prepared for action. It was the fault of the Indians, and not of the administration, that the expedition and the battle took place. The Prophet first threatened invasion, and first commenced the fight.

As associated ideas are connected, so it has always been considered, that a war with England would produce one with the savages. In the year 1795, Mr. Ames, in Congress, when pleading for the appropriations to be made to carry into effect the British treaty, considered a failure in it would produce a war with England, and in contemplating the distresses thereof, he combined the horrors and bloody scenes of the tomahawk and scalping-knife. The association of his ideas naturally flowed from what our country had experienced from the resentment of England. And at the battle of Tippecanoe, it was found that the savages were armed with new guns and rifles of the British manufactory ; and that they are now stimulated by the British, and fighting with them, against us, is conceded. Now do not all these circumstances give reasonable grounds of *suspicion*, that the hostilities of the savages proceeded from the British influence ?—This is more than probable, as a recapitulation of the arguments will show. The Congress of 1776 brings this charge against the ministry of England. Dr. Osgood bears witness that the British, in holding our posts on our frontiers, contrary to the articles of peace, and before 1794, facilitated the inroads of

sive measures, it became necessary to put in force the act which empowers the President to call out the militia for the protection of the frontiers : And I have accordingly authorised an expedition, in which the regular troops in that quarter are combined with such drafts of militia as were deemed sufficient." Thus under Washington, as under Madison, there was no "express" act ; in both cases the executive acted under a previously existing law. There is a great similitude in all the leading points, between the expedition of Harmer, in 1790, and that of Harrison, in 1811.

the hostile savages on our defenceless frontiers.' Our government have received official communications from officers commanding forts in different places affirming that by the British influence the Prophet was exciting the Indians to hostilities; the Prophet had actually many warriors of different tribes collected; Gov. Harrison pacifically met them, with a proposition for a conference. The Prophet commenced actual hostilities—they are found to be supplied with British arms and ammunition. All these circumstances support the idea of the British influence in the hostilities of the savages beyond *bare suspicion*. If the savages had had any matter of complaint against us, it is reasonable to suppose they would have suggested it; but I have never heard that they have made any complaint, or brought any allegations against our people or government, as the ground of their present war with us, so that we have all the evidence of their being stimulated to the war by British influence, that the nature of the case will admit, and all that could possibly be expected without a mere accident, as the British intrigue for dividing us was disclosed by Henry.

IN view of this evidence, it is easy to call to mind the language of Mr. Channing upon this subject; it is page 9—"When I consider, what I blush to repeat, the accusation which we have brought against England, *without a shadow of proof*, that she has stirred up the savages to murder our defenceless citizens on the frontier." Here we have, not the shadow only, but even the substance of proof. If Mr. Channing be in the habit of *blushing*, it is presumed that he will increase it, by reflecting on this, his false and criminating assertion. And the Rev. Mr. Thayer is still more to be pitied. He is contemplating the same idea in page 7—"I am pained at my heart, I cannot hold my peace, on finding this railing accusation brought forward without proof." What will the heart felt pain of this Reverend gentleman be, in view of the plenary evidence we have of this atrocious and cruel conduct of the British ministry? We may well conclude, from the evidence here produced, that the Presi-

dent might with propriety have expressed something far beyond a bare *suspicion*, in the case of the British influence in stirring up the hostilities of the savages against us. And even now, since hostilities actually exist, from what principle can the British justify themselves, in employing such a mode of warfare against us as the savages carry on? The laws of all civilized nations forbid it, and the laws of Christianity do not justify it. What would be thought and said of the government of the U. States, if they should retaliate on the British, and contrary to, and in contempt of all the feelings of humanity, hire certain banditti, to penetrate the British territories, tomahawk, scalp, and destroy without distinction of non-age and dotage? O ye falsely called "Bulwark" of the mild religion of the blessed Saviour, let Pagans blush at your acknowledged conduct!

In this connexion I will still pursue that little deceptive verbal artifice of the thirty-four addressers in its consequences. Page 6—"Without any *express* act of Congress an expedition was set on foot," &c. The Rev. Mr. Thayer, by this declaration of the addressers, is enabled to understand and comprehend the meaning of a certain clause in the proclamation of his Excellency Gov. Strong, for our fast, issued the 26th of June last. This is manifest from Mr. Thayer's own words, page 7—"By this charge an act of perfidy has been brought to light, which, but for this, might have been buried in oblivion. It rests on the responsibility of thirty-four members of our national government, whose character for veracity is irreproachable; that 'without any express act of Congress an expedition was last year set on foot into the Indian territory, which had been relinquished by treaty on the part of the United States.' Till I came to a knowledge of this fact, I could not fully comprehend this petition we were instructed to prefer in the proclamation for the last fast—"that He would dispose the people of these states, to do justice to the Indian tribes, to enlighten, and not exterminate them." With a knowledge of this instance of treachery, we need not look to a foreign nation for a cause of the hostility and

barbarity of a race of beings, who, by the sacredness which they attach to all pledges and treaties, loudly admonish civilized nations to respect whatsoever things are true and honest." Mr. Thayer, it seems, perfectly understood the addressers as they implicated our executive; they planted the bitter root of deception; his Excellency Gov. Strong watered it, and the Rev. Mr. Thayer has produced the fruit, in boldly charging our government with an "instance of treachery," and fix this as the cause of the hostilities of the savages. The words of the addressers are more buttered than their followers; "but the poison of asps is under their lips." If a charitable Christian minister among us, such as Mr. Thayer, could find in that sentence of his Excellency's proclamation, "treachery" in our government, and a violation of their faith with the savages, and a desire to exterminate them; what will an invidious interpreter amongst them, belonging to the nation with which we are at war, find in it, to whet their resentment, and to stir up all their savage fury against us, for the noble purpose of securing their existence. This the savages must believe, when they are informed that the sentiment proceeded from the governor of Massachusetts, who is a wise man, and knows the evil designs of Congress against them, and being a friend of his red brethren, and friendly towards their great Father the king, has published it in a proclamation to the people. When his Excellency shall, for once consider, that this ill-fated sentence may be (which is more than probable) the occasion of mothers and their tender babes suffering the pains of death under the torturing savage hand, how will he rue the inconsiderate, unguarded moment which gave that sentiment publicity; and that too, when the insinuation was as unfounded, as detrimental and cruel?

It appears to me, that there is something deceptive in the sentiment of the addressers, with respect to the necessity or grounds of the war. Or at least they darken counsel with words without knowledge. Page 6, they say, "It appears to the undersigned, that the wrongs of which the United States have to complain, although in

some respects very grievous to our interests, and in many, humiliating to our pride, were yet of a nature, which, in the present state of the world, either would not justify war, or which war would not remedy. Thus, for instance, the hovering of British vessels upon our coasts, and the occasional insults to our ports, imperiously demand such a systematic application of harbor and sea coast defence, as would repel such aggressions ; but in no light, can they be considered as making a resort to war, at the present time, on the part of the U. States, either necessary or expedient." There appears to be something a little enigmatical in this sentence. "The hovering of British vessels upon our coasts, and the occasional insults to our ports, imperiously demand such a systematic application of harbor and sea coast defence, as would repel such aggressions." What are our harbor and sea coast defence ? Our forts and navy. What is a systematic application of them ? To apply them to the use for which they were made, viz. to let off our cannon in our defence. But in what degree ? So as would repel such aggressions. What next follows ? This—"but, in no light, can they be considered as making a resort to *war*, at the present time, on the part of the U. States, either necessary, or expedient." What, when these aggressions imperiously demand an *application* of our harbor and sea coast *defence* ? I always thought this was the essence of war ; but in no light is it so considered by the addressers—this is mysterious—to me it is a riddle deserving a place in Thomas' Almanack ; and I presume any of us would gladly wait for the next year for a satisfactory solution.

ANOTHER item in which the addressers and other federal writers have conveyed erroneous ideas to the people, is with respect to the suppression of debate on the important question of war. As answer to what the addressers have said on this subject I give you as follows. "This pamphlet tells us, that, on the momentous question of war with G. Britain, the right of public debate, in the face of the world, and especially their constituents, has been denied to the representatives."

Here it is admitted that the *right of debate* was not precluded ; that only it was not permitted “in the *face of the world*, and especially of constituents.” And because they could not talk in the *face of the world*, the federal gentlemen would not talk at all. Now, when we consider that all congressional argument, to be effective, must operate to the conviction of the representative body alone, it would seem that a debate with closed doors would be the most desirable of all things for a good logician ; because, in that case, he would have the members by themselves, and instill into them the persuasive deductions of his reasoning. If therefore the federal gentlemen did not like this closed door opportunity of debate, it shows that their object was not to convince the understandings of the Representatives of the people, and thereby prevent the war, but that their debate was to influence the passions of the people themselves. There was no hindrance to debate when the doors were shut ; but the federalists themselves “declined discussion.” This admission is fatal to their argument. At page 4, of this federal address, will be found the following confession : “The intention to wage war and invade Canada, had been long since *openly* avowed. The object of hostile menace had been ostentatiously announced.” The reader is desired to mark this passage, and to impress it on his mind, that the federalists acknowledge the determination to go to war had been for a long time, announced ; *openly* avowed by the majority. Indeed every body must remember the fact : for the avowal was treated with much ridicule by the opposition both in and out of Congress. Well, then ; the resolution to go to war with Great Britain was avowed, the federalists admit that it had been, *long before the secret part of the session*, avowed *openly* and *ostentatiously*, yet what did these same federalists do when that avowal was made ? The doors were open then ; they might have spoken in the face of the world, and of their constituents at that time. Did they do so ? No ! They were *dumb*. It was their marked policy to be *silent*. The truth of this is notorious. At Washington, when

the doors of Congress *were* open, when the question of war was fully announced, when the committee of foreign relations made their report in part, when every measure proposed on the side of the majority inevitably led to war; what was the conduct of those federal addressers then? Why—let them blush, if they can—caricaturing a legislator that stood up for the country; they were giving countenance to two or three caricaturists at Washington, who were employed to depict Mr. Porter on the back of a terrapin! This was the occupation of *honorable* men, when the doors of Congress *were* open—yes, *open* in the face of the world, in the face of their constituents, and when the subject of war was stated “as for debate.” The republicans invited discussion: *they* spoke on the topic; and spoke so much without being answered by the opposition, that a republican member, (I think it was Mr. Bibb, of Georgia) threatened to call the *previous question* on his own political friends, if they did not decline further speaking, seeing that the federal representatives had decided not to speak at all. Thus the federal gentlemen not only declined discussion” when the doors were shut; but they “declined discussion” when the doors were open. When the question of war came up—*not for discussion*, but for *decision*—these very same men, who had *waved* the right of debate at the proper period of the session—these very same men, who, for at least *six months*, had had a fair opportunity to speak to the subject, complained of *tyranny*, because, when the moment to *act* had arrived, that moment to which the majority had uniformly pointed from the commencement of the session, the opposition were not allowed to waste in idle debate the precious time of Congress, and array by inflammatory harangues, a party *out of doors*, against the constituted authorities! And what greater occasion was there for discussion at last than at first? None. The addressers, at page 4, confess that, “*No one reason for war was intimated, but such as was of a nature public and notorious!*” If all the reasons for war were notorious before the doors of Congress were shut, and the federal members refused to discuss the question

then, with what face can they conjure up a necessity for subsequent debate, and cry out *danger to freedom!* from a temporary secret session? Why, if they would not speak when the subject was open for *discussion*, did they think it tyrannical to close the doors upon them when the question was proposed for *decision*? Yet, in fact, there was no infringement of the right of debate. The pamphlet does not say there was. It concedes that the federal gentlemen *might* have spoken on the subject of the war, both in open and secret session; but they would speak on neither occasion. They complain then of their own negligence. If men will not speak when doors are open, and will not speak when they are shut, what propriety is there in a complaint of closed doors?

THE whole of this complaint of the addressers is couched in terms calculated to deceive the people. They do not say they were denied the freedom of debate, only in a qualified manner. By an artful combination of words, they have conveyed an idea to the people, which their address, taken together, will contradict; yet the root of deception has vegetated, it has taken effect, and brought forth its baneful fruit in Dr. Osgood; in his Protest, page 14, he observes, "Attempts will first be made to bridle the tongues and pens of the opponents. This has been done in Congress already, while the war question was under debate; it was by gagging the mouth of a *Randolph*, and other enlightened patriots, that the act passed." How astonishing that the reverend doctor should retain such sentiments! I never have heard that Mr. Randolph has made any complaint, on the ground of the *freedom of debate*, notwithstanding his propensity to loquacity. I have always understood Mr. Randolph to be a gentleman possessed of very considerable powers and penetration of mind; and this is the *only reason*, I can render, why *his name* is not entered on the list of the thirty-four addressers.

ANOTHER instance in which the adherents of Great Britain in this country have deceived our fellow-citizens, is, relative to the sincerity of our government, to adjust existing differences with England, and especially upon

the subject of impressment. The addressers in their 9th page recur to certain documents, "that the real state of this real question may be understood;" they say, "Mr. King, our minister in England, obtained a disavowal of the British government of the right to impress "American seamen," naturalized as well as natives, on the high seas. An arrangement had advanced nearly to a conclusion on this basis, and was broken off *only* because Great Britain insisted to retain the right on the "narrow seas." What however, was the opinion of the American minister on the probability of an arrangement, appears from the public documents communicated to Congress, in the session of 1808, as stated by Mr. Madison in these words: "At the moment the articles were expected to be signed, an exception of the 'narrow seas' was urged and insisted on by Lord St. Vincent, and being utterly inadmissible on our part, the negotiation was abandoned." Mr. King seems to be of opinion, however, "that with more time than was left him for the experiment, the object might have been overcome." This, Rev. gentlemen, is a part of what the addressers have offered, "that the real state of the question may be understood." And it seems that the Rev. Mr. Channing has so understood it. In pages 8 and 9, he observes thus, "When I consider our unwillingness to conclude an arrangement with her, on that very difficult and irritating subject of impressment, notwithstanding she proffered such an one as our own minister at that court, and our present secretary of state declared "was both honorable and advantageous to the United States." Now, Rev. gentlemen, I beg liberty to say, "that the real state of the question may be understood," that this is of a piece with the rest of the British negotiations with us. In them she *never* desired to come to any equitable settlement with the United States. She has exercised her policy towards us, made professions of great desires that all existing difficulties might be amicably adjusted, always ready to negotiate, and when negotiation was protracted to the greatest length, and as much time as possible consumed, she comes upon the point of conclusion, and just ready to sign the articles

of agreement ; and thus keeping America agape, tantalizing them with delusive expectations, till the signatures must be affixed ; then all at once, and well thought of too, the court of admiralty must be consulted. Lord St. Vincent insists upon an exception of the "narrow seas," and this being utterly inadmissible on our part, the negotiation is abandoned. What would any adjustment of the subject be to us, if we should concede to impressment upon the "narrow seas," through which almost all our navigation passes ? It has been the manifest policy of the cabinet of England, to lead our negotiations and our country to believe they are nearer a close of amicable adjustment of differences, than they think themselves to be. This is apparent from the documents transmitted by the President to Congress, November 18, 1812. Mr. Russell, in giving a narrative of the conversation he had with Lord Castlereagh, in which conversation Lord Castlereagh communicated to Mr. Russell as follows : "The question of impressment," he went on to observe, "was attended with difficulties, of which neither I, nor my government appeared to be aware. "Indeed," he continued, "there has evidently been much misapprehension on this subject, and an erroneous belief entertained that an arrangement, in regard to it, has been nearer an accomplishment than the facts will warrant." Even our friends in Congress, I mean (observing perhaps some alteration in my countenance) those who were opposed to going to war with us, have been so confident in this *mistake*, that they have ascribed the *failure* of such an arrangement *solely to the misconduct of the American government*. This error probably originated with Mr. King, for being much esteemed here, and always well received by the persons then in power, he seems to have misconstrued their readiness to listen to his representations and their warm professions of a disposition to remove the complaints of America, in relation to impressment, into a supposed conviction on their part of the propriety of adopting the plan he had proposed. But Lord St. Vincent, whom he might have thought he had brought over to his opinion, appears never for a moment to have

ceased to regard all arrangement on the subject to be attended with formidable, if not *insurmountable obstacles*. This is obvious from a letter which his lordship addressed to Sir William Scott at the time. Here Lord Castlereagh read a letter contained in the records before him, in which Lord St. Vincent states to Sir Wm. Scott, the zeal with which Mr. King had assailed him on the subject of impressment, confesses his own perplexity and total incompetency to discover any practical project for the safe discontinuance of the practice, and asks for counsel and advice. "Thus you see," proceeded Lord Castlereagh, "that the *confidence* of Mr. King on this point was *entirely unfounded*." Is not this document, Rev. gentlemen, a sufficient answer to all the objections which have been made against the administrators of our government, touching their insincerity in negotiating on the subject of impressment? Here it is apparent that the British negotiators acted with duplicity and deceit; and answered their purposes of policy in it; so long as we would negotiate with them, we gave them opportunity to depredate upon us, to make what interest they could in this country, to have their amicable dispositions published in all their papers in the United States, and to cast the odium of non-agreement upon our government; and so far were they successful as that thirty-four members of Congress were found capable of giving publicity to the hurtful error.

THIS is not the only instance of British contrivance to give their friends in this country a pretext to disseminate black suspicions of insincerity in our executive to amicable adjustments of differences with England. A treaty formed and consented to by our ministers Messrs. Monroe and Pinkney, must, before it be presented to our government for ratification, have an inadmissible article added to it, which our negotiators objected to in the time of it, with declarations, that it could not be received. The treaty arrives with its inadmissible addition. Mr. Jefferson then being president, thought not proper to lay it before the Senate for their advice and consent. This treaty then, by the friends of Eng-

land, was spoken of in general terms as being very advantageous to us, without ever hinting at the inadmissible article ; and our government spoken of in the British papers in this country, as being totally destitute of an amicable disposition toward England. Is it unreasonable to suppose that the British ministry had sagacity sufficient in the outset of these negotiations, to foresee their general progress and terminations : that the subject of impressment must finally be referred to the board of admiralty, and that they would except the "narrow seas," and also that the inadmissible article must be added ? With respect to the subject of impressment, it is granted that England never pretended to the right of impressing our men ; but of what consequence are those professions, as long as she makes a constant practice of it ? The addressers in page 8, say, "The claim of Great Britain pretends to no further extent, than to take British seamen from private merchant vessels. In the exercise of this claim, her officers take American seamen, and foreign seamen, in the American service ; and although she disclaims such abuses, and proffers redress, when known, yet, undoubtedly, grievous injuries have resulted to the seamen of the United States ; but the question is, can war be proper for such cause, before all hope of reasonable accommodation has failed ? Even after the extinguishment of such hope, can it be proper, until our own practice be so regulated as to remove, in such foreign nation, any reasonable apprehension of injury ?" It is highly insulting for us to be told by the British ministry, that their claim pretends to no further extent than to take British seamen ; although this may be true on paper, while their officers take whom they please with their approbation. Their officers take whom they choose, *not under* so much as a *suspicion* of their being British subjects ; but under a *pretext* only of their being such. Were it as they pretend, that they are British subjects, and deserters from their service, they would be brought to trial, condemned and executed according to their laws ; and not as soon as possible be shifted from one

ship to another, to be sent out of hearing, upon some foreign station. Who ever heard of their executing any for desertion, except our *own citizens* whom they had previously impressed, and by duress compelled to enlist and take the bounty; who after that deserted from them, and the British by information from their friends here, received intelligence of them, seized, condemned, and executed them, as in the case of Wilson, taken out of the Chesapeak, and executed at Halifax. The British officers receive the caresses and approbation of the ministry, for valiantly perpetrating those “disclaimed” acts of hostility against us. The officer who does the best repair, and keeps his complement of men the fullest, is the best fellow. Who ever heard of one of the British officers receiving their disapprobation for their errors in impressment? Nor yet, for any other injury their “rashness” might lead them to do us, even in the murder of Pierce, or the attack on the Chesapeak, unauthorised acts on paper, but approved by the ministry, in their countenancing, and promoting those officers to higher command. So deceptive and hollow-hearted is England, in all things to us. This is a complaint our government have against them—see the President’s message, June 18, 1812. “British cruisers have been in the practice also of violating the rights and the peace of our coasts. They hover over and harass our entering and departing commerce. To the most insulting pretensions they have added the most lawless proceedings in our very harbors: and have wantonly spilt American blood within the sanctuary of our territorial jurisdiction. The principles and rules enforced by that nation, when a neutral nation, against armed vessels of belligerents hovering near her coast, is well known. When called on nevertheless, by the United States to punish the greater offences committed by her own vessels, her government has *bestowed on their commanders additional marks of honor and confidence.*”

THE addressers, in page 8, on the subject of impressment, observe thus—“But the question is, can war be proper for such a cause, before all hope of reasonable

accommodation has failed? Even after extinguishment of such hope, can it be proper, *until our own practice be so regulated* as to remove, in such foreign nation, any reasonable apprehension of injury?" Why cannot the British government so regulate her practice of impressment, as to remove all reasonable apprehension of injuring us? The answer is, there is such a similarity between the American citizens, and British subjects, that it is impossible to discriminate. Very well; how then shall our government regulate our practice in favor of England? For my logic infers, that there is as great a likeness between the British subjects and the citizens of the United States, as there is between the citizens of the United States and the British subjects. What duty, therefore, can our fellow citizens be made to believe our government have neglected in this respect?

ANOTHER instance in which federal writings have been calculated to deceive the people, respects the repeal or modification of the French Berlin and Milan decrees, as they respected our trade. Our government gave the two belligerents to understand, that if either of them would so repeal, or modify their obnoxious edicts, as that they should not affect our trade, an intercourse would be opened with that power, so doing, and closed with the delinquent one, if that also did not do the same in three months after our president had made proclamation of such repeal or modification. England alleges that France was first in the wrong, and must therefore be first in relinquishing her decrees, and that England stood ready and would relinquish her orders in council in the same degree, *pari passu*, or in equal pace. France repeals her decrees as they respected the commerce of the United States only, which was all that our government did or could with propriety require of her; while they remained in full force as they respected other neutrals. This being communicated to our government, the president made proclamation thereof, and urged upon England a repeal of her orders in council as they respected the United States. * But then England recedes from her engagements, and by Mr. Foster, her resident minis-

ter here, gives us to understand in a letter addressed to Mr. Monroe on the 10th of June last, thus, "I have no hesitation, sir, in saying, that Great Britain, as the case has hitherto stood, never did, nor *ever could*, engage to *repeal* her orders as affecting America *alone*, leaving them in force against other states, upon condition that France would except singly and specially America from the operation of her decrees." Though at first there were cavilings made with respect to the evidence of France having relinquished her decrees, as they respected the United States, when the evidence was such as is usual in such cases between nations, and such as we have received from England, by the medium of ministers, yet they insisted upon the written instrument, until the emperor in condescension was pleased to give it. Then Britain and her adherents undertook the denial of the reversion of the French decrees upon the broad ground of their being repealed absolutely and unconditionally with respect to all nations as well as this; a thing which our government never did, nor could with propriety ask of them; and what they have never affirmed; but that they were modified only so as not to injure us—and the denial of the repeal of the French decrees, on this broad ground, is the part which the congressional addressers have taken, where they have none to contradict them. But they convey an idea to their constituents as if those French decrees were not repealed as respects the United States, and so calculated to deceive the people. Perhaps this has contributed to excite the irritation of Dr. Osgood to such a peculiar degree. The Doctor talks roundly upon the subject in the 11th page of his Solemn Protest, "As the British orders were professedly occasioned by the French decrees, it was expected that they would be revoked on the repeal of those decrees." This is granted, that they would, "*pari passu*." The Doctor proceeds—"Our government, having proclaimed that repeal, demanded the revocation of the British orders. England replied that we were mistaken in our assertions of the repeal of the French decrees, and, in proof of our mistake, produced official documents of the French government,

explicitly contradicting our proclamation, and affirming that those decrees, so far from being repealed, were the fundamental laws of the French empire, and therefore were not and never could be repealed." Could not those decrees be the fundamental laws of the French empire, in a restricted sense, and yet be repealed as they respected the United States? The Doctor proceeds—"and therefore were not and never could be repealed." This is something singular, when the decrees contained a provision in themselves, to become null and void on the occurrence of a certain event, viz. as neutral nations should resist those orders in council, and cause themselves to be respected, the French decrees ceased to have effect upon them. The Doctor surely must either have never known or forgotten this. The Rev. gentleman proceeds—"She urged further, that ourselves knew that they were not repealed, by the almost daily loss of our ships and cargoes in consequence of their continued execution; as since the period of their pretended repeal, scores, if not hundreds of our vessels had been seized in French ports, or burnt at sea by French cruisers, while many of their unoffending crews were manacled like slaves, confined in French prisons, or forced on board of French ships to fight against England." The Doctor forgot to tell us those vessels and crews, thus roughly handled in French ports, were British crews sailing under the *flag* of the United States with their *forged papers*. The Doctor now comes to the point. "In opposition, however, to all those proofs, our government, with an hardihood and effrontery, at which demons might have blushed, persisted in asserting the repeal."

HERE, Rev. gentlemen, you see the difference in those assertions which are called contradictory; the British and their friends affirm those decrees are not repealed, that is, on the broad and unlimited ground, before mentioned. Our government do not contradict this; but affirm that they are repealed in a limited manner, especially as they respected the United States, which was all we could ask of France; and so far they are repealed, and the French empire still remains, whatever may be

said of their being its fundamental laws ; the Doctor's commentary thereupon notwithstanding.

THE next thing in which the writings of the federalists are calculated to deceive the people is, that the war proceeds from French influence and a desire to please Bonaparte. Here it is not necessary to quote much of their language expressive of it—the idea is familiar with them. The friends of England have suggested it in Congress, their partizans out have been ready loudly to proclaim it after them. Dr. Osgood, in page 15 of his Protest, observes, when speaking of the authors of the war, “ Their chosen master, *Bonaparte*, however, must be obeyed at every hazard.” I shall not undertake to prove a negative. This can never be required of any ; it belongs to the accuser to bring forward some plausible reason at least, for his accusation. The subject however may deserve some observations.

WHEN we consider any man or any body of men under an influence to obtain a certain object, or having through exertion obtained it, we necessarily consider whether it be an ultimate and last end ; or whether it be a subordinate end, to obtain one yet future which is the last end. To suppose our government should go to war with England *merely* to please the French emperor, is most incongruous ; we must annex some recompense, object or reward, they have in view equivalent to the price they pay for it. The question is, what object have our government in pleasing Bonaparte ? Fear his ire, they cannot ; a wide ocean separates him from us ; and he has neither men nor a navy to annoy us. He has no territory contiguous to us to excite the cupidity of our rulers, as a reward for such a measure. And it is totally inconceivable that they should do it for money, and pocket it among the republican members, and keep it a profound secret ; and if they should bring it into the public treasury, they would make a losing go of it. Their wages thereby in Congress would not be raised, and from their own property they must pay their part of the expense of the war. And to go to war with England for the sake of a trade with France, as Dr. Osgood

suggests, is totally inconsistent. If we could have had a free trade with both, it is impossible we should go to war with either, for the sake of a trade with the other, when we might have peaceably enjoyed the trade of both. The question then returns, What possible object can our government have in view, in going to war with England to “please the French emperor, their master?” Is his *pleasure* the ultimate and last end; without therein having in view any consequent favor, compensation, reward or object whatever? It becomes gentlemen who make these bold assertions, as if they had the whole theory of the business in their minds, to point out the consistency of them; or let them blush, if they be in the habit of blushing, at these unfounded, seditious and criminating assertions. Should the question be retorted, and it be required to point out any other motive which could possibly induce our government to go to war with England—it is answered, that England has never ceased to exercise a hostile disposition towards the United States, since their revolt from her, and absolving all political connexions with her. She early commenced the before unheard of practice of taking by force our citizens to man her navy—she has never ceased piratically to depredate upon our commerce at sea—she sought a pretext to delay fulfilling the treaty of peace with us, and, contrary to its stipulations, held our military posts, and facilitated the depredations of the merciless savages upon our frontiers. She invited our citizens to violate the laws of our land, and facilitated the means to them, by a royal order. She has been ready to negotiate, to deceive our people with false views of her amicable disposition toward us, to cast the blame of non-agreement upon our government, and to gain time to depredate upon our men and property. She has treated with contempt the lawful authority of the United States over her own jurisdiction. She has wantonly murdered our fellow citizens in our own waters. She has promoted her officers, the instruments of those outrages, to higher honor and command. She has placed her armed vessels at the mouths of our harbors, to annoy our out and

home bound trade. While, in her greatest professions of friendship toward us, she has employed her commissioned agents and spies amongst us, for the purpose of disaffecting our people towards their own government, and to aid and assist the friends of Britain, in effecting a political separation of the United States. She has refused to comply with her arrangements with us, made by her accredited minister, after receiving a fulfilment of them on our part, without ever offering a satisfactory reason for her so doing. She assumes our right of the seas to herself, and has laid our commerce under tribute, to be regulated, augmented or diminished, according to the wisdom and pleasure of his Britannic Majesty. And in addition to all this, before our declaration of war against Great Britain, to cap the climax of wrongs received from her, it is no presumption to say, that the late hostilities of the Indians were in consequence of her influence, as it is acknowledged they have been heretofore, in a time of peace with her. These, reverend gentlemen, are some of the reasons which are rendered for a war with Britain; which really comprise, being submitted to without resistance, re-colonization. And are not those reasons highly sufficient? If not, our fathers had no reason to contend with England. But it is granted on all hands they had, without running to France, to bring from thence an influence his Most Christian Majesty had over Congress, to oppose the tyrannical pretensions of the British ministry towards us. And they who now run there for it, must be considered too grossly ignorant for writers, or enemies to our sovereignty and independence.

BUT one more instance will I name (for I am tired with this disgusting business) wherein the federal writers deceive the people, that is, that in our war with England we quit our own ground, and mingle in European contests, and join our destiny with European nations. Thus the congressional pamphleteers express themselves by quoting the words of Washington in page 5th—"Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part

of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humour, or caprice?" And in page 13th—"Every consideration of moral duty and political expedience seems to concur in warning the United States, not to *minge* in this hopeless, and to human eye, interminable European contest." To this idea Mr. Channing follows suit with a bold voice; see his fast sermon of July 23, page 13—when speaking of the war he says, "To see it in its true character, we must consider *against what nation it is waged*, and *with what nation it is connecting us*." And, "When I view my country taking part with the oppressor against the nation which has alone arrested his proud career of victory." And again, "We are linking ourselves with the acknowledged enemy of mankind." Page 14th—"Into contact and communion with this bloody nation, we are brought by this war." "This is the nation with whom we are called to interweave our destinies." How do those bold assertions appear to be true? We have not quitted our own, to stand on foreign ground by declaring war against England. We contend only for our own individual rights. We are not intermeddling with European contests; not taking part in any of their quarrels. Does our contending with England for the sake of our free navigation of the seas, and our sailors' rights, imply a treaty offensive and defensive with France? If not, how are we connecting ourselves with that nation? We are no more connecting ourselves with France in this war, than we should be with any of the Barbary powers, or any pagans of the East Indies, if they by any means had a quarrel with England respecting territorial bounds; or if we also were contending with her for territorial bounds, our connexion with them no more exists from the similarity of the objects for which we both contend. And if France be contending with England, because England steals her subjects from her merchant ships, and prohibits from her her national rights to use the seas, and we be contending with her for our rights in the same objects, this is not interweaving our destinies with hers. Each party must

experience the fate of his own quarrel ; one may obtain his rights, and the other fail—it is by no means necessary that they sink or swim together, because they contend for the same or different objects. “This is the nation,” says Mr. Channing, with whom we are called on to interweave our destinies.” But, by what, or by whom, are we thus called on? Not the circumstance of our being at war with the same power she is ; this does not forbid our being at war with France, before the year is at an end. Are we called on by our government to interweave our destinies with France? No, they have not intimated any such thing, but the contrary ; see the President’s Message to Congress, June 18, 1812. “Whether the United States shall continue passive under these progressive usurpations, and these accumulating wrongs ; or, opposing force to force in defence of their natural rights, shall commit a just cause into the hands of the Almighty Disposer of events, AVOIDING ALL CONNEXIONS WHICH MIGHT ENTANGLE IT IN THE CONTESTS OR VIEWS OF OTHER POWERS.” This is directly the reverse of interweaving our destinies with France or any other power ; nor do I recollect of our being called on, by any portion of our citizens for this purpose. If then, we be not called on by the circumstances of the war, nor by our government, nor yet by any portion of our fellow-citizens, to interweave our destinies with France, we may justly conclude *we* are not yet called on, however soon we may be, to interweave our destinies with France or any other nation. It is hopeful therefore, that Mr. Channing and other writers will a little more accurately study truths and propriety in their next publications upon this subject.

THE Rev. Mr. Thayer, in contemplating upon the executive suggestion that the British influence might be exercised in exciting the hostilities of the savages against us, observes thus, page 7, “By this charge an act of perfidy has been brought to light, which, but for this, might have been buried in oblivion. It rests on the responsibility of thirty-four members of our national

government, whose character for veracity is irreproachable." When Mr. Thayer and the public shall come to consider more maturely that address of the thirty-four members of Congress, and see how it has deceived them, and how admirably well calculated it is in all its parts to deceive the less informed ; and when they consider that this circumstance in the address could not exist from mere accident, but must be the fruit of labor and design, will it not operate, in spite of candor and charity, greatly to diminish, if not totally to destroy, that confidence which has been reposed in them ? It has, so far as it has received circulation, most egregiously deceived many honest minds, and greatly strengthened the erroneous ; and with its artful cloud of dust, it totally blinds the wavering. What awful delusion must their constituents be possessed of, if confined to their publications ? Such writings as that address, if not treason and felony, must be considered a high misdemeanor ; it is adhering to and giving our enemies aid and comfort with a bold hand. The members of our national council are privileged ; the freedom of debate admits of things being spoken on the floor of Congress, which are not suitable to publish to the world. Why did not those querulous members bring up to view those deceptive ideas contained in their pamphlet, in their debates in Congress ; but because they knew they would be so promptly answered, and their folly so readily exposed, that the people would not have been deceived by them, nor would they have affected the then approaching Presidential election, as sending them among the people, where their folly could not so readily be presented to the public view ?

THE next thing in rhetorical order, in federal writings, after *misrepresentation*, follows *defamation*. The thirty-four pamphleteers lay a foundation for this, by implication and consequence. And here it becomes necessary again to quote the premises from which the consequence is drawn. In page 6, they say, "With respect to the Indian war, of the origin of which but very imperfect information has as yet been given to the public." Why could they not have told their constituents, what infor-

mation they had obtained, beginning with Capt. Dunham's letter, written in 1807, setting forth the British influence among the savages, and how our government were repeatedly receiving information of the same kind from various officers down to the year 1811? Perhaps this would not have answered their purpose so well! They proceed, "Without any express act of Congress, an expedition was last year set on foot, and prosecuted into the Indian territory, which had been relinquished by treaty on the part of the United States." Now comes the consequence, "and now we are told about the agency of British traders, *as to Indian hostilities.*" This is a master stroke. They have begotten the ideas and presented the ill formed thing, in embryo, to public view; but in a fertile soil. Their numerous pupils have made rapid improvements. The idea has grown to the most execrating slander. Mr. Thayer in his 7th page predicates perfidy of our government, thus—"by this charge an act of *perfidy* is brought to light." And he acknowledges its origin, thus, "it rests on the responsibility of *thirty-four members* of our national government, whose character for veracity is irreproachable." Let it remain so; I presume they are not envied! The reverend gentleman proceeds—"Rather therefore, than lift up our voice to Heaven, in supplication for a blessing on a war, precipitately begun, and *founded in unrighteousness*, let us pray," &c. That the war should take place so suddenly, so totally *unexpected*, seems to be a circumstance, by the federal writers to attach the greater guilt to our rulers. Dr. Osgood, page 3 of his Protest—"The feelings of every man, capable of the least reflection, must be shocked beyond measure by so *sudden* and *unexpected* a fall from peace and plenty, into the complicated horrors of war." Page 12—"It is therefore the more wonderful, and can be accounted for on no other principle, but the imperceptible influence which the author of all evil, the spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience, has been permitted to exert in the hearts of dark-minded, cool, deliberate, wicked rulers." But how it is that these "cool, deliberate, wicked rulers" all at once

become frantic, I can't imagine, except, as the Doctor observes in page 14, "Conscious of their guilt and danger, but destitute, as fallen angels, of any heart to repent, party spirit and rage have so worked them up that they have at length become desperate, and in a fit of *desperation have proclaimed war.*" Here defamation of our rulers comes out in hard words and round periods, with all the majesty and solemnity imaginable. This fit of desperation in our rulers contributed to render the existence of the war so sudden and unexpected to Dr. Osgood, and the Rev. Mr. Laurence—see his sermon of August 20, 1812; page 11th, he observes, "We would by no means impede the current of excessive grief, but would rather obediently raise our mournful voice, with the increasing multitude of genuine patriots, to the capitol, where the monster WAR received its *unexpected birth.*" But there seems to be a little something crooked, running through errors. Dr. Osgood, in his 15th page, speaking of the war, makes this frank confession, "My brethren, the blood runs cold in my veins at the prospect of the heart chilling scenes before us. The thing we *greatly feared has come upon us.*" How the war should exist, so sudden, and totally unexpected, to gentlemen, as taking place in a fit of desperation in our rulers, and at the same time so "greatly feared" by them, is a little mysterious to me! I do not understand the consistency of their *greatly fearing* that which was *totally unexpected!* But then, no matter for that. *Truth and consistency* have been old hampers to writers in all ages, and it seems, as if to get rid of the clog, the wisdom of some of our modern writers had determined to let them grow *obsolete!* There is, however, an apology, which ought in candor to be made for the inconsistency of those reverend gentlemen, viz. they have but too well copied, and imbibed the sentiments of their great prototype, the address of the thirty-four—in page 4, we are informed that "They (the people) have been carefully kept in ignorance of the progress of measures, until the purposes of administration were consummated, and the fate of the country sealed." It is natural here to understand that the purposes of administration were

consummated, when war was declared; and that by this also, "the fate of the country sealed." The people being carefully kept in this ignorance, seems to be that which rendered the declaration of war so totally unexpected to those reverend gentlemen.

HERE then, we may do well, to see what evidence may be collected from the words of the addressers, that there was some important thing in the "progress of measures," which was "carefully" concealed from the knowledge of the people, which they ought to have known. They say, immediately preceding this declaration, "Except the message of the President of the United States, which is now before the public, *nothing confidential was communicated.*" No important thing, then, in the President's communication, could be hidden from the people. They proceed, "That message contained *no fact, not previously known.*" The people know *all* then, as yet. "The intention to wage war and invade Canada had been long since openly avowed. The object of hostile menace had been ostentatiously announced." So far, so good. It was not hidden then, from the people, that Congress intended to go to war; this was right in them, not carefully to keep the people in ignorance of their intention. I think it was somewhere about the last of November, and the beginning of December, 1811, that Congress, to relieve the people of their suspense, let them know that they were determined to go to war with England, before they should rise, if England did not before then relax in her measures towards us. Congress gave time to England, and to their own constituents, to consider of the war, and they did so, and expressed their approbation. Many of the General Courts, of different States, pledged their sacred honors, that they would support Congress in what measures their wisdom might dictate for our relief; and that Canada would be an object of attention, was "ostentatiously announced." So that, not only the *war*, but the very object of the war, was pointed out to the people; nothing was hidden from them, and every important measure of that long session did but corroborate the intention of Congress for war, by being prepar-

atory to it. The addressers proceed, "The inadequacy of both our army and navy for successful invasion, and the insufficiency of the fortifications for the security of the seaboard, were, every where, known." Well, surely, this was ample knowledge. The people have nothing to complain of yet. What next follows? Why, "Yet the doors of Congress were shut upon the people." "They have been carefully kept ignorant of the *progress of measures* until the purposes of administration were consummated, and the fate of the country sealed." This is the greatest wonder of all! What did the shutting of the doors of Congress hide from the people, when nothing remained but to call the important question upon the subject of war, after it had been debated in Congress six months with open doors? and nothing new brought forward, and the people perfectly understanding the matter in all its circumstances, from the beginning to the end; the intent of war, of invading Canada, the weakness of our seaboard and maritime defence? They saw all our preparations for war, and expected a declaration of it in the close of the session, and it came according to their wish and expectation. It still remains to be known, what important thing or circumstance occurred in the measures, which the people "have been carefully kept ignorant of," and that too, when all things were as the people would have them. The address, in making declaration that the people were so early and well informed in every thing, does not prove that they were ignorant of any thing. What therefore can that thing possibly be? The addressers acknowledge, "nothing confidential was communicated!" We may then from all circumstances justly conclude it was *nothing!* Here then the matter comes out. The thirty-four addressers have told their constituents, that the people "have been carefully kept in ignorance" of a *great* and *important* NOTHING, to the endangerment of their liberties! The odium of such conduct toward the people rests upon Congress! No pains are spared to invent pretexts, by misrepresentation, for the purpose of vilifying and defaming our rulers, and no bounds set to

slander, when once the pretexts are found, either by religion, or a sense of moral obligation; no bound set to it by a love of truth; modesty and common decency have been no bar in the way of it. Indeed, it has been carried to the utmost stretch of obscenity! No time or place *too sacred* for defaming *Christian rulers* of a *Christian people*! Slander has sacrilegiously robbed the *desk* of appropriate *truths*; and worshipping assemblies of God's people of their *devotion*. Our best men are publicly represented as being "dark-minded, cool, deliberate wicked rulers," as doing that at which "demons might blush," and then, "conscious of their guilt and danger, but destitute as fallen angels of any heart to repent," in a "fit of *desperation*," have flung our country into all the horrors of war. How much, reverend gentlemen, we stand in need of a power and government over our own spirits, that we may with decorum answer such astonishing language as this! Give me liberty to say, gentlemen, that some of you treat our Christian rulers with more freedom than what Michael thought decent, or even *dared* to treat the DEVIL, Jude ix.—"Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, *durst* not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." Holy angels have always been afraid to call hard names and bring railing accusations. Peter tells us of it as well as Jude, in his 2 Epistle, 2nd chap. 11 verse—"Whereas angels, which are greater in power and might, bring not railing accusation against them before the Lord." Those characters were very wicked, and would have justified the angels in bringing a railing accusation against them, if any would. They are described in the 10th verse thus, "But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lusts of uncleanness, and despise government: presumptuous are they, self-willed, they are not *afraid* to *speak evil* of dignities." We never can have worse characters on the earth, than these; and you know what dreadful degrees of hardness, in wickedness, sinners arrive to, before they shall "*not be afraid* to *despise government* and *speak evil* of *dignities*." But even such

and the devil himself, received no railing accusation from the angels. They were afraid to give it, they considered that no character or circumstance would justify it.

IN connexion with the defamation of our rulers, at this crisis, there is a wonderful propensity in the federal writers to extol England and decry France. It is well to talk of our neighbors, where we have nothing but that which is good to say of them, and present them as suitable examples for imitation; but to be gabbling over their *real faults* without necessity, is justly esteemed slander. What necessity now presents so loudly calling for the faults and wickedness of the French nation and their emperor to be published abroad? True, France has injured us, and so has England. For England there is some palliation made on the account of the nature and character of the war. See Dr. Osgood's Protest, page 10—when speaking of the complaints our government make against England, he says, "They pretend that in a war of almost twenty years duration, and of a nature and character different from any other that has ever happened in modern times, some of our seamen have been pressed on board British ships," &c. Has not the war continued as long with France, as with England, which has all this time been at war with her? And do not the two belligerents reciprocate the 'nature and character' of the same war? Will not, therefore reason and candor make equal allowance on both sides? France has injured us, and we have taken notice of it. She has relinquished the measures of complaint, and a negotiation is now pending between her and our government respecting reparation for the injuries we have received. Where is the policy, therefore, at this time, in throwing out so many hard and illiberal things against her and her emperor? Dr. Osgood, in page 13, speaking of our government, observes, "They have acknowledged themselves caught and entangled in the toils of Bonaparte, that rival of Satan himself in guile and mischief, and his most conspicuous agent here on earth." Mr. Thayer coincides with this language, page 11—"Great Britain, which alone prevents the scourge of nations from having

universal sway, have we not every thing to fear"—“we have borne the insolence, the admonitions, the threats of this ILLUSTRIOUS SINNER.” And the Rev. Mr. Lawrence seems to be not a whit behind his fellows in high sounding invectives, see page 12—“What we most seriously dread, is an alliance with the tyrant of France, from whose sceptre springs certain wretchedness, and whose very touch is death to republican independence. I warn you, citizens, to beware of a connexion more deadly than the adder’s bite, or the serpent’s sting, that you may avoid this scourge of the human race, whose lawless ambition would cover a globe with wretchedness and misery.” Dr. Morse also cannot pass beyond his 23d page before he vents his spleen and pours out his gall upon the French emperor—“and to throw us into the *fatal* embraces of the tyrant of Europe, the insatiable devourer of every republic on earth, except our own.” And Mr. Channing appears to be more full in expressing his sensibility of the great wickedness and atrocity of the French government, page 13, thus, “I blush—I mourn. On this point no language can be exaggerated. We are linking ourselves with the acknowledged enemy of mankind—with a government, which can be bound by no promises—no oaths—no plighted faith—which prepares the way for her armies by perfidy, bribery, corruption—which pillages with equal rapacity its enemies and allies—which has left not a vestige of liberty where it has extended its blasting sway.” And to cap the climax of impolitic folly, even his excellency Governor Strong, in his message to the General Court of this Commonwealth, of January 27, 1813, must clap to a helping hand, and say, “Although we have no agency in conducting our national affairs, we must view with anxious concern, the important changes, which are taking place among the powers of Europe. One of its sovereigns, under pretence of giving freedom to the seas, is carrying war and desolation into regions remote from each other, and seems determined by *fraud* and *violence* to subjugate or destroy every civilized nation.” Why at this time is there this uniform high ton-

ed flow of invectives against France? Has she not relaxed in measures of which we justly complained? Are there not some glimmerings of hope that she will do us justice, or something near right? What object can those gentlemen have in view, by thus decrying France at this time? To say they act without object, is to say they act irrationally; that they are moved by mechanism alone. This cannot be admitted. Is it possible they should be afraid that our government are about to form a treaty offensive and defensive with France? This cannot, at present, be the case. There is not the remotest hint of any such purpose. The President in his message to Congress of June 18, 1812, when contemplating the measure of war, which the United States were about to take, expressly says, "Opposing force to force in defence of their natural rights, shall commit a just cause into the hands of the Almighty Disposer of events, *avoiding all connexions which might entangle it in the contests or views of other powers.*" This has ever been the uniform sentiment and feelings of our government, in accordance to the advice of the *illustrious Washington*; and we have never heard the faintest whisper from any part of the Union to the contrary. This, therefore, cannot be that which the federal writers so greatly fear and deprecate. What then can it be, but the favorable termination of the pending negotiation with France? This must be that, no doubt, which so deeply penetrates their sensibility. Not a treaty of alliance, of which there is nothing said in its favor; but one of amity, commerce and navigation. This can be the only probable thing which appears so dreadful to them. The Rev. Mr. Laurence expresses himself thus in page 12—"It is not British vengeance displayed in revoked orders in council; neither is it the bloody assassin which most excites our fears; what we *most seriously dread* is an *alliance* with the *tyrant of France.*" Dr. Morse expresses himself more fully to the point, page 24, thus, "What then are we to expect from the contest in which we are engaged, but the ruin of our commerce, the depreciation and abandonment of estates, now among the most valu-

able, in our commercial towns, the sacrifice of an immense property of our citizens, which is now in foreign countries beyond our control, or on the ocean ; the loss of our little navy and brave seamen, the destruction of the lives of multitudes of our young men ; a vast increase of national debt, and heavy taxes, without means of paying them ; disunion, alienation, animosities, insurrections, and *civil war* among ourselves, and, *worst of all*, an ALLIANCE WITH FRANCE, an evil to be seriously apprehended, and more to be *deprecatèd* than any my imagination can conceive, the evils of which, if we are to judge from the state of European republics, comprehended in her embraces, no one can contemplate without horror and dismay." *O wonderful! wonderful!!* when nothing at *présent* can be "seriously apprehended" more than an amicable adjustment of differences with France, even if that should take place! Would this be such an unutterable evil? This is more to be feared than "the bloody assassin!" More than a "civil war among ourselves," yea, beyond what "imagination can conceive!" This caps the climax of federal horrors, and leaves the ten furies unnoticed in the back ground! This fear draws forth and pours out the full tide of federal invective upon the government of France. Is the design of it, if possible, so to irritate that government, as to prevent them doing us justice? What else can it be? Minor scribblers are not so much regarded; but when the Governor of Massachusetts lends them his strength, what will the effect of it be? Official communications from the President to Congress, and from the Governors to the General Courts of the States, are found among our articles of exportation. They are of light carriage, find a quick market in Europe, and are looked at with eagerness on every royal exchange. What apology can Mr. Barlow make for all this gross abuse of the French government, if he should find it to be any obstacle in the way of his adjusting our differences with them? Will it satisfy them for him to tell them that the liberty of the press is a sacred principle in the constitutions of our governments—that England has her friends in the United States, and early laid a foundation for this, by

providing for the return of the tories to dwell among them, "as the most fit instruments whereby to work their ruin"—that these persons have extended their influence—that they and their party can never be reconciled to republican forms of government, nor to the freedom of the press, but by it mean to destroy both—that this party retains a deep rooted enmity against France for assisting America in her obtaining her independence; and as Britain and her friends have the full and unrestrained liberty of the press, they make liberal use of it to breathe out their unfriendly feelings towards France. Will it pacify the government of France, if Mr. Barlow should tell them that these invectives are the productions of unprincipled persons, who call their tongues their own, and could never be persuaded of the evil of that little member, that it "is a fire, a world of iniquity, that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature, and it is set on fire of hell;" and that the tongue proves itself to be an unruly evil, full of deadly poison, which knows no difference between legitimate and illegitimate liberty; and that this intrepid band of slanderers in the United States do not treat the government of France with more virulence than their own; that they are marshalled by a British spirit, which places them in battle array, and with their heaviest artillery discharge their foulest glut in their fullest volleys upon their own government? And if in this connexion they should ask Mr. Barlow whether it were best for governments to admit the liberty of speech and of the press? Would he not blush, and mourn, and sigh, and be silent?

THE next thing in order, after defaming our rulers, to excite the passions of the people against the war, is to dwell upon the unhappy circumstances which attend it. In this the morality of the war takes the lead. It is said to be unjust, and murderous, and therefore unsuitable to pray for its success. It is conceived that what has already been said of the conduct and pretensions of Britain towards us, sufficiently confirm not only its justice, but necessity. But as I think the observations pertinent, I will quote the sentiments of his excellency Governor Plumer of New-Hampshire, in his late address

to the General Court of that state. "The justice and necessity of this war are much greater than most of the wars ancient or modern, that are recorded in history, sacred or civil. A single case from each will confirm and illustrate this position. In ancient times certain Jews insulted and abused a *concubine*, so that she died. The men of Benjamin refused to give up the culprits, and for this offence the other tribes made war on them; more than one hundred thousand persons were slain, and one of their tribes nearly exterminated: and we have the *sure word of testimony*, that God approved of that war. In modern times England waged war in support of her claim to cut logwood in the Bay of Campeachy, and to gather salt in the island of Tortugas; and in the reign of her present king, she made war against Spain, because the Spanish court refused to let her see a treaty it had made with France, to which England was not a party, and a sight of which she had no right to demand. If God justified and supported the war of Israel to avenge the death of a single woman, will not this unchangeable justice, and this invincible power succeed a war, not of our own seeking, but forced upon us by the tyranny and injustice of our enemies, a war in defence of our rights, a war to avenge the murder of our citizens, the imprisonment, slavery and death of *thousands* of our seamen! Is not the agency of the Almighty, in the nature and fitness of things, employed in promoting the cause of truth and justice, and in supporting and vindicating the equal rights he has himself established! Our cause is just, and if the American people, as a band of brothers, unite and act with the firmness and resolution of freemen, our success will be certain. In fine, the just reasons for our going to war with England, are so superabundant, and the necessity so imperiously calling for it, that federal gentlemen are constrained to acknowledge an occasion of war on our part, although they so roundly deny it! See the Address, page 6, "It appears to the undersigned, that the wrongs of which the United States have to complain, although in some aspects *very grievous* to our *interests*, and, in many *humiliating* to our *pride*, were yet of a nature, which, in the present state

of the world, either would not justify war, or which war would not remedy." Here the just cause of war is *granted*, the *policy* of pursuing it is *doubted*, from the circumstance of "the present state of the world," or from the inefficacy of the measure. Page 8, "*Yet undoubtedly grievous injuries* have resulted to the seamen of the United States." "But the question is, can war be proper for such cause, before all hope of reasonable accommodation has failed? Even after extinguishment of such hope, can it be proper, until our own practice be so regulated as to remove, in such foreign nation, any reasonable apprehension of injury?" Here it is implied that the "*grievous injuries*" are a *just cause of war*. But the propriety of going to war on the account of them, depends on the solution of the two questions above stated. In page 13, the addressers express themselves more to the point, thus—"Certainly, the British orders in council and the French decrees form a system *subversive of neutral rights*, and constitute *just grounds of complaint*." But here again the addressers endeavour to wipe off the propriety of going to war with England, as the adulterous woman her crime from her mouth, and with as little effect, Prov. xxx. 20—"She eateth and wipeth her mouth, and saith, I have done no wickedness." They proceed—"Yet viewed relatively to the condition of those powers towards each other, and of the United States towards both, the undersigned cannot persuade themselves that the orders in council, as they now exist, and with their present effect and operation, justify the selection of Great Britain as our enemy, and render necessary a declaration of unqualified war." If "certainly the British orders in council and French decrees form a system subversive of neutral rights, and constitute *just grounds of complaint*" against both; and France has relinquished her part of this obnoxious system, and England still adheres to it with great rigour, how does this conduct in France remove our just complaints from England? The addressers, however, do not say, in so many words, that our just grounds of complaint are removed from England; but only, that they cannot persuade themselves that this circumstance, leaving in

operation the orders in council against us, “justify the selection of Great Britain as our enemy.” The reasons the addressers render for this their inability, are worthy of particular attention. The first is drawn from its “being viewed relatively to the condition of those powers towards each other.” But what circumstance is there in the relative condition between England and France, from which an argument is drawn against the justice of selecting the former as our enemy? The addressers have not been so kind as to suggest. May we conjecture it is because the own *mother’s son* is the more liable to be slain and divided by the sword? This would be to “quit our own to stand on foreign ground.” The second argument is drawn from a view of the relative condition of the United States towards both.” But what is there here to prevent our selecting England as our enemy? The addressers still keep us ignorant. Perhaps it is because we claim a more general descent from England than from France. This argument is addressed to our sympathy. What else can it be? The third argument is drawn from the present existence, operation and effect of the orders in council. “The undersigners cannot persuade themselves that the orders in council, as they *now* exist, and with their *present effect* and *operation*, justify the selection of Great Britain as our enemy.” Here is something which looks more like an argument than any thing I have before seen. Their words imply that, the orders in council were once a justifiable ground for the selection of Great Britain for our enemy; but that they had received some alteration, or modification, which had removed their obnoxious quality—thus, “the undersigned cannot persuade themselves that the orders in council as they *now* exist, and with their *present effect* and *operation*,” &c. I have never before heard of this favorable modification of the orders in council; that *now* they are more favorable than what they were, and that their *present effect* and operation are not as they were in past time. I admire that I have not some where before now, seen a hint of this new modification—either in some communication to Congress, or in some of their debates, or in some newspaper, or have

heard somebody speak of it before now. Surely those gentlemen cannot have reference to any repeal or supposed repeal of those orders, for the mode of their expressions forbids this, for they say, 'as they *now exist*, and with their *present effect and operation.*' This supposes their '*existence, effect and operation.*' The gentlemen have not deigned to point out the new alteration, or modification those orders in council have undergone, so therefore we are left to our full liberty to conjecture what it is. Perhaps it is, that his Britannic Majesty has reduced his duties or customs on our goods, so that we should pay but a very trifling tribute to him; as the orders in council, contained a provision in themselves for his Majesty to make any future alterations in those duties as he in his wisdom might dictate. It is to be remembered, that we contend against the principle, and not the sum, as our fathers did against a light tax upon tea. But after all, the gentlemen addressers do not say, in so many words, that there is any favorable alteration or modification of those orders in council; this is only an inference naturally drawn by the reader, as implied, in their argument, and if it should prove fallacious, and no such modification existed, they have in this argument shown as much benevolence, as in a number of other instances, to their constituents, as they would have done, if they had thrown an handful of ashes in their eyes, so that they should not have seen again for a fortnight. But in the 14th page, the addressers not only come more, but most to the point, in frankly declaring, that we have abundant and just ground, on our part, for going to war, thus—"The right of retaliation, as existing in either belligerent, it was *impossible* for the United States, consistent either with their duty or interest, to admit." How is it possible that words should express the justice and necessity of our going to war, in stronger terms than these? If "it were *impossible* for the United States, *consistent* either with their *duty or interest*, to admit the right of retaliation as existing in either belligerent," then certainly both duty and interest called on the United States to make resistance to the pretensions of both the belligerents. But as one of

the belligerents has relinquished his right of retaliation, as respects the United States, and the other still adheres to those retaliatory pretensions, the duty and interest of the United States call on them to make resistance, and not admit them, as our acquiescence would imply. Our interest may justly call upon us to draw the sword in defence of it. But then we are left at our own discretion whether we will do it or not. We often do things which are not for our interest, and in many instances have a right so to do. We may spend portions of our interest and be innocent, for our comfort, convenience or pleasure. But, according to the address, we have something more than interest calling upon us to make resistance—they combine the voice of *duty* with that of interest. "The right of retaliation, as existing in either belligerent, it was impossible for the United States, consistent with *either* their *DUTY* or interest, to admit." If we may dispense with our interest in certain cases, and be innocent, surely we cannot with *duty*. Here then the good morality and imperious necessity of the declaration of the war, and carrying it on with vigor is, if the addressers do not err, established beyond controversy; and with this view of the war, it is astonishing that they did not vote for it! For in this instance, in declaring our just grounds for war, they have not attempted, as in the preceding ones, to wipe off the good policy of going to war, and burn and pulverise it, and cast it into the brook Kidron as an unholy thing. And it is still more surprising what should induce them to make this declaration of the necessity of the war, except they were impelled to it by some extra power, as was Balaam to speak the truth in spite of all his opposition to it. There is something omnipotent in *truth*, it will cause itself to be owned and respected.

ANOTHER objection against the war, is drawn from a comparison of our maritime strength with that of our enemy. This the addressers bring into view in their 13th and 14th pages, when speaking of England and France, they say, "Both attempt to justify their encroachment on the general law of nations, by the plea of retaliation. In the relative position and proportion of

strength of the United States to either belligerent, there appeared little probability that we could compel the one or the other, by hostile operation, to abandon this plea." Mr. Channing speaks more largely of the power of Britain over us, in illustrating the great impropriety of the war, in page 10th, when speaking of the ocean he says, "We see it laving all our shores—we hear the noise of its waves—but it is our clement no longer," and in pages 14, 15, he asks these important questions, and makes his observations on them:—"What brilliant successes are placed within our reach? Is it on the ocean or on the land that we are to meet and spoil our foe? The *ocean* we resign to England; and unless her policy or clemency prevent, we must resign to her our cities also. She can subject them to tribute or reduce them to ashes." Here Mr. Channing ought to have remembered, that Britain has already, in her orders of council, not only laid our cities under a very heavy tribute, but our country also; this is one reason of the present war. We wish not to be taxed at the will and pleasure of his Britannic Majesty now, any more than our fathers did in 1774—the tax which he required of our fathers at that time, was nothing to be compared with what he requires of us, in his orders in council, upon the pains and penalties of the confiscation of our vessels and cargoes. The circuitous routs, to touch at one of his ports, the expense of unloading and loading up again, paying duties, buying his licence, in our out and home bound trade to Europe, if it falls short, will come near ten per cent. on our extra produce—see 10th page of this address. This would of itself be quite a handsome colonial revenue for his Britannic Majesty, or we might expect it would be very soon, inasmuch as the duties on our goods are to be augmented or diminished as his Majesty in his wisdom may dictate. Is it suitable that we should submit to this tribute, merely because England has more cannon than we have? This would be making short work of it, and we had better yield at once, and our fathers had better never have set us the example of resisting downright tyranny. And it seems that Mr. Channing has already come forward with

his example, by saying, "The ocean we resign to England." This seems to be a pleasing circumstance with federalists, manifest repeatedly in their convivial and social meetings. That little ditty, "Britannia rule the seas," sounds as agreeably in federal ears, as Ezekiel's words did in those of his hearers when he was "unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice." However, the United States do not yield their rights so tamely and become slaves; and it is expected they never will, till they become a nation of Quakers. They contend for their right of the ocean, not that part merely "laving all our shores," but also the majestic billows which roll in the broad and "narrow seas." Arguments drawn from our weakness are appropriate to cowards, tories and traitors; but this was never the policy of Washington. In his stratagems in two instances he made his enemy believe him much stronger than he was; and in one his own army. The history of the American revolution mentions both circumstances. Those now who are ready to proclaim abroad our weakness, show themselves not to be friends to our country or its cause.

In various instances the opposers of the present war address the sympathetic feelings and religious affections of the people. The war is against the nation from which we descended; against the country which contains the sepulchres and ashes of our fathers. So, may we say, do some of the mountains of Ararat where the ark rested. But is this a good reason why we should yield to oppression? Was this an argument of weight in the year 1775, when urged by the tories of that day? If it be wrong in us to resist the tyrannical pretensions of England towards us, because she is of near akin to us, is it not wrong in her, to make those pretensions; for it is manifest that we stand in as near a relation to her as she does to us? Dr. Morse with others, to illustrate the great wickedness of the present war, presents to view the religious character of the nation with which we contend; he observes, "A war, it is added in the proclamation, against a nation, 'which for many generations has been the bulwark of the religion we profess.'" To

this I would only observe, can our fathers bear testimony to this declaration, who, though now dead, yet by their history, speak? They tell of their sufferings by their being persecuted in England on the account of their *religion*; and finally were induced for the sake of a good conscience, and the free exercise of their religion, to leave dear friends, and all the delights of a civilized, cultivated world, pass the dangers of the seas, and settle in this part of the earth, then a dreary wilderness, and with none but savage neighbors! Do our persecuted fathers say that England was the bulwark of their religion? And do not we profess the same religion our fathers did? And England has not changed hers from that time to this. The Doctor proceeds, "Yes, let me add, against a nation which is still the bulwark of this religion—a nation which imbosoms a great multitude of devout men and women,—whose prayers, like a cloud of incense, daily ascends up before the throne of God for protection." It is hoped, it is believed there is this multitude of pious, prayerful persons in England; for if they had been as destitute of them as was Sodom, we might have expected before now, some awful, some dreadful tokens of the divine displeasure to be executed on them for their national sins; for it is believed, that there is not a more faithless and wicked ministry in any nation of the earth. And in addition to this, in the federal writings against the war, the religious affections and consciences of our fellow citizens are addressed, on the ground of the war being unjust, wicked and murderous; that those who lend their aid in personal services, or loan their money for its support, or countenance it in writing, or conversation, are guilty of blood, and are considered in the view of God, and the divine law, as murderers! Dr. Osgood appears to be the fullest on this point, and will of course receive particular attention. In page 9th of his protest he observes, "If at the command of weak or wicked rulers, they undertake an unjust war, each man who volunteers his service in such a cause, or loans his money for its support, or by his conversation, his writings, or any other mode of influence, encourages its prosecution, that man is an accomplice in

the wickedness, loads his conscience with the blackest crimes, brings the guilt of blood upon his soul, and, in the sight of God and his law, is a murderer."— "Whether to obey God or man, is the *question* upon which we are to make up our *minds*; in this awful *dilemma*, my brethren, you and I, all the *men* and all the *WOMEN* in these United States, are now placed." "Each individual, after consulting his conscience, and availing himself of all the information within his reach, must determine for himself, and according to his own ideas of responsibility to God, at whose tribunal he must give an account. *Nor has he much time for deliberation.*" Here has the Doctor imposed a hard task upon the people of his charge, and upon the public in general; if they have governed themselves according to his preaching, for seventeen years past. When the people assembled in legal town-meetings, to consult upon the propriety or expediency of adopting Jay's treaty, the Doctor says of them, in his sermon of Nov. 19, 1795, pages 30, 31, thus—"The infatuated multitude have acted as blindly in this business, as those objects which are moved by mechanism only. Nine-tenths of the people at those meetings know but little more of the relations of their country to other countries, than they do of the relations of this earth to the heavenly bodies. Their ignorance, however, upon such subjects may not be to their reproach. They may know enough for the places and stations which Providence hath assigned them; and may be good and worthy members of the community, provided they would be content to move in their own sphere, and not meddle with things too high for them." "Not being the eyes, ears or tongues of the body, they are monstrously disorderly when they presume to exercise the office of these organs." "And their presumption is of the most dangerous tendency."—Thus it appears that the Doctor, but a few years ago, considered that nine-tenths of the people in their meetings knew but little more of the relation of their country to other countries, than they did of the relation of this earth to the heavenly bodies. This however was not to their reproach, they knew enough for the places and stations

which Providence had assigned them; and in these places might be good members of society, provided they should not meddle with things too high for them, by looking into our public affairs, for they not being the "eyes, ears or tongue of the body" politic, "they are monstrously disorderly when they presume to exercise the office of these organs."—But what now does the Doctor require? Why, all must be expert in the business, and have suddenly to learn their political astronomy, and find out the relation of this country with others, to determine the justice of the present war, that they may know how to act, so as not to be guilty of blood. But those who have attended to the Doctor's preaching, and have not looked into public affairs, what a miserable situation they are in, to determine upon the propriety of the war! What a pity it is, that the Doctor did not encourage his hearers and the public, seventeen years ago, to acquire knowledge in their political astronomy, that they might now be enabled to decide upon the question, that they might act with propriety, and not be considered as murderers! There are, according to Mr. Channing, these important questions to be answered before the character of the war can be decided on. Page 8, he says, "To render a war justifiable, it is not enough that we have received injuries—we must ask ourselves, have we done our duty to the nation of which we complain? Have we taken and kept a strict and impartial position towards her and her enemy? Have we not submitted to outrages from her enemy by which he has acquired advantages in the war? Have we sought reparation of injuries in a truly pacific spirit—have we insisted only on undoubted rights? Have we demanded no unreasonable concessions? These questions must be answered before we decide on the character of the war." These questions must be determined by each individual, according to Dr. Osgood—"All the *men* and all the *women* in these United States," each one must decide for himself; "nor has he much time for deliberation," says the Doctor. This is requiring them to make bricks without straw! It must be a hard task for those gentlemen, who have not been in a habit

of looking at public affairs, and more especially for the ladies, who have not considered politics as coming within their sphere of action; it is a hard case if they are to be considered as murderers, although our government may have wrongfully gone to war, because they have in their sphere aided and assisted their husbands and sons in carrying it on. It is really thought that the Doctor would do well to absolve the ladies from his anathema, if they *have*, in subjection to their own husbands, made a shirt or two for the soldiers. And if the young ladies, in Stoneham and Reading, did, as has been reported of them, in a glow of patriotism present a stand of colours to a volunteer Rifle Company of young gentlemen, composed of these towns, in approbation of their forwardness to defend the rights of their country, it is thought they may pass without being guilty of a great crime. And if the young ladies in Pittsfield did serve the soldiers there with a sumptuous dinner, with the consent of their parents, in token of their good wishes for the warriors and their success; and if they be now, in the north part of New-York and Vermont, preparing thousands of socks and mittens for the soldiers at this inclement season of the year, among whom are their fathers and brothers, it is thought they may be excused, and that the Doctor will feel himself under high obligations to remove from those little innocents, his imputations of murder and blood-guiltiness!

THE next circumstance which will be taken notice of, and which is found in federal writings, and as an argument against the present war, and which attaches no ordinary guilt to our rulers, is the kind of blood to be shed in it, and the valuable lives to be lost in the conflict beyond those who fall in European wars. Mr. Channing speaking of the war, observes, page 15, "It will cost us blood, and not the blood of men whose lives are of little worth, of men burdensome to society, such as often compose the armies of Europe." "In this part of our country, at least, we have no mobs, no overflowing population from which we wish to be *relieved by war*. We must send our *sons*, our brothers to the *field*; men who have property, homes, affectionate friends, and the

prospect of useful and happy lives. That government will *contract no ordinary guilt* which sheds such blood for provinces." Here Mr. Channing conveys new ideas to me of European armies and of the object of their wars. I have quoted the passage thus far entire, to remove all suspicion of misrepresentation, though I shall be under necessity, for the sake of perspicuity, to repeat the most of it. The war, says Mr. Channing, "will cost us blood, and not the blood of men whose lives are of little worth—of men burdensome to society, such as often compose the armies of Europe—we have no overflowing population, from which we wish to be *relieved by war.*" This places the wars of Europe on different ground from what I ever imagined. It would seem that slaughter and defeat of their own army were their object to be relieved "from their overflowing population." The end for which the conflicting powers in their wars, will naturally "often" pray, is the destruction of their own army. This explains a declaration often found in federal sermons and writings to this purport, that "England has successfully resisted the strides of the tyrant of Europe." It has never been understood before how England has done this; but now, it appears that her success has consisted in the defeat and *destruction* of her *armies*, whereby she is "relieved from her overflowing population," and "of men burdensome to society." But after all, I have my difficulties in admitting Mr. Channing's difference between European armies, and ours, as to relationship, which must be obviated before I can concede to it. This is the difference which he makes, "We must send our SONS, our BROTHERS to the field." I have always understood that family connexions were the same in all nations, those in Europe the same as in Asia, Africa and America; that, "all the charities of father, son and brother," were common to mankind; and how crowned heads in Europe should "often" raise armies of men, and they *not* be SONS of MOTHERS, is a mystery to me! And that our government, "will contract *no ordinary guilt* which sheds such blood," as sons and brothers, in the present war, is incomprehensible! However, we must view this as being

the fate of America in all the wars which shall be forced upon her. It was the case with us, in our revolutionary contest with England; so that we ought not to impute more iniquity to our present Congress for sending "our sons and brothers into the field" now, than to all the Congresses throughout the eight years conflict we had with England for our liberties; for they looked for no others to send into the field, but sons and brothers, except some might think there was an addition, when a father and grand-father were sent, who they themselves were sons and brothers.

THE last great and weighty objection which I shall take notice of, used by the writers against the war, is the divided state of the people with respect to it. And some of them even call upon the people to make resistance. The addressers in pages 5 and 6, speaking of our government, observe thus, "Of all states, that of war is most likely to call into activity the passions, which are hostile and dangerous to such a form of government. Time is yet important to our country to settle and mature its recent institutions. Above all, it appeared to the undersigned, from signs not to be mistaken, that if we entered upon this war, we did it as a divided people; not only from a sense of the inadequacy of the means to success, but from moral and political objections of great weight and very general influence." Here, it is true, the addressers do not call upon the people to make resistance to the war, as some of their pupils do; but they well exhibit the part of the wood-cutter in the fable, to whom the chased fox came, and with his assistance hid himself, with his promise that he would not tell where he were; but when his pursuers came up, and made inquiry for him, the wood-cutter was silent, but with his finger pointed to the place of his concealment. The addressers point to the way of opposition to the war, and furnish many arguments of which liberal use is made. I have seen only an extract of Dr. Parish's late fast sermon in a newspaper; which I consider of no other importance than Dr. Franklin did light matters, such as "straws and feathers in the street, which serve only to show which way the wind blows." And the Doctor's

against the war, appears to be a blind, furious and giddy tornado; urging his people on to resistance, with as much confidence as if he had a right so to do, and the power of making war and peace were delegated solely to him. The Doctor expresses himself thus, "And still do you hope, and hope, and hope, for a change of measures in the FRENCH CITIZENS, the Gallatins, the JEFFERSONS, the BURRS and MADISONS of the country? You may as well expect that the freezing blasts of winter will cover your fields with corn, your gardens with blossoms." "Then do what is infinitely easy; LET THERE BE NO WAR IN YOUR TERRITORIES: PROCLAIM AN HONORABLE NEUTRALITY." The Doctor must be totally mistaken; that which he calls "*infinitely easy*," is *utterly impossible*. The amputation of a member from the Union cannot be performed without great pain and blood; and if the hemorrhage should once take place, it would probably not be in the power of surgeons, with all their tourniquets to stop it, until the great question between WHIG and TORY, in this country, shall be decided. The Dr. further observes, "This nefarious declaration of war is nothing more nor less than a licence given by a Virginia vassal of the French emperor to the English nation, authorising them in legal form to destroy the property of, NEW-ENGLAND." "Then BREAK AWAY from this TREMENDOUS WAR, which is sinking you and your posterity, and your country, into the abyss of ruin!!" Thus Dr. Parish warmly exhorts his people to an "honorable neutrality," and to a "breaking away from this tremendous war." Dr. Osgood carries the subject further in its consequences, than the sagacity of Mr. Parish pointed out. Dr. Osgood pauses not at the idea of breaking away from war; but predicts a civil war as being inevitable. In the 14th page of his protest he observes, "If at the present moment no symptoms of civil war appear, they certainly will soon, unless the courage of the war party fail them." The Doctor is so kind as to explain how this most unhappy event is to receive its existence. He proceeds, "The opposition comprises all the best men in the nation, men of the greatest talents, courage and wealth, and whose Washingtonian

principles will compel them to die rather than to stain their hands in the blood of an unjust war. Prudence leads them, at present, to cloak their opposition under constitutional forms." Here the Doctor most egregiously mistakes, if he thinks himself and other writers against the war are cloaked by the constitution, or have the least countenance from it. No principle in our constitutions of government can be more apparent than this, that a majority shall rule or decide all questions; it is the very essence of republicanism. When a minority rule or decide questions for a majority, it is downright tyranny. We have been taught from our cradles this essential principle of our government, and it is universally practised upon. In all our town meetings the majority carry the vote—in all corporate societies of what name or nature soever—in all our general courts, if it be but a bare majority, the act is as valid as if it passed unanimously. So in the election of all officers under our state and federal constitutions, a majority determines without asking how great it is. One of our Presidents of the United States was once chosen with but two majority; and if Mr. Clinton had had in our late election for President, but one majority, he would have been considered on all hands as being chosen. It would have been wicked and ridiculous for the minority to stand it out when the votes were legally given. So in Congress the majority must decide, and the Union abide the decision; or reverse the system, and let the minority govern, which is totally inconsistent with a representative government. And the more important the question decided is to the nation, by so much the more important it is, that it be yielded to, without further opposition. And no question can be more important than that of war, which requires the unanimity and energy of the nation, and none therefore so loudly calling on the minority to yield to the important decision, as in the present case of war. And now, when the question is determined after it had been for a long time in contemplation, and so openly and fairly discussed in Congress, and every circumstance undisguisedly laid before the people (except those confined to federal papers) and a vast majority calling for it, as the last resort

for redress of past, and security against future injuries ; for the minority still to oppose, with all their exertions, in writing, uttering and publishing every thing true or false, as they please, to weaken the hands of our people, and strengthen those of the enemy, is not only not “cloaking their opposition under constitutional forms,” but it is contrary to, and subversive of the fundamental principle of our state and federal constitutions. For gentlemen to use the liberty of speech and of the press in this manner, and plead a constitutional right for it, is ridiculous as for the bloody assassin who shoots every neighbor who does not think as he does, and then plead a constitutional right to hold and bear arms, that they may not be taken from him. These gentlemen plead their consciences, their unbelief and their belief respecting the war ; but they must give liberty to the vast majority of their fellow citizens also, to possess consciences, unbelief and belief ; and let all remember, that according to their faith, it will be done unto them. If those gentlemen have faith, let them have it to themselves as the Quakers do, and let them be as silent as they are, and not make such a noise about it. The Doctor proceeds, “Provoked at these obstacles, the patrons of war will have recourse to violence.” Here the Doctor acknowledges their design to cast obstacles in the way of carrying on the war. In time of war is it an uncommon or unlawful thing to use violence to remove all obstacles to their success ? But, as it respects those gentlemen, I hope there will be no occasion to use violence—only let our wholesome laws be put into execution against treason and traitors, and such kind of obstacles will be removed. The Doctor proceeds in speaking of the opponents of the war, page 15, “Against these a popular clamour will be set up, a deadly hatred excited. They will be called enemies to their country, traitors, the friends of Britain and monarchy, opposers of a republican government, and insurgents against the law.” To this it is sufficient only to say, that when any number of men have already commenced a practice of stealing, robbing and killing, and are determined to pursue it, it requires no great sagacity in them to foresee that they will be called thieves, robbers and murderers.

The Doctor proceeds, "At length they will be proclaimed rebels, and force used to subdue them. And as no considerable number of men will tamely surrender their lives, force on the one side will produce force on the other. Thus a civil war becomes as certain as the events which happen according to the known laws and the established course of nature." The Doctor seems to have determined for himself, at all hazards, to persevere in this kind of opposition—page 18, "For myself, according to the course of nature, I have but a short time either to mourn or rejoice in the affairs of men; but while it shall please God to continue me in this tabernacle, by his grace, no fear of man shall deter me from discharging what, in my conscience, I believe to be my duty, in testifying against wickedness in high places, as well as in low." The Doctor expresses but one possible incident which may prevent all the horrors of a civil war, that is "unless the courage of the war party fail them." Mr. Channing speaks more cautiously upon the subject, page 18th, "Resistance of established power is so great an evil—civil commotion excites such destructive passions, the result is so tremendously uncertain,—that every milder method of relief should first be tried, and fairly tried. The last dreadful resort is never justifiable, until the injured members of the community are brought to despair of other relief, and are so far united in views and purposes as to be authorized in the hope of success." Mr. Channing proceeds with some pertinent observations in drawing a comparison between our revolt from England conducted by Washington, and a supposed one from our own government, and concludes with these words: "From a revolution, conducted by such a man, under such circumstances, let no conclusion be hastily drawn on the subject of civil commotion." But Dr. Osgood considers that nothing can prevent this "unless the courage of the war party fail them." Of this however there is *no probability*. The United States are now engaged and determined to defend their rights of the ocean and of their seamen; not to become tributary to England, nor to have "the impressment occasionally of some of our sailors." They have manifested this in

the election of our worthy president, when the odds in the votes was ten thousand of dollars in favour of Mr. Clinton. But the happiness of our country was, that we had electors who would not sell it for corruptible things. Now if the opponents of the war comprise all the wisest and best men in the country, as Dr. Osgood says, will they be so infinitely rash and mad as to commence a civil war, by resisting the execution of the laws against traitors and culprits, and carry it on against their own neighbors and country, because their consciences will not suffer them to join with their country in carrying one on against an old, restless, and injurious enemy? These gentlemen surely must possess consciences of strange operations! It is utterly *impossible* that any wise or good men should conduct thus. And with respect to the division of the people relative to the war, I believe gentlemen have given a very exaggerated account of it; and especially Dr. Osgood, see page 15th—"In New-England, the war declared cannot be approved by any but here and there a furious party leader, a few ignorant, deluded fanatics, and a handful of desperadoes. It must be abhorred by more than nine-tenths of the people in the mercantile States, and by every sober and good man in all the States." This is thought to be quite an exaggerated account; but whether the Doctor in it infringes the most upon *truth* or *decency*, is not a question of importance; but when it is considered that he has been favored with a liberal and christian education, is now advanced in years, and has always been placed in a circle of refined friends and a polite neighborhood, we should naturally have supposed, that he would have paid more respect to both! What dependence can ever be put upon the declarations of gentlemen who write thus extravagantly? "As a mad man who casteth firebrands, arrows and death, so is the man that deceiveth his neighbor, and saith, Am not I in sport?" It is manifest that in federal writings there are great pains taken to deceive the people, and not only in implication and consequence, but by full, bold and false assertions, which have had their effect in dividing them from their present government. This has been the open and bold work of federal

presses and federal preaching for years. And had you, reverend gentlemen, put forth half of your zeal to enlighten the people and communicate truth, where it has been exercised to propagate error, we should be at this time a united people, and in the enjoyment of peace and commerce at this moment. It has already been observed in this address, that England has extended her unjust pretensions towards us, as she could find herself supported by citizens in this country. According to our apparent division, her boldness would grow to make encroachments upon our essential rights. The policy of England has been to divide us by whatever means were in her power. And there have been high exertion and considerable expense to get the Clergy on her side, and she has thus far succeeded. With a prospect of success in making the United States tributary to her, England has with her usually deceptive measures brought the government of the United States to declare war, or yield up their essential rights, and become tributary to her as colonies, dependent on her for protection. Those gentlemen, therefore, who have been opposed to the measures our government have taken to repel the unjust aggressions of England, may view themselves as bringing the present war upon our country. Had not England found means to obtain advocates among the citizens of the United States, she would not have pushed our government to the extremity of war; but she has been so encouraged and supported by her "friends" in and out of Congress, as to do it. And now she expects that they will so exert themselves as to enervate and render ineffectual the measures our government have taken, and to alienate the people in the northern States from their general government, and thus "divide and conquer;" you may therefore, reverend gentlemen, justly attribute to that influence which you support, all the political evils which our country experiences. Had it not have been for this siding with England, to give her encouragement of bringing the United States subservient to herself, we might now have been at peace and in the enjoyment of all our neutral commercial rights. All the wickedness therefore, madness and atrocity which

has been attributed to our government, may justly be flung back upon the influence which you support. This has brought the calamity of war with all its attendant evils upon us. Many of you, reverend gentlemen have delineated them as if you felt the weight of them. Review your own writings, look carefully at them. Consider the loss of commerce, of property, of ordinary pursuits, of the depreciation of estates, and the poverty of multiplied families; the influence which you support has done this. Review your observations upon the expenses of the war as they respect the public. "High taxes, nothing to pay, murmuring, discontent and insurrections," and attach this to the influence which you support. Review your just observations upon the moral effect of the war; its thousand temptations, in its consequences, to corrupt the integrity and morals of the people; and ascribe this to the cause which you abet. Look further, upon the absolute necessity imposed upon our government, for the defence of our essential rights, and not become tributary to the tyrant of the seas, and for the security of our seamen, to "send our sons and brothers in the field," to be "marks for the sharp shooters," and their flesh to be given to carnivorous animals, and their bones to bleach in the northern regions upon the surface of the earth. Add to this the lamentations of dear friends and connexions for them, and say the influence which you support has done it. And if we should experience a civil war among ourselves, as Dr. Osgood sanguinely predicts, and, as your sermons, reverend gentlemen, are calculated to stir up, and see, not only neighbor against neighbor, wielding the dreadful instruments of death; but father against the son, and the son against the father; and the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; this awful and unnatural scene of horror and distress, should it take place, will be solely attributed to the influence which you now make and support. I entreat you, therefore, to consider, "Pause, pause, for Heaven's sake pause!" Quit this destructive, this accursed influence. Retrace your steps. In pursuing them we may all adopt the language of Dr. Osgood, where he says, "My

brethren, the blood runs cold in my veins, at the prospect of the heart chilling scenes before us." Tell your people and the public that you have been deceived, as I believe some of you may justly do, being confined for your knowledge principally to federal publications. Tell them that you did put confidence in the integrity and veracity of the thirty-four members of Congress who became addressers to their constituents; that their address is the bitter root, as the root of the verb from which is formed the numerous modifications of words; that you have conjugated it, and declined it in all its modes and tenses, and find that the principal things of complaint therein, are without foundation; that the addressers never have been denied the utmost freedom of debate in Congress, either with open or closed doors. Tell them that on examining public documents, you find that the impressment of our seamen has ever been considered a just ground for a declaration of war against England under every administration of our government. That was the uniform sentiment of Washington, of Adams and Jefferson, as well as that of Madison and the present Congress. Let your people know, that you now see, that the imputation of insincerity in our government, in their negotiations with England on the subject, was ill founded; that this is owned, proved, and expressly acknowledged by Lord Castlereagh to Mr. Russell. Let them understand also that there was no perfidy in our government relative to the Indians, in the Wabash expedition, although it existed "without any express act of Congress,"—that there was no need of any, that there existed a standing law for the purpose, as you have seen, under which Washington acted in Harmar's expedition, and under which Madison acted in Harrison's expedition. And with respect to the people's "being carefully kept in ignorance of the progress of measures until the purposes of administration were consummated, and the fate of the country sealed," as well as every other material objection against our present administration, let them know that they all turn out, as you have clearly seen, to be great NOTHINGS.

ONLY let us feed the people with truth, and there will be no difficulty in uniting them. Let your people know *what* England requires of us in her orders in council, of which our government complain. Not a word of *this* is to be seen in any federal papers or writings ; nothing of it in the address, only they are barely named, as “the orders in council as they now *exist*, and with their *present effect* and *operation*,” but not a single word of what this *effect* and *operation* is. Nor have I seen a single lisp of it, gentlemen, in any of your sermons, any more than if no such thing existed ! Only let your people know that England requires the benefit or revenue of almost all our commerce to the continent as much as if it were her own, and we her subjects. She assumes our right of the seas, as if she had turnpiked the Atlantic, set up the gates and placed her collector in the toll-house. Ask your people whether any body has ever told them this, and whether they are willing to pay a double revenue to *England*, to that which they pay in their commerce to their *own government*, and this merely because England will shoot us if we don’t ? Those who would understandingly yield to the British orders in council, and to her impressment of our seamen, would submit to recolonization, and again become British subjects. Let your people know also that there is no foundation yet discovered, for so many bold assertions that our government are under the influence of and governed by Bonaparte—that the cry of French influence is no more than an invention of the enemy, as a set off, a balance to meet the just charge of British influence among us. The man must be blind to our political situation who does not see this. Even the addressers were able to wave all arguments our government make use of against the practice of impressment, and volunteer themselves as attorneys for England. There is a British spirit among us, in opposition to the prosperity of the United States—federalism is this spirit, and nothing but old *toryism*, “the old *serpent* in a *new skin*.” But what will be the consequence, reverend gentlemen, of your succeeding in your opposition to this war ? We shall have an instance of the minority’s boldly wresting the reins of

government from the hand of a majority, to the destruction of our republican government! And this is not all— if we now be unable to resist England in her impious pretensions towards us, we may next expect she will assume a right to tax our merchandize sailing from one port to another in the U. States, which she may do with the same propriety, that she may execute her present demands; she will only need to purchase but a few more friends among us, if any, if we cannot now carry on the war, for this or any other of her demands she may be pleased to make. In this case we shall fall totally under the power of England; then may we expect she will pay us well for our past disobedience and rebellion against her! Reverend gentlemen, this is impossible, it is totally *impossible* that you should succeed, and the independence of our country remain. What possibly can be your design and intention? When we see gentlemen so zealously engaged, it is natural for us to believe they have some, to them, important object in view. We know what your influence tends to; but it is rash to impeach the motives of gentlemen. Is it possible you can have in view the annihilation of our federal constitution? It is said without hesitation that your conduct tends to this. And there are some passages in some of your sermons which have a bearing towards displeas'dness with our federal constitution and forms of government. One writes in this manner, "And here I think it my duty to remark, that it is an essential defect in our federal constitution, in my own opinion and that of many others, that it does not require that such men alone, as we have now described, should be permitted to administer it; that it does not recognize the Christian religion, nor even the existence of God; so that even an atheist may be constitutionally placed at the head of our nation. This is a national sin for which we are now justly suffering the displeasure of heaven, and which ought to be deeply lamented and speedily reformed by the whole of the nation." This reverend gentleman, thinking as he now does, with many others, that our federal constitution has such an essential defect in it, and that it "is a national sin, for which we are now suffering

the displeasure of heaven ;” surely he, with many others, must feel themselves under high moral obligations, to be in the exercise of all their abilities, to remove this evil defect in the constitution. Another reverend gentleman writes to this effect, “Our constitution has that in it which will inevitably destroy it—it tolerates Christianity only as an innocent thing, and does not imbosom it, as that government which has so successfully resisted the strides of the tyrant of Europe.” Now if those gentlemen think as much alike as they write, it must be the destruction of our federal constitution in an important article which their moral sensibility leads them now to effect. We may justly suppose them to be exerting themselves according to the dictates of their own consciences, which must be to remove “this national sin for which we are now suffering the displeasure of heaven.” But our federal constitution contains nothing, nor has any deficiency in it “which will inevitably destroy it,” but by the co-operation of the will of men. If those gentlemen be doing nothing then, in their view for the destruction of the federal constitution, to remove “this national sin, for which we are justly suffering the displeasure of heaven,” they live in neglect of what they believe to be duty, to remove the “displeasure of heaven” from us ; but if they be doing any thing for this purpose, it must be considered as being done in their recent sermons and publications. This being granted, all mystery ceases ; as it is apparent their writings have this tendency ; for then they will, with propriety, be considered as acting with moral agency, or as causes by council, whose conduct is directed to obtain a desired end. But after all, if you, gentlemen, should succeed in the annihilation of our federal constitution, and obtain one imbosoming Christianity, containing a religious test, and uniting church and state, all difficulties will not then be passed. Ten to one, but that, even with this barrier, we shall have bad as well as good men to rule over us ; and perhaps murderers who may be disposed to destroy the peace and happiness of mankind ; for you abundantly affirm that those who engage in an unjust war, or abet or lend their assistance to carry it on, are guilty of blood ;

and in several instances, to confirm this you quote writers upon the laws of nations. Moreover you speak of the great difference between the present war and the former one we had with England, that then our cause was just, then you could support it, that then our enemy made unjust pretensions towards us, and carried on an unjust war against us ; of course, although the British constitution imbosoms Christianity, contains a religious test, and unites church and state, and comprises every barrier to keep bad men out of office ; yet at that time their king and a majority of parliament were murderers, and guilty of all the blood that was shed in that long and tedious conflict. It is presumed therefore that they could not have got worse men in parliament if they had been chosen without the restraint of a religious test. But because a religious test is no bar in the way of bad men's being in office, is not all the difficulty. Let the people but once find that they are like to be gulled out of their constitution, and to have one exonerating them from the burden of choosing their teachers of religion and morality, they will be more implacable than a bear robbed of her whelps. But, reverend gentlemen, if the destruction of our constitution be your object generally, as your writings tend to this, and as it is fairly inferred from moral principles in two instances ; is the method which you take to accomplish it, *fair* and *honorable* ? Will the holiness of the end sanctify such corrupt and deceptive means to obtain it ? Will it pardon for all the anarchy and confusion, which in such a case must be experienced ? It seems to be difficult to write down our federal constitution or the present administrators thereof. Our rulers have withstood the shock of the severest volley of invectives that ever proceeded from the dragon's mouth, and their ranks stand yet unbroken. In one of Dr. Osgood's former sermons this idea is contained, viz. that now ministers have not that respect shown them nor that confidence reposed in them which ministers formerly had in this country. To this may I not ask the question which David did to his brother Eliab, in another, Is there not a cause ? The occasion may be wondered at ; but admitting it, the effect is not surpris-

ing, but such as might be thought naturally to follow. If ^{one} half of the harsh illiberal things flung out against our rulers which are contained in your former as well as latter publications, had been believed generally, our rulers would long before now have been neglected by the people. Indeed it is an hard case, to stem the torrent of truth and make falsehood be generally believed: so long as Congress publish at suitable times their diplomatic correspondences with foreign nations, and lay them before the people, together with all their own proceedings upon them, the people are able to satisfy themselves with respect to our foreign relations. And under those circumstances, let there be ever so loud a cry set up, of Wolf, Wolf! the people will not be frightened, as long as they see it to be an innocent animal. But for this circumstance of having our foreign relations and the measures of Congress so amply laid before the public, it is thought that our present rulers would have been written down or out of office before now. Can all history afford a parallel, or any thing that may bear remotest likeness to that which we have constantly experienced for twelve years past? A constant course of the most virulent publications against the rulers of our nation, constitutionally chosen by the people, for the purpose of removing them and introducing in their places men who may favor the unjust pretensions of an old, intriguing, inveterate enemy. With as much propriety might the people have placed royalists in their councils, a Ruggles, an Oliver, or a Murray or Gore, in the time of our former contest with England; as for the people now to place the friends of England in office. Our political situation will form as wonderful a trait in the history of our country for future generations, as that of the old witchcraft in Salem is to us; and a view of your sermons, reverend gentlemen, will excite in them an association of as wonderful ideas as a sight of Gallows-Hill* does now in us. And perhaps the same

* Gallows-Hill is an eminence near Salem, where the witches were executed.

remedy awaits the present fascination which did that, viz. to hang the accuser instead of the accused.

THUS, reverend gentlemen, in this peculiar crisis of our national affairs, I also have been disposed to "show mine opinion," and have been the more liberal in quoting public documents, being sensible that nothing will have due effect, but that which shall convince the understanding, which is the design of this address, and which requires plainness of speech. And if it be thought in any instances I have overleaped the bounds of decency, or have infringed upon those of decorum, you will consider that I have been in a situation to look at and to answer things unfounded, illiberal, and peculiarly irritating. In contemplation of your candor, and that of the public, with a view of the license we have to "prove all things and hold fast that which is good," this is submitted to your perusal, not flattering myself that it is calculated to exite that attention which the importance of the subject demands.

I have the honor to be,

Reverend and respected gentlemen,

Your most obedient and humble servant,

SOLOMON AIKEN.

Dracutt, February 25th, 1813.

LBJL'26



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 899 309 3