

Revised 15 June 1922

30 Oct. 1923

21 Dec. "

Revised 7 October 1924

Revised 18-24 October 1928

Revised 5-6 March 1934

Revised 2-6 February 1943

(Papez's contributions consolidated here)

( " folder record <sup>ms</sup> pp. 2120-32 & 55

18 Sept - 13 pp. typed.

made an appendix to Crit. Jnl. 19 Oct. 1927

In Critical Studies, revised 24-6 Oct. 1928

Revised 6 March 1934

33

1555-1595

LOUISIANA PURCHASE pamphlets  
1803 Acet. 32

Louisiana Purchase  
1803-4

An Address..... on the Cession, etc. 1803.

Monroe's Embassy, signed Poplicola. 1803.

Series relative to a war with Spain, signed Poplicola. 1804.

On a war with Spain (No. II), signed Poplicola. 1804.

These ~~groups~~ two pamphlets and two newspaper articles, dealing with the Louisiana Purchase, may be studied as two groups: the first preceding the purchase; the second following it.

No. 6.

*Theodore Tilton*

AN ADDRESS  
TO THE  
GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES,  
ON THE  
*CESSION OF LOUISIANA*  
TO THE FRENCH;  
AND ON THE  
LATE BREACH OF TREATY BY THE SPANIARDS:  
INCLUDING  
THE TRANSLATION OF A MEMORIAL, ON THE WAR OF ST. DOMINGO,  
AND CESSION OF THE MISSISSIPPI TO FRANCE,  
DRAWN UP  
BY A FRENCH COUNSELLOR OF STATE.

ENTERED ACCORDING TO ACT OF CONGRESS.

•PUBLISHED

BY JOHN CONRAD, & CO. NO. 30, CHESNUT STREET, PHILADEL-  
PHIA; M. AND J. CONRAD, & CO. NO. 140, MARKET-STREET,  
BALTIMORE; AND RAPIN, CONRAD, & CO. WASHINGTON  
CITY.

H. MAXWELL, PRINTER.

1803.

(Illustration to be placed

to face page 1555)

## LOUISIANA PURCHASE PAMPHLETS:

1803

~~In 1803 Brown published two political pamphlets dealing with the~~  
~~Louisiana Purchase.~~ <sup>In group</sup> The first is An Address to the Government of the  
United States on the Cession of Louisiana to the French <sup>and</sup> ~~The second~~  
~~is Monroe's Embassy, or the Conduct of the Government in relation to~~  
~~our claims to the navigation of the Mississippi (sic).~~ Our reproductions  
 will show the complete titles. The Conrads of Philadelphia were the  
 publishers, ~~of both pamphlets.~~

When <sup>we</sup> ~~it is~~ known <sup>f</sup> Brown wrote the <sup>Address</sup> ~~former~~ we <sup>must</sup> ~~are compelled to~~ accept  
<sup>Embassy</sup> the ~~latter~~ on the testimony of its title-page. <sup>at the end of it</sup> ~~If we turn the pages~~  
~~of Monroe's Embassy we find~~  
 has an additional <sup>feature</sup> ~~feature~~ because it  
 is signed with the pseudonym of Poplicola. In 1804 ~~we shall find a~~  
 (1 and 8 October)  
 ^

Poplicola contributing <sup>ed the</sup> two articles <sup>Louisiana Purchase 1556</sup> on the same subject to ~~the~~  
~~Philadelphia Gazette~~ <sup>(later)</sup> ~~study and~~  
~~newspaper~~ and we shall ascribe them to Brown, <sup>because we know</sup>  
~~he did not issue these two political pamphlets of 1803 and~~  
~~learn nothing by them.~~ <sup>as our second group.</sup>

To the French people pamphlets on Louisiana were <sup>Common</sup> ~~not new~~ in  
those days; but to the readers of ~~publications in~~ the United  
States they were <sup>distinct</sup> ~~considerable~~ of a novelty. There appears to  
have been not more than one other ~~Louisiana purchase~~ pamphlet  
issued before or contemporaneous with Brown's. Perhaps there were  
more but they have not been seen <sup>by the bibliographers.</sup> ~~by the very persons who by reason~~  
~~of their special interests would be expected to have seen them.~~ <sup>And recorded</sup>

~~Brown was not the first American to broach the subject although~~  
~~he undoubtedly was the earliest to issue more than one pamphlet~~  
~~on it.~~ <sup>the subject as soon as</sup> Of course the newspapers were full of ~~the subject from the~~

<sup>24 October 1802</sup> ~~time~~ time when Spain's action was known ~~until long after Brown was dead.~~

~~Very few of the historical facts need to be in the mind of the~~  
~~reader to understand the background of these pamphlets and to~~  
~~appreciate Brown's part in it so that we shall not swell the~~  
~~bulk of our work by giving any historical summary of the Louisiana~~  
<sup>the Louisiana Purchase</sup>

1557

~~Furthermore our purpose~~  
~~Purchase, it will serve as well if we only direct attention to~~  
~~the historical details when they immediately concern debatable~~  
~~points of these works of Brown.~~

In both pamphlets we have statements of the loss that will  
fall on the merchants by ~~reason of~~<sup>a</sup> the withdrawal of ~~the~~ place  
of deposit<sup>1</sup> at New Orleans. Therein we may find Brown's real motive,  
~~for writing these pamphlets.~~ Ostensibly it was to arouse the  
government to war-like action. In one case he states ~~that~~<sup>2</sup> his  
private affairs are not concerned but later he says ~~that~~<sup>3</sup> the  
merchant, artisan and planter see how their private interests  
will suffer if action is not taken. In another place, though<sup>4</sup>  
not yet having seen any, he fears loss in the future. Undoubtedly  
~~Brown's~~<sup>his</sup> relatives and their merchantile and shipping interests  
~~were at the bottom of the matter but, of course,~~<sup>Concerned in</sup> no one who ~~has~~<sup>knows</sup>  
~~read Brown's life up to this point~~<sup>1803</sup> will believe ~~that~~ his ~~only~~  
motive was ~~his~~<sup>a</sup> possible pecuniary interest in the family busi-

ness. ~~affairs.~~ Of the times it has been wisely said<sup>5</sup> that "men

- ~~1 Don Juan Ventura Morales the Spanish official at New Orleans~~  
~~had failed to prohibit the Mississippi the place of deposit~~  
~~for exports brought down the river from the western states.~~  
Such a place was necessary; for the cargoes had to be trans-  
ferred from river boats to sea-going vessels. Therein, and  
therein only, consisted the breach of treaty by the Spaniards. / the 1795
- 2 Address, p. 1.      3 Ibid., p. 88.      4 P. 26.      Embassy,  
5 Josiah Dwight to Federalist Central Committee, quoted pp. 312-13  
Morrison's Harrison Gray Otis, Boston, 1913.

who would not look into a newspaper, will read a pamphlet with attention" and Brown was not the man to miss such a golden opportunity. ~~At the same time it should be borne in mind that the interests of the family business probably colored his motive;~~ <sup>as</sup> ~~so that his uninterested view point is not to be accepted without suspicion.~~ *the whole truth,*

Be <sup>the</sup> ~~Brown's~~ motive what it may it is interesting to note ~~that~~ it only took him a little more than one year to change ~~completely~~ his attitude of mind. ~~in the matter of rushing into war.~~ In the two communications to the Philadelphia Gazette under the signature of Poplicola ~~referred to before,~~ <sup>he</sup> Brown advises against hostilities with Spain and recommends patience with everything, even insult. ~~before going to war.~~ He must have read the speech of <sup>Senator</sup> General James Jackson ~~in the Senate wherein he~~ <sup>who</sup> argued ~~that~~ the merchants should not advise war because if it ~~were~~ entered on they would surely be totally ruined. <sup>In 1807</sup> ~~Three years later~~ in his British Treaty pamphlet we shall find Brown quite a peaceably disposed citizen. From this change ~~of opinion we are driven to conclude that~~ <sup>was</sup> he ~~had been~~ convinced of the folly of his earlier advice; as he might wisely have



been when he saw the happy result of the ~~Purchase~~ negotiations.

~~In themselves~~ <sup>two</sup> These pamphlets are really of national historical value ~~hitherto unappreciated~~. All writers on the subject of the ~~Louisiana~~ Purchase speak of the surprise of Jefferson and the American ambassadors when it was learned ~~that~~ Napoleon would sell the whole of Louisiana. They never seem to have considered that, when it was possible for such an unpolitical author as Brown to see clearly the position of France and the intentions of Napoleon, they should <sup>not</sup> ~~have~~ argued the whole Department of State to have been a parcel of innocent children. At least it seems the President, his cabinet and the diplomatic service of the government, should have been quite able to understand what Brown understood, and possibly to receive information a little earlier. ~~Just~~ <sup>How</sup> much confidential information Jefferson and some of the ~~republican~~ <sup>of his party</sup> senators had, has never been divulged, ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> should not be. We can rest assured they had plenty.

~~After reading all the usual historical works on the subject~~

~~it will be found that~~ Jefferson's minister plenipotentiary, James Monroe, was well posted on the French side so that before leaving the United States he must have had some idea ~~that~~ the whole of

Louisiana would be offered. That Jefferson felt the necessity for going slowly in asking his countrymen for perhaps any number of ten millions to buy the whole is quite probable; that he also was weighing his knowledge of popular opinion against the fact that he was about to consummate an action which the constitution did not give him the right to perform is also more than probable but that he was so ignorant of the truth as not to know what had all along been perfectly evident to his political opponents the Federalists is beyond belief. The Senate debate of February 14, 15, 16, 21, 23, 24 and 25 shows that not only Jefferson and his ambassador could not have been surprised but even that Senator Morris <sup>1</sup> had proposed to take all of Louisiana. <sup>2</sup> Payment was even thought of; <sup>3</sup> and a betrayal of secrets of the Senate and a suggestion that two millions to certain members of the French court would have caused France to sell the territory, are among the published records of the Senatorial debates.

For over ten pages of Monroe's Embassy <sup>4</sup> Brown suggests and amplifies the wisdom of taking all of Louisiana instead of just the right to the river and New Orleans and the Floridas. On page 46 of the same work he says:

- 1 P.157 Report of a debate....on certain resolutions concerning the violation of the right of deposit, etc., by William Duane, Phila., 1803.  
 2 P.172, Ibidem. <sup>4</sup> Beginning at p.36. <sup>3</sup> P.194, Ibidem.

"On this principle, we may hope to bargain with France for the province. If the jealousy of England is at length aroused, and the French be absolutely forbidden to receive the province, or if England be incited to this vigor by the offers of America to support her opposition; or if the states take possession without loss of time, and offer no other alternative than a sale, who can doubt of the decision of France? Will they not take something in preference to nothing:...."

In both these pamphlets ~~we thus find~~<sup>as</sup> our author judging the true situation as well ~~if not better than~~<sup>as</sup> the statesmen of his day.

Compare with this the quotation from Marbois' History of Louisiana as given in Hosmer's Louisiana Purchase<sup>1</sup>

Napoleon said: "I know the worth of Louisiana and I have hoped to repair the error of the French negotiator who abandoned it in 1762. I have recovered it on paper through some lines in a treaty; 2 but I have hardly done so when I am about to lose it again."

The Brown passage just quoted continues:

"if the cession become impracticable by any means, can she have the least objection to take ten or twenty millions from us in exchange for an airy and barren claim. The wisdom of their conduct in this respect is readily discovered; but it would be somewhat harder to discover the wisdom of the States, in acceding to the bargain. To purchase the absence of those who cannot approach, to give money to France for relinquishing that which she cannot obtain, seems to be no very frugal or saving scheme."

Here we see not only a suggestion of the advantage the United States had, which was all very good for Brown's purpose, but a hazarded guess at the price, which afterwards proved to have been a lucky hit. The price paid ~~we should remember~~ was ten or twenty

1 P. 132.

2 Section III of the treaty of Idlefonso.

millions; in fact just fifteen. On page 43 Brown had already stated fifteen millions as ~~being~~ hardly possible of raising, as if he were also acquainted with the price at which we could ~~probably~~ buy it all.

But the actually prophetic passage is on page 48. It reads:

"If when our Ambassador arrives, the state of things be such that France is obliged to forego her scheme, she will consent to sell. While she has hope of gaining the province, she will not barter it for money. That people are not idiots or madmen... Their consent to sell, therefore, is an infallible proof that they are hopeless of gaining. If a man go to law for an estate of ten thousand a year, and consents, at any time, to sell his right to the adversary for six pence, it is plain that he hopes for nothing from his suit."

Here Brown's <sup>legal</sup> ~~early~~ training stood him in good stead.

When he comes to the conclusion of Monroe's Embassy he launches out into inciting to arms even stronger than he had in the ~~earlier~~ ~~pamphlet the~~ Address. He deprecates any war action by <sup>the</sup> western people but at the same time takes pains to explain ~~that~~ they would not be punished for it. Joining the French, rebellion and secession<sup>1</sup> are not withheld through any patriotic spirit or fear of the riot law. ~~And he closes committing the outcome to Sovereign Providence.~~<sup>2</sup>

On Brown's side the two pamphlets stand for evidence. He is ~~the~~ one who we are sure realized ~~that~~ the affair was of such magnitude.

1 Gilman: James Monroe, Boston, 1898, American Statesmen Series, p. 79 says "one newspaper raised the cry of disunion."

It had been popularly represented to be only a matter of the breach of treaty by the Spaniards,<sup>1</sup> not, as actually was the case, of taking a stretch of country equal if not larger than the original thirteen states. At least Jefferson, Monroe and Livingston must have realized it fully, but there is no evidence of it in all which the historians have given us. Of course no one need demur if out of a ~~hidden~~ love for the dramatic they prefer <sup>the</sup> ~~that~~ "surprise" story <sup>for</sup> ~~for~~ the fact remains Brown could not have been surprised for he knew of it. If no <sup>writer</sup> ~~one~~ but Brown saw the possibilities ~~as he did, then~~ of course ~~the~~ ~~truth is~~ he was the only one who properly appreciated the situation. <sup>When</sup> ~~if~~ we discard the popular "surprise" story it is <sup>likely</sup> ~~possible~~ he merely was following ~~the~~ arguments ~~he~~ found in the ~~unpopular~~ federal newspapers, ~~of the day~~. Be that as it may, ~~the fact remains that~~ in both pamphlets his arguments are on the whole the same, they are a deal like ~~those of~~ Jefferson's letter <sup>2</sup> of 18 April 1802 to Livingston; in fact they echo in a surprising manner ~~those used in~~ the secret diplomatic correspondence.

1 The wrong was righted before 20 April 1803 according to Madison's letter to Monroe--State Papers and Correspondence bearing upon the Purchase of the Territory of Louisiana, Washington, 1903, p. 181.  
 2 Ibidem., p. 15 ff.

We do not know ~~just~~ what result the pamphlets produced. The facts/ of importance <sup>are:</sup> ~~is,~~ the negotiations went on, no violence ensued, no war was begun, and on the 20th. of December of the same year in which the pamphlets were issued Louisiana was by a very picturesque ceremony formally ceded to the United States.

So far as <sup>the</sup> ~~Brown's~~ pamphlets were concerned the agitation for war-like measures was ~~in both cases~~ a failure. In the cause of humanity we are to be congratulated ~~that~~ it was so; for the matter may have been viewed by the other three nations differently than it was, and war might have been ~~an affair of~~ greater world complications than it appeared to be. Nations can <sup>often</sup> ~~usually~~ acquire territory by <sup>a</sup> ~~the same~~ peaceable process ~~as individuals use~~. The President was a man of peace and diplomacy and Brown's failure was the success of Jefferson. No <sup>one</sup> ~~sensible person~~ would have it otherwise, even <sup>save</sup> ~~possibly to keep~~ fifteen millions of dollars ~~away from the French. But failure or success so far as~~ a party in power was concerned is not of such importance as the fact that Brown foresaw the situation and judged it correctly. That he alone foresaw it is very improbable.

1

The advertisement to the second edition of the Address had

this significant statement:

"The measures which have lately been taken by the government, are widely different from those which the editor, ...ventured to recommend."

The same idea is ~~followed~~<sup>in</sup> by Monroe's Embassy, so ~~that~~ we see ~~that~~ Brown was ~~grievously~~ disappointed ~~in the result~~. ~~Just what~~ <sup>2</sup> he says the government would not do--it proceeded to do. This was caused by the fact that the idea of force was not new, it having been thought of before and abandoned as not so liable of success as diplomacy and as contrary to the duty, policy and character of the United States. To him it appeared his advice had fallen on deaf ears; in fact he shows a trace of bitterness and becomes almost abusive of the government's action when he referred to the fact that all his efforts had resulted in an embassy. ~~if he had taken the opportunity to open his fire on the~~ ~~conduct of Monroe when formerly our minister in France he might~~ ~~have brought on a battle in which he would have become one of~~ ~~the leaders.~~

1 Which we shall hereafter quote in full.

2 P. 90 of the Address.

Now that these two pamphlets have been considered in the aspects which they have in common attention should be directed to them individually.

The first, entitled An Address to the Government on the Cession of Louisiana, etc., was heralded by some unidentified writer in the Philadelphia Gazette and Daily Advertiser for 4 January 1803, as follows:

"Cession of Louisiana. There are few public events that have engaged more attention lately, than the conduct of the Spaniards on the Mississippi. There seems to be little difficulty in the public opinion as to the conduct which the government of the United States ought to pursue, provided the only party with whom we had to deal, either in negotiation or war, were the Spaniards. In such case a demand upon the Spanish officers of the restoration of the intercourse, and, in case of refusal, a military expedition down the river, are the obvious



measures;—but if Louisiana be really ceded to France, it then becomes an enquiry of some importance--what the intentions of the French government are? Whether the restrictions on the navigation of the river arise from a previous concert between France and Spain? Whether France when she comes into possession, will grant the freedom of the river on the same terms on which we have hitherto enjoyed it? Whether, even if this session be made, and the French resolved to take possession, it ~~would~~ not be fully justifiable and highly prudent in the United States to anticipate their arrival, and sieze the country immediately?

Considerable light has been thrown upon the intentions of the French in this particular, in a very curious performance, written by one of Buonaparte's counsellors of state. In this ~~paper~~ the arguments in favor of attacking St. Domingo, and of resuming Louisiana, are copiously displayed. The objections arising from the adverse interests of Spain, England and America, are enumerated and confuted; and the advantages to France from a station on the Mississippi, are placed in the most striking point of view. This ~~paper~~ past through a few hands in Paris, at the time the late negotiations were pending, and is in every respect, a very extraordinary and valuable performance. The present crisis of affairs renders the contents of it extremely interesting to Americans, and the public ought to be informed of them. A translation will accordingly appear in a few days, from one of the presses of this city, accompanied with remarks on the measures which it becomes our government to adopt on this important occasion."

Who ~~the~~ writer of this ~~notice~~ was is not known but in the

sequence and matter it has a striking similarity to Brown's work

and may according to the practise of the day have been furnished or

<sup>written</sup> by him. <sup>However</sup> It is made ~~up~~ of so much of the material in the same words

as the pamphlet ~~itself, that~~ it is ~~only~~ of small consequence. ~~But~~

~~If~~ it be by Brown, it might be ~~considered as~~ an interesting example

of his method of announcing his work--not by any means the only

instance where we have suspected <sup>it</sup> ~~the same action~~. In its possible

connection as press-agent's work it has many points to recommend it, notably its modesty, ~~and lack of present day "puffery"~~. It sounds the note of the pamphlet and warns off all Republicans.

The actual date of ~~the~~ publication has not been ascertained but the statement at the close of the Gazette notice ~~which heralded~~ ~~it~~ would indicate ~~that~~ it was about the 10th. of January. This shows there was plenty of time for <sup>the French rail</sup> ~~the original~~ memoir, on which it is based, to cross the Atlantic <sup>from the traveller at Paris</sup> ~~in some ship connected with~~ ~~the Brown family's business~~ and it indicates ~~that~~ the composition may have gone back to the <sup>late autumn</sup> winter of 1802. ~~1801~~

The title-page was so hastily ~~composed~~ and thoughtlessly designed, 1569

it does not conform to the ~~pamphlet's~~ presentation of the material. The

whole address ~~itself~~ does not pretend to be "drawn up" by the Consellor--

it is the memorial of which he was <sup>presented</sup> ~~intended~~ to have been the author.

1

Dunlap ~~in speaking of the French Counsellor of State~~ was confused by

the title-page and says parenthetically "for the author merely assumes

that character, the better to elucidate the truths he wishes to inculcate".

Most writers <sup>follow</sup> since Dunlap, <sup>but if they go on to the</sup> ~~read the title page and say the pamphlet is~~

~~another instance of Brown being a romance. To all it has therefore~~

~~been a sealed book, none having shown they had read more than the opening~~

<sup>they find</sup> paragraph ~~where Brown says~~ "nor would the compiler of this address,

have ventured to assume the office of a councillor" etc. <sup>2</sup> ~~Had they read~~

When Brown used the word Counsellor for himself and also for the author of the quoted part he <sup>made a serious mistake</sup> ~~was bound to confuse the~~ <sup>readers</sup> ~~as a report the authenticity~~ of the French memorial has been questioned. In later paragraphs the explanation is definite and clear. The memorial was obtained from a traveller at Paris where it had been circulated in a few copies. It was known to be by a Counsellor of State whose name of course could not be disclosed. Whomever he was he certainly had a remarkably accurate knowledge of the secret intentions of the French government.

1 Vol. II, p. 62.

2 The word should be counsellor--the error being corrected in the second edition.

XXX See the London Monthly Magazine Vol. XV, p. 689, 25 July 1803.

~~At this time of his life Brown had very little to do with romancing,~~  
~~in fact, the greater part of his work for the past two years had been~~  
~~in the prosaic realm of cold reality. Also~~ <sup>Brown</sup> ~~About this time he~~ was

meditating if not actually at work on his translation of Volney and  
 in translating that work from the French we shall ~~presently~~ see ~~that~~  
 his practise was to paraphrase rather than literally ~~to~~ translate. The  
 second edition ~~of the pamphlet is of help here. It~~ contains certain

variations many of which, at first sight, <sup>might</sup> appear to support the claim  
<sup>that</sup> ~~that~~ Brown was revising his own <sup>invention</sup> ~~work~~; but upon ~~further~~ study no one will

be able to find one change which cannot be ~~reasonably~~ explained <sup>by his</sup> ~~The~~  
<sup>paraphrasing method.</sup> The  
 diction alterations are not only perfectly consistent with but are

suggestive of a French original; ~~There are plenty of instances where~~

and the sentences ~~are also suggestive of a similar origin;~~ <sup>French</sup> ~~in fact,~~ <sup>dead</sup> if the

origin had not been ~~so~~ distinctly stated it could be ~~easily~~ determined  
 by internal evidence. The staccato sentences, the italics, the  
 changes in words, in punctuation, in idiom, in sentence construction,  
 the omissions, additions and substitutions all owe their  
 existence to the ~~very free~~ paraphrasing practised by Brown.

When Brown wrote Monroe's Embassy he supplied the title of the memorial. At the bottom of page 31 to the text which reads "Whatever may be their projects for futurity..." he says in a note "See almost all the French memoirs which Otto's<sup>x</sup> preliminaries produced, especially one with this title." Projects for Futurity is so distinctly Frenchy it <sup>easily</sup> becomes Projects pour l'avenir. Up to the present no copy has been found so we cannot go into the matter of the accuracy of Brown's translation.

~~The American newspapers were full of the matter at the time so~~ <sup>Brown's</sup> ~~Brown's~~ ideas and arguments should not have an undue importance <sup>as material</sup>. Greater value is in the manner

x Louis Otto was Charge d'Affaires as early as 1790.

in which it was used. That the Senate debaters had read <sup>his</sup> ~~Brown's~~ pamphlet cannot be learned. There has been found two copies ~~which were~~ owned by Senators. <sup>The Federalist</sup> ~~xx~~ Theodore Foster of Rhode Island bought a copy at Rapin's in Washington, but he dated the purchase some time in March, the trimming of the edges having cut away the day of the month. <sup>The Republican</sup> S.L. ~~Mitchill~~ <sup>xx</sup> ~~owned the~~ <sup>a</sup> second edition and dated it 1803. <sup>Probably</sup> ~~Perhaps~~ both of them and others as well as Brown read the <sup>newspapers of the day.</sup> ~~same yellow journals.~~ Brown could not have <sup>derived</sup> ~~gotten~~ his ideas from the actual sessions of Congress because the government had been moved to Washington in 1800, he did not, so far as we know, journey there and his pamphlet preceded the debate in the Senate <sup>by at least thirty - four days.</sup>

The usual comment is that the pamphlet was a non-partisan argument and ~~that it~~ had influence. Of course no one who repeats the first part of that ~~comment~~ has read it; for the attitude is so distinctly federal and ~~so~~ strongly anti-republican. ~~it may be taken as the pattern of Brown's political belief.~~ One of his strongest hits at the government is on page 85 <sup>where</sup> ~~in which~~ he joins ~~all the other Federalists and~~ calls it cowardly.

~~xx Foster was a Federalist.~~

~~xx Mitchill was a republican.~~

The ~~matter of its~~ <sup>of the pamphlet</sup> influence is not decisive. From a superficial examination <sup>it</sup> ~~the pamphlet~~ appears to have been a failure because as expressed in the resolutions offered in the Senate by James Ross <sup>of Pennsylvania</sup> the government action did not follow Brown's <sup>advice</sup> ~~ideas~~. The debate resulted in an amendment proposed by John Breckenridge <sup>2</sup> of Kentucky. The amended resolution was unanimously voted by the Senate and soon became law.

<sup>2</sup> James Ross the mover of the resolutions was senator from Pennsylvania. He was a strong Federalist, an intimate friend and attorney for Washington. The fact that Brown's family were merchants and that the pamphlet was addressed to the Representatives in Congress for the purpose of influencing legislation <sup>would suggest</sup> ~~may have lead to~~ copies <sup>were</sup> being sent to every member <sup>of</sup> both branches of the legislature. <sup>but we know</sup> ~~Brown's~~ <sup>That Foster bought a copy at Washington in March 1805</sup> ~~publication was at least thirty-four days before the opening of the~~ Senate debate, so they had plenty of time to make themselves familiar with its contents.

In the course of the debate Ross, Morris of New York, and Wells and White of Delaware show traces of the arguments Brown used. Their speeches are remarkable for their dearth

<sup>2</sup> In 1805 he was made Attorney-General by Jefferson.

<sup>3</sup> A sketch of his life by Harrison Hall the editor and a reproduction of the portrait painted by Sully may be found in the Portfolio, December 1816, pp. 449-60.

of originality. It was not until the debaters had been all heard that anything even in unimportant detail was brought out ~~in rebuttal~~ to strengthen or batter down the arguments which <sup>were</sup> ~~we can find~~ in Brown's pamphlet. So far as the record shows it probably was true that all those in favor of Ross' resolutions and most of, at least the prominent, opposers had read and absorbed what Brown wrote.

Brown being unofficial could make explanations interpreting the motives of Spain and France whereas Ross being a part of the government did not dare to even suggest them unless he wished to hasten the closing of the Senate doors <sup>for</sup> ~~and~~ a secret session.

Apparently Ross hoped some other Federalist would attack the subject. He did not offer his resolutions until no one else would and the session was nearing its end. Then he hinted at the subject, he knew he was in the minority, that he probably would fail, but in spite of the fact that he had been defeated in the elections and was to serve in the Senate only a few more days he bowed to the interests of his constituents. His opening speech



was considerate--he said he wished to give the President power to back-up any negotiations the envoy might make. His resolutions put the war preparations in the hand of the President. It appears as if Ross were defeated. In reality he did not fail--the means to the end were changed<sup>1</sup> but had it not been for his resolutions it is probable no such protective action would have been hastened.<sup>2</sup> There was danger in the subject--bribery was hinted--confidential discussion--the rules of the Senate--and cleared galleries and closed doors were delicacies.~~of the matter~~

Whether Ross as the Senate spokesman for Brown or Brown through the popularity of his pamphlet helped ~~at all~~ in ~~the~~ bringing about the Louisiana purchase is not known. Of course no

1. Madison to Monroe 1 March 1803 State Papers, etc. Washington 1903, p. 113 spoke of them as "driving at war thro' a delegation of unconstitutional power to the Executive."
- 2 Livingston to Madison 12 May 1803 State Papers, etc. Washington 1903, p. 190 said "they proved we would not be trifled with."

political event of that magnitude was ever actually due to one influence. In most cases if one can prove any influence at all the work is esteemed worthy of remark and remembrance.

Structurally, <sup>the pamphlet</sup> ~~it~~ was planned with care and well worked up to a ~~power-~~  
~~ful~~ dramatic climax. It opens with an introductory paragraph relative to the compiler, the source of his material follows. The formal statement of his entreaty for the patience of the reader is next made, followed by a brief outline of the introductory part of the material. These ~~rather elaborate~~ introductory details are well stated and ~~as~~  
briefly ~~as~~ possible only occupying three out of the ninety-two pages of the first edition. Then follows the

quoted material,--the translation from the French,--for seventy-three pages. This in turn, it should be noticed, does not pretend

<sup>1</sup> to end the memorial as it originally appeared in French, ~~Brown~~  
~~has chosen to affect breaking off abruptly,~~ <sup>though</sup> <sup>2</sup> the argument seems

to have been completed. Then follow sixteen pages of summing up  
 in which Brown deserts his old habits of language and develops  
<sup>it</sup> ~~the work~~ dramatically to the end.

From a literary standpoint <sup>it</sup> ~~the work~~ is faulty in the artificial-  
 ity of parts of the structure, in <sup>some</sup> ~~certain~~ slips in logic, in a  
 narrowness of view, ~~of the subject~~. The historical facts are at  
 times ignored, though inexplicably so, and the coloring applied  
 is ~~perhaps~~ often a little too lurid. However, on the whole it is  
 powerful, convincing and well worked up to arouse ~~in the reader~~  
 a desire <sup>for</sup> ~~to take~~ action. ~~The men who successfully resisted its~~  
~~appeal were giants.~~

As a campaign document the work is excellent. ~~No matter whether~~  
~~it is all by Brown or whether it is partly by him, the mere selection~~  
~~of the material, if he had never written a word of it, is enough~~  
~~to make a study of it worth while.~~

1 Aside from the proof of the authorship, one of the most interesting  
 things about the discovery of the French original would be the  
 continuation from this point.

2 Of the 92 of the first edition.

a copy of

ho ff He <sup>an</sup> selected <sup>apparently</sup> the argument ~~that appeared to him to be~~ irresistible; he made plausible <sup>an</sup> ~~the~~ inflamed arguments of an enthusiast <sup>at</sup> which <sup>had no</sup> least, ~~it needed no~~ assistance of his <sup>in</sup> ~~guiding hand to make~~ it a part of the minority cry for extreme measures ~~that was~~ heard at the time. The government and the majority of the people and its representatives were ~~of~~ peacefully disposed mind, and this pamphlet ~~was of course~~ highly inflammatory. But <sup>nevertheless</sup> ~~it~~ may have helped to call attention to the <sup>situation.</sup> ~~matter.~~ The majority <sup>must have</sup> ~~probably~~ "sat up and took notice" when the advocate by means of italics told them <sup>1</sup> ~~that~~ they might awake some morning and find their next door neighbor changed from bad to worse--from the Spaniard to the French--and if they would not take the advantage offered in <sup>swift though violent action</sup> ~~violating the custom of~~ nations they would not be able to get their rights, ~~any other way.~~

Brown was a "jingo" of the Federalists but in spite of ~~his~~ <sup>that</sup> "jingoism" he intended to be a good and true patriot and he gave a deal of attentive thought to <sup>the</sup> ~~an~~ adequate protection of the United States, not only at this time, but at others, notably in the magazines he edited. <sup>afterward</sup> ~~Here.~~ The comment that follows the quoted part, ~~that which is without question Brown's, in which he emphasizes~~

the actual weaknesses of our country's defense ~~may be cited in proof of his patriotic anxiety.~~

The bearing this pamphlet has on Brown's life is mostly in relation to his political beliefs and activities. To his work, however, it is of ~~greater~~ value and interest.

It is perhaps the romantic spirit of an adventurer that caused him to appreciate the subject and give his services to making it a subject of common ~~talk and~~ information, with a view to directing the course of ~~action by the~~ government. He certainly aimed high, although he justly failed in a partisan attempt. Had he not had an unusual faculty of differentiating romance from reality he would never have <sup>written</sup> ~~been found assembling~~ a political pamphlet, which has ~~been somewhat of a puzzle so far as its genuineness is concerned.~~

Perhaps <sup>he</sup> ~~It is a~~ romance of Brown's, and those who so desire may ~~find facts to warrant indecision,~~ but to us it appears to be an example of the ~~more~~ material and realistic side of his nature and work, and its value in collecting the ideas of the "jingo" of the day is enough to warrant its inclusion in any collection of historical material. Brown has always had a niche in history because of his picture of the yellow fever--it should be enlarged to accommodate this political pamphlet.

~~We have been particularly fortunate in finding~~ A rather obscure English eulogium <sup>was written by</sup> ~~of this work of Brown's~~ Nathaniel Atcheson wrote and published in London <sup>in</sup> ~~in~~ 1808 a pamphlet entitled American Encroachments on British Rights which not only cited another of Brown's <sup>pamphlets 1</sup> ~~works~~ ~~to be noticed in its proper place~~ but gave the following note to a mention of the ~~recent~~ Louisiana purchase:

"See a pamphlet which is highly deserving of serious attention, entitled "An Address...., and the Memorial on the Cession of the Mississippi to that Nation." Edition, Philadelphia, 1803. This work, which developes the views of the French Government, having been suppressed in America, is worthy of reprinting, and some persons here connected with the British interest on that continent have copies of it. Mentioning the cession of Louisiana to the French, the writer observes,--"As to England....2perserverance." Of the importance of the Mississippi the author says, "The prosperity....3river." Again "The master.....4waves," meaning the dissentions between the citizens of the United States. This is an able tract, and evidently the production of a person conversant in the politics of France. See...."

After ~~that word~~ "conversant" there was an asterisk which <sup>gave</sup> ~~gives~~ a further note: ~~as follows:~~

"Since said to be written by M. Talleyrand:--it is reprinted in the New Quarterly Review."

~~As we have already seen~~ This statement concerning the authorship by Talleyrand is important but it is probably ~~just~~ as erroneous as in the case of Brown's British Treaty. The alleged reprint in the New Quarterly Review is another error there being nothing in the

1 The British Treaty of 1807 which he says Gouverneur Morris wrote.  
2 P.59. The only italics used is for "The schème...account." The France in brackets is not in the original.  
3 P.68. It should all be in italics. 4 P. 70.

first twenty volumes which relates to the Louisiana purchase except a reference ~~to it~~ in one of the unimportant reviews of a book of travel. So far as we know the Quarterly Review never reprinted any pamphlets or tracts.

But that note is not the only error, ~~in this comment on Brown's pamphlet.~~ The statement is made that it had been suppressed. As we shall see that is about as far from the truth as it could be--for it had the distinction of ~~being one of the few instances of a work of Brown's which went into~~ a second edition.

The criticism ~~given or implied~~ is, however, quite in balance for the errors made and ~~is of value as~~ showing how well received Brown's works were in a <sup>England.</sup> ~~foreign country. The suggestion that what our peer-neglected author wrote was said to be the work of the world famed Talleyrand is no mean recommendation, for the intelligence of Brown. Evidently this Louisiana pamphlet needed no belated assistance of Atchafson.~~

**SESSION OF LOUISIANA**

**TO THE FRENCH**

**LATE BREACH OF TREATY BY THE SPANIARDS.**

**INCLUDING**

**THE TRANSLATION OF A MEMORIAL, ON THE WAR OF ST. DOMINGO,  
AND CESSION OF THE MISSISSIPPI TO FRANCE,**

**DRAWN UP**

**BY A FRENCH COUNSELLOR OF STATE.**

**A NEW EDITION**

**REVISED, CORRECTED AND IMPROVED.**

**ENTERED ACCORDING TO ACT OF CONGRESS.**

**PUBLISHED**

**BY JOHN CONRAD, & CO. NO. 30, CHESTNUT STREET, PHILADEL-  
PHIA; M. AND J. CONRAD, & CO. NO. 140, MARKET-STREET,  
BALTIMORE; AND RAPIN, CONRAD, & CO. WASHINGTON  
CITY.**

**E. MAXWELL, PRINTER.**

**1803.**



(Illustration to be placed

to face page 1584)

The Philadelphia Gazette for 18 February 1803 notices the forthcoming second edition. In it ~~we shall see~~ the old ghost of genuineness haunting the author, but the tone of the article is one of defense of the ~~author's~~ silence in regard to the original ~~a method~~ of procedure ~~that we believe the case warrants.~~ <sup>ed</sup> The public is seldom satisfied with any statement that suggests there is a delicacy about the matter. People usually want the details of the delicacy entrusted to them. ~~The notice reads:~~

"Louisiana Pamphlet

It appears that the rapid sale of the first edition of this work, and the acknowledged importance of its contents to the interests of America, have induced the publishers to begin a larger impression, on a more convenient and cheap scale. From this edition of the memorial, I am assured that some passages, less applicable than others, to the present crisis, will be retrenched, and the whole will be carefully revised, corrected, and improved.

Many cavils and enquiries have been current respecting the genuineness of this memorial. The editor may, perhaps, be induced to seize this opportunity of removing these doubts, but he ought to know that those who deny the intrinsic evidence of this production, will give ear to no other testimony; while those who admit this kind of evidence will demand no other. He ought to remember what he has been so often warned of: that to produce a nameless original will avail him nothing, since the office of the writer is the point, and not whether such reasoning appeared first in English or French.

It is observable, that those who have interest in weakening the effect of this pamphlet, have hitherto contented themselves with taking a few passages and shewing them in an insulated state; or with railing at the supposed writer, in vague and general terms. 'Tis a pity; for the course of truth, that such railers are not a little more communicative and impartial. If they are sincere in their doubts, they must believe that a fuller view of the contents of the pamphlet would only more clearly establish its spuriousness. This

however, is a proceeding which they know it would be best to omit. The reader would be apt to forget the enquiry into the person and nation of the writer, and to think only of the truth and importance of his statements. Instead of gravely weighing the various evidence, for assigning the memorial to Cornot or Gouverneur Morris, they would be busy in considering whether the pictures here drawn of the value of the Mississippi territory: of the caprice and imbecility of our councils and of the dangers arising to us from the neighborhood of France, were genuine pictures: were counterparts of truth or not.

Everyone must see that this work professes not to prophecy. It contains only speculations on the future by one who is not an actor but adviser. For the truth of these speculations an appeal can only be made to the common sense of the readers. If the events predicted be improbable, and the predictor avows no other inspiration than that of experience, we reject them without regard to his reputation or office. If the cession of Louisiana to France is chimerical; if the French interests in that province will not be incompatible with ours; if their former conduct prognosticates nothing but a religious observance of treaties, the meekest amity and sublimest disinterestedness in their new station; if our internal divisions and jarring interests; the mutinous temper of our slaves and the restless ferocity of our savages, expose us to no danger from so ~~pacif~~ pacif, unambitious, and amicable a race as the French, of what moment to us is a different opinion in others? Who cares whether the pro-consul of Italy or the quondam treasurer of America, or any Grubstreet politician in Paris, London or New York has a different notion of things?

If, on the contrary, we adopt opposite views, and believe in the cession; in the likelihood of cunning, intrigue, quarrels of encroachments from the French in our own vulnerabilities; we shall be entirely absorbed in the contemplation of the events depicted in this pamphlet, and leave to those who have more leisure and less zeal, for the public, to discuss who it is that invites us to the contemplation.

The cavillers therefore, take the wisest course in suppressing all those passages which, in their opinion, prove the spuriousness of this memorial. They know the deference which party-men pay to their mere assertion, and endeavor to divert all attention from the arguments of the pamphlet, by ringing all possible changes on the dainty terms, forgery and romance. This is their right way, and if I was a friend to any other cause than that of truth, I should earnestly persuade them to persist in it.

VINDEX."

X

Who "Vindex" was is not known, ~~to us but in his article there~~

X "appear many of the earmarks of Brown. Probably it and the advertise  
"Vindex" in the Weekly Magazine, Vol. II, p. 109 is apparently not Brown.

~~ment presently to be quoted were by Brown.~~

~~The point of importance, however, is that the writer persists~~  
~~in the defence and genuineness of the body of the pamphlet.~~ <sup>quoted part.</sup>

To have his pamphlet go into a second edition in a little over  
a month was ~~not a little~~ flattering; ~~at least~~ if Brown could not

have the government do as he recommended he could <sup>at least</sup> find readers

~~x for his recommendations and a professional author in Brown's days~~  
~~had immediate needs~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~for respectable sales.~~ ~~The fact that the second~~  
~~edition was a larger impression was a triumph for Brown.~~

The Philadelphia Gazette contained this advertisement on Washing-  
ton's birthday:

"Louisiana Pamphlet. Second edition. This day is published, (Price 25 cents) An ADDRESS on the Cession of Louisiana to the French, and the late Breach of Treaty by the Spaniards, including the Translation of the Memorial on the War of St. Domingo, and Cession of the Mississippi to France. Drawn up by a French Counselor of State.

The favorable reception which the first edition of this pamphlet met with has induced the publishers to issue a second edition, revised, corrected and improved, and in a cheaper and more convenient form."

The last paragraph recalls parts of the "Vindex" article <sup>previously</sup> ~~just~~  
~~quoted, and it may be that Brown wrote both this advertisement,~~  
~~and the article. The internal evidence is strong but the article~~

1 ~~What there was more convenient about the second edition is not~~  
~~clear. Both editions are the same in size but the second is re-set~~  
~~in a smaller type, harder to read. The first was an excellent piece~~  
~~of printing while the second is no more than the ordinary. Undoubt-~~  
~~edly This new edition was cheaper but hardly more convenient.~~  
2 ~~"Vindex" in the Weekly Magazine, Vol. II, p. 109 is evidently not Brown.~~

second

1586A

~~part of this work.~~

The changes in this edition consist of the following, not given in italics. The paging given is ~~that of~~ the first edition. Page 4, 1.15 ~~the word feudal~~ was substituted for ancient in the first edition.

KT

4, 1.22 ....skillfully for cautiously.....

5, 1.23 naked for furious.

17, 1.1 endeavoured for strove.

20, 1.27 no paragraph.

21, 1.7 The series of ages to come is infinite is omitted.

22, 1.3 to page 29, 1.25 is omitted.

second sentence of the / (see advertisement to this second edition and the note on page 16 of ~~second edition~~.)

~~2013~~

31, 1.16 prompt for induce.

34, 1.6 slope for portion.

37, 1.4 them ~~corrected from~~ it.

37, 1.8 those for these.

41, 1.14 in part is added.

44, 1.22 larger for large.

46, 1.9 ff.....extended for when....extend.

46, 1.22 Lower Mississippi for Delta (in italics).

51, 1.24 and to the English for as to them.

52, 1.5 would for will.

52, 1.13 A wise policy would teach for Far better would it be for.

55, 2.10 Note at the bottom of page 32 of second edition is new. X

66, 1.4 ensued added.

66, 1.6 defeats! These defeats for defeats, which.

66, 1.10 but chiefly for and finally.

66, 1.16 and how have they been busy? added; after employed.

67, 1.13 wealth for riches.

67, 1.27 for want of an assortment; added; after shop;

(....strong.) 72, 1.12 to 17, in italics with note added (second edition, p.43.)

73, 1.3 A race for who are.

77, 1.14 Do added; before those.

77, 1.16 do they omitted.

77, 1.16 brotherly for paternal.

84, 1.1 long added before separation.

(x)

The French memorial in quotes begins p.3 line 24 and ends p.26 line 17.)

~~being of importance only as indicating that he contributed to the paper, we omit here the details. Similarly, the description of the second edition and its differences may also be here omitted.~~

Besides the <sup>sale</sup>advertisement ~~already~~ mentioned there is one inserted in the second edition as <sup>a</sup>sort of a preface. It is new, liable to loss from most copies because it is an extra single leaf inserted and is of sufficient importance to <sup>be</sup>warrant <sup>ed.</sup>quoting it. ~~It reads:~~

"THE reception which the first edition of this work has met with, has induced the publisher to issue a second impression, in a cheaper and more convenient form. The editor has retrenched nothing new from the memorial, but the passages respecting New Holland, which were thought to be no wise applicable to the present situation of affairs.

The measures which have lately been taken by the government, are widely different from those which the editor, in common with a large part of the community, ventured to recommend. These measures are, in every point of view, of the utmost importance, and their true consequences, whether they be beneficial or not, deserve to be fully investigated and disclosed. Reflections on this subject, drawn up by the editor of this performance, will shortly appear, and it is hoped that they will not prove altogether unworthy of attention.

The editor withholds his name on this occasion, merely because no name can give a just title to that audience which his arguments may fail to obtain. Conscious of no sinister or factious views, he will cheerfully encounter, if necessary, all that the adverse zeal or clashing interests of others may suggest against him, and assumes no merit with those who approve, since he merely repeats what is to be heard in all public places, and urges considerations already familiar to the best part of his countrymen. Feb. 18, 1803."

1 This refers to Monroe's Embassy.

**MONROE'S EMBELLISHMENT**  
**THE CONDUCT OF THE UNITED STATES**  
**IN RELATION TO**  
**OUR CLAIMS TO THE NAVIGATION**  
**OF THE MISSISSIPPI,**  
**CONSIDERED,**  
**BY THE AUTHOR OF AN ADDRESS**  
**TO THE**  
**GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES,**  
**ON THE**  
**CESSION OF LOUISIANA, &c. &c.**

---

ENTERED ACCORDING TO ACT OF CONGRESS.

---

**PUBLISHED**

BY JOHN CONRAD, & CO. NO. 30, CHESNUT STREET, PHILADEL-  
PHIA; M. AND J. CONRAD, & CO. NO. 140, MARKET-STREET,  
BALTIMORE; AND RAPIN, CONRAD, & CO. WASHINGTON  
CITY.

G. MAXWELL, PRINTER.

.....  
1803.

(Illustration to be placed

to face page 1588



~~In~~ The Philadelphia Gazette and Daily Advertiser for 3 March 1803,

Brown's second pamphlet on the ~~Cession of Louisiana~~, was advertised thus:

"Monroe's Embassy, Just published, by John Conrad & Co., No. 30, Chesnut-street- price 1 cents. Monroe's Embassy; Or, The Conduct of the Government, in relation to our claims to the navigation of the Mississippi considered--By the author of An Address to the Government of the United States on the Cession of Louisiana, &c. &c."

The date of publication has not been positively determined; the evidence ~~does not~~ <sup>that</sup> indicate<sup>s</sup> the date of ~~the~~ <sup>is too early.</sup> advertisement ~~quoted~~ On page 24 mention is made of the "Ambassador not yet gone". Monroe sailed March 8th. <sup>which</sup> ~~conforms with the probability that March 3rd. was probably the date.~~ On page 52 Brown says "five months have already past since the provocation has been given." The date of ~~that~~ <sup>the</sup> provocation was 16 October 1802 therefore 16 March was the ~~latest~~ <sup>earliest</sup> possible date for the composition, <sup>of the</sup> ~~of the~~ <sup>last six pages.</sup> ~~work.~~

1 The price is not given in this advertisement in the copies seen but it undoubtedly was twenty-five cents.

Though Brown may have found the pseudonym Poplicola <sup>1</sup> ~~in the account~~ in Plutarch's Lives or even in Rivington's Gazette, he did not need to go so far; ~~in fact~~ he may have seen the name used for similar political purposes in two of the Junius letters / ~~those~~ dated 28 April and 28 May 1767. ~~Just~~ What decided the selection of the unusual name is not known.

~~In the quotation from The London Monthly Magazine of 28 July 1803~~  
~~already quoted we~~ <sup>found</sup> ~~find this mention~~ of Monroe's Embassy.

"The same author soon afterwards and probably with similar intentions, published "Monroe's Embassy, or the Conduct of the Government in relation to our claims to the Navigation of the Mississippi considred; by the Author of An Address to the Government of the United States, &c." "

1 Not Brown's alone. A Tory Poplicola in Rivington's Gazette of 1773 had done his best to persuade the colonists to allow the landing of the tea at New York. See Van Tyne: Loyalists of the American Revolution, New York 1902, p.12. Historically the name is interesting. Poplicola-- a lover of the people--was a descendant of Valerius and wished not only to save his country from Collatinus but to make it truly republican. His daughter Valeria is near enough to Valerian which in due course we shall find of especial interest to ~~our author~~. ~~Is it possible Brown fancied himself rendering a similar service to the United States?~~

Brown.

The "afterwards" was after the publication of the pamphlet on the Cession of Louisiana to the French, in the study of which we saw ~~that~~ Brown was laboring to persuade the government to use force to acquire the territory. ~~for the United States.~~

Of course the writer ~~of this article~~ had not read the pamphlet, for if he had he would not have used ~~that~~ "probably". ~~As has~~ ~~been seen~~ ~~Monroe's Embassy~~ <sup>It</sup> is not only "similar" in intention but it is a resultant ~~of the publication of the other pamphlet.~~ <sup>Address.</sup>

In structure, Monroe's Embassy is ~~not equal to the Address to~~ <sup>inferior.</sup> ~~the Government on the Cession of Louisiana.~~ It is thrown together hastily with no particular plan, it lacks the dramatic effect of the better known pamphlet, and, though introduced properly and concluded with effect, it is in need of revision <sup>and</sup> omission, ~~and construction.~~ <sup>that defect.</sup> Lacking construction it is not possible to outline its character. To give ~~any~~ idea of its logic, at times faulty, it would be necessary to give a resumé of each paragraph. However, there is one good point despite ~~its lack of construction.~~ It is not at any time tiresome reading, in fact it is ~~much~~ lighter in tone than ~~the better constructed pamphlet,~~ the Address.

On page ten Brown speaks of examining the matter with an impartial mind and lending a patient ear to the opposition. This is of course only talk, for his impartial mind only considered the arguments of the republicans as targets for Federal canister.

On page thirteen he speaks of the Envoy as being to Spain. This is of course a partial error. Monroe was accredited to both France and Spain.

A noteworthy fact is that on page twenty-nine when he comes to ridicule the idea of the embassy he avoids all personality. There was not a little in Monroe's former experience as minister to France to afford an opportunity for spectacular criticism of Jefferson's choice. Washington could not condemn him too severely.<sup>1</sup>

At times the first person becomes objectionable and Brown's statistics become panicky. Having already rehearsed the difficulties in St. Domingo it seems as if he should have avoided the error of taking it for granted that Napoleon would conquer, but when one considers the spectacular victories that followed in rapid succession it is perhaps excusable. The suggestion that Jefferson might lose his popularity is a good example of Brown's

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 174-6 Foster: A Century of American Diplomacy, Boston, 1900. For eight months Foster was Secretary of State under Harrison.

lack of understanding of the arts of the politician.

Though an excellent example of what <sup>he</sup> Brown could do when <sup>applied</sup> ~~focus~~ing his ~~imaginative~~ analytical mind <sup>to</sup> ~~on~~ a practical subject it shows him, as he unquestionably was, ~~and~~ and would not otherwise be, ~~no~~ no politician and no statesman. His limited knowledge of law gave him little regard for diplomacy, ~~and complications of an international character.~~

We had supposed ~~that~~ he would remain neutral all his life, but the partisanship of the merchantile classes was, after all, followed by him. As we have seen in the case of the other pamphlet <sup>he</sup> Brown ~~here makes a departure from his practice~~ and shows himself to be like his father <sup>1</sup> a staunch Federalist. He does not let slip any opportunity to hit hard at Jefferson even to the point of trying to threaten him with personal responsibility but of course what appeared to Brown and to many others of his day as "cowardly delays and pacific expedients", as weakness and vacillation ~~in~~ Jefferson's were really the best traits of <sup>his</sup> ~~his~~ character. ~~Jefferson's~~ ruling passion was peace.

1 Eliza Brown's copy-book, covered with old wall-paper, ~~shows~~ <sup>marks</sup> him to ~~have been~~ the rankest sort of a Federalist.

Our second group of Louisiana Purchase writings of Brown  
are the ~~POPLICOLA~~ <sup>newspaper</sup> CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PHILADELPHIA GAZETTE.

2120

~~1 and 8 October 1804.~~

~~Besides the two Louisiana purchase pamphlets~~ <sup>excellent</sup> ~~There are two articles~~  
~~what is called~~ <sup>1</sup>  
~~on the West Florida controversy resultant of the purchase which have~~  
~~the same object as the Address and Monroe's Embassy; namely, to influence~~  
~~the action of the members of Congress, especially in connection with~~  
~~taking war-like measures. In them and connected with them There is suf-~~  
~~ficient evidence to warrant the conclusion that they are by Brown. Both~~  
~~are signed with the Monroe's Embassy pseudonym Poplicola.~~

They appeared in the ~~Philadelphia Gazette~~ <sup>issues</sup> for the 1st. and 8th. of <sup>Monday</sup>  
October 1804. This was the same paper that ~~twice gave its space to not-~~ <sup>announced the first edition of the Address</sup>  
~~announced and noticed~~  
~~ice of the second edition of Brown's first Louisiana purchase pamphlet,~~  
~~and to the notice of the publication of his Monroe's Embassy.~~ <sup>announced the</sup>

Brown apparently had an "open sesame" to its columns. Its former  
owners had been Andrew Brown and Samuel Relf. Andrew Brown was probably  
~~the same relative of Brown's~~ <sup>is mentioned</sup> whose widow ~~was listed~~ in the 1827 note-  
book of Brown's brother Joseph. He <sup>2</sup> gave up the paper in September 1801  
from which time it was <sup>published</sup> ~~owned~~ by Relf. ~~Henry and William Duane were the~~  
~~editors.~~ <sup>3 possible</sup> In 1804 he <sup>ran</sup> a young ladies school.

1 A recent study of the matter has been published at Baltimore in  
1918. The West Florida Controversy by J.T. Cox, Baltimore 1918.  
2 See Gazette 3 September.

The writer is clearly a cooled-off Federalist with a changed attitude toward Jefferson such as we saw coming in Monroe's Embassy. Apparently Brown had been persuaded by the Senate debate and the amendment to Ross' resolutions. However his real interest or motive is the same, ~~even coinciding to the extent of~~ applying mostly to shipping interests especially of West-Indian trade. <sup>Both</sup> ~~The~~ articles are obviously written by a citizen and not by ~~an~~ politician. They are constructed along Brown's special line, in the manner of a debate such as he had taken part in when a young man and a very active member of the Society for the Attainment of Useful Knowledge. There is the same frequent use of italics. <sup>His</sup> ~~Brown's~~ style is ~~clearly~~ in them, especially <sup>his</sup> ~~the~~ diction. The most

characteristic part is the closing paragraph of the first article

which reads:

"These are the considerations to which every good citizen will give close attention. To give a satisfactory reply to these queries, would be a public benefit. If no body better qualified shall give us that satisfaction, an attempt will be made more amply to elucidate this interesting subject by Poplicola."

There we have Brown ~~framing his structure~~ in the same fashion ~~as~~ we so often found ~~him doing~~ in his works of fiction.

The details of the horrors and suffering to be expected by an expedition into the bogs and woods of Florida are similar to those  ~~cited~~ in the Address when the conditions of the French in St. Domingo were recited. The heading "Queries" is, ~~as we have seen in our study~~ <sup>a regular</sup> ~~of the Weekly Magazine~~ also another Brown "tag." ~~Added to all these~~ details we find both of the articles signed with the same pseudonym as our author used in Monroe's Embassy and that pseudonym is important despite the fact that Brown was as we have suggested in a note not ~~the only one to use it.~~

Any one who is at all inclined to doubt Brown's authorship ~~of these~~ articles should ~~also~~ compare the statement about the man who offers to sell his right to his adversary for six pence in Monroe's Embassy

and that of the people who would pay twenty pounds for a ten-pound



1

debt as found here.

The fact that we here find Brown contributing to one of the newspapers of the day is not so important as that he was seriously studying political matters and turning publicist. ~~That they are of pecuniary interest is true but that they had more than that for a motive is~~ clearly <sup>foreshadow his</sup> ~~to be seen from Brown's~~ later editorial activity in public affairs notably in his American Register.

There is one light in which we may view the <sup>three</sup> ~~three~~ works which we have here <sup>grouped</sup> ~~related~~. It is clear that each step in Brown's thought as represented by the Address, Monroe's Embassy and the Poplicola queries is an advance in the direction of peace. If we were to imagine another step of ~~what we might style a series~~ it would undoubtedly be an argument for peace-at-any-price. Where he first in the Address advised war and moderated it to half war-like measures in the Embassy, he finally in the queries warned his countrymen of the ravages of war and advised very moderate action. Thus in the second article he says:

1 Paragraph nine of the second article.

"We have paused, we have negotiated, we have compromised; when unable to obtain absolute and complete redress, what have we done? We have given up our claims, or have postponed the discussion of them."

By negotiating just claims he saw no need for the United States to  
<sup>1</sup>  
 go to war with Spain.

With their very slight attention to convincing argument these  
 articles are merely pendants of the more important political pamphlets  
 of 1803 so ~~that~~ it is clear any lengthened consideration of their  
 merits is ~~quite~~ unnecessary. Anyone who has not read the ~~Louisiana~~  
~~purchase~~ pamphlets should <sup>not</sup> read these articles. The same general criti-  
 cism which we have applied to the ~~more pretentious works~~ is equally  
 appropriate here.

So far as we know there was no public influence of these contri-  
 butions; ~~of Brown's~~ <sup>†</sup> they fall among the host of similar efforts made  
 by various writers of the day.

Related to our author's life and work they are of interest and of  
 historical value to show the bent of his mind and the power of his  
 political persuasion.

1 Spain had set the example. When there might have been trouble over  
 the Louisiana transfer by France to us Yrugo the Spanish ambassador  
 formally objected but his government through our ambassador gave  
 assurance there would be no actual objection.

~~inasmuch~~ <sup>As</sup> the newspaper in which the articles originally appeared is not widely accessible ~~it has been thought wise to~~ <sup>we</sup> reprint them here so that any future student of the subject may have access to all the material necessary for any decision even of our ascription of them to Brown.

~~The first appeared in the number for Monday 1 October and the second in the number for the 8th.~~

---

For this Gazette.

---

QUERIES.

Relative to a War with Spain.

AS there seems to be a probability of a national difference with Spain, every good citizen must deem it incumbent on him to consider the matter maturely, and to weigh all consequences well before he gives his voice on one side or the other. As the time is hastening when the national legislature will open its sittings, and some measures

will be proposed by our government for the sanction of the representative body: this is the moment of deliberation and enquiry. It is impossible that a war with Spain, whose possessions lie so closely round about us: whose interests are so intimately blended with those of a still more formidable nation, France, should be productive of slight or inconsiderate consequences. War with any state, however insignificant, should make the governors of every nation pause, but, in the present state of European policy, there is no fore-telling where the tide of hostilities, when once set in motion, will end. Our commerce, our genius and our institutions constitute us, in the strictest sense, a member of that body whose main trunk is spread over Europe, but whose principal branches are extended over all the borders of this Western World. War is a whirlpool, which gathers all those nations round its centre. Hitherto we have with great difficulty, and with marvelous good fortune, kept ourselves from being involved in its current. Surely there should be most cogent reasons to induce us wantonly to trust ourselves within its reach, and to part with that sweet tranquillity, those inestimable benefits which we have hitherto, for so long a period enjoyed.

With deep impressions of the infinite moment of the question should

every man sit down and examine it. Before he inquires into the decisions of abstract justice, before he considers whether we have been treated by the Spanish government in a manner consonant to rigid equity or not, he will weigh well the consequences which war will bring along with it. He will ask with anxiety and eagerness, what is to be gained, and what is to be lost by such a war?

Spain itself, is to us, a transmarine nation, but its colonies and detached territories are contiguous to our own. He will first confine his view to Transatlantic Spain. With that our only intercourse, at present, is of a commercial nature. We should, therefore, consider how our trade will be affected by a war. What do we now receive from the European dominions of Spain? What effect have these receipts in furnishing employment to all those artisans who are connected with the building and fitting of shipping? What effect have they on the fortunes of our merchants, and thro' them, upon the general wealth of the community? What effect upon the public revenue?

What is the nature and value of the commodities, of either foreign or domestic production, which we export to Spain, and what is the various and complex effect on the condition of individuals, which this trade already produces? Is there not present scarcity of corn in

Spain? Shall we not, in case of the continuation of peace have, in our own hands, the supplying of their wants, and will not this be a source of immense advantage to us, in every form in which trade can benefit a nation? Is not flour our staple article of commerce? That article which we have the means of manufacturing to an almost unlimited extent, and the production of which has a more powerful effect than any other on our real wealth, happiness, and population. Could there be any period at which<sup>a</sup> war with Spain would prove more deeply injurious to our true interests as a nation of farmers and millers than the present?

We should then consider, whether Spain be not capable of inflicting direct, and positive injuries, by annoying our trade with their ships of war and their privateers.--Contemptible as we regard them, as a naval and military nation, let us not forget, that stations and opportunities may compensate, in a large degree, the want of fleets and armies. Let us consider that we are a nation of husbandmen and traders; our traders setting the plow to work, and are enabled in their turn to sell and barter by the plow--that the West Indies are the grand emporium where a vast proportion of our commodities are exchanged. There is our market, whither the products of our lands

and husbandry are carried, and from whence all that can make our home comfortable, is brought back. In the great highway to this market are the Spaniards posted, in the impregnable fortress of Havanna. Within sight of the very towers of this fortress are our ships in their voyage out and home obliged to pass. From thence may the watchful enemy descry them, and rushing out, in pinnaces and barges, make them an easy prey.

Even in our immediate neighborhood the Spaniards occupy stations from which they may effectively annoy us. Their posts in east and west Florida, are situated as if on purpose to molest and intercept our intercourse with the Tropical Islands, and with our new Empire on the Mississippi.

What a poor and deceitful consolation is it that these ravages may be, in some degree, prevented or diminished by arming our merchant ships and beating off the petty enemy, whom only to be armless, makes formidable. This may be lessening indeed, but it is not annihilating the evil: for to what amount will the additional expenses of naval equipments arise? What will be the cost of the needed arms, ammunition and men? On whose expenses will this cost ultimately fall? Will it not fall, in the enhanced price of all West-Indian commodit—

ies, on the farmer and mechanic, and in the consequent rise of all provisions, on the whole community.

A still poorer consolation is it that we may retaliate on Spanish subjects, for admitting that we can molest and pillage their trade and their property, this considered as mere retaliation, will afford us but the wretched and infernal satisfaction of revenge, but it does not fill the empty purse; or build up the ruined fortune, or abate the exorbitant price of the necessaries of life.

Some may indeed question this conclusion, and observe that our privateers may pillage the Spaniards in the West-Indies and European seas, and thus we may reimburse ourselves for all our losses, incurred by the suspension, or pillage of our own trade.

Let it be inquired what the nature of the Spanish trade is, whether that between the parent country and the colonies may not be concentrated or suspended, or protected in such a manner as, for the most part, to baffle all our force and all our stratagems.

But what genuine citizen would not abhor, what enlightened statesman would not deprecate, the riches that are gotten by the plundering called privateering. The wealth of a nation is lessened by the influx of money, if prodigality and vice keep pace with it, and how



notorious is it, that wealth gotten by privateersmen begs profligacy, presumption, and waste, and leaves all those concerned in it much deeper than ever in wretchedness and poverty.

But perhaps it may be said that the Spanish posts may be seized.-- This cannot be done without soldiers and ships of war, and can it be done, even by their assistance.-- Let us sit down and count the cost. I do not mean the mere money, which it is the fashion with exasperated patriots to despise when it comes in competition with what they call national honor, but the cost in lives. Let us also consider the incidents of a campaign in the woods and bogs of Florida, and especially the probability of success against maritime fortresses, well defended by ramparts and men, and still better by the horrors of the climate, and a trackless wilderness. As to the grand post from which the enemy can harm us most, it is absolutely inaccessible to our attempts. The most formidable naval and military power in the world, Great Britain, expended thousands of lives and millions of money, half a century ago, in gaining momentary possession of Havana.

But suppose the conquest of the Floridas effected, it must either be restored at the conclusion of hostilities, in which case all the

lives and all the money previously expended in obtaining and preserving it, will be thrown away, or it will become a permanent possession, that is, we shall enlarge an empire already of unwieldy magnitude; we shall multiply the seeds of foreign war, and intestine animosity; we shall put to new hazard the integrity, unity, and peace of the American empire.

These are the considerations to which every good citizen will give close attention. To give a satisfactory reply to these queries, would be a public benefit. If no body better qualified shall give us that satisfaction, an attempt will be made more amply to elucidate this interesting subject by

POPLICOLA.

---

On a war with Spain.

(No. II)

WHEN an injury is received, or thought to be received from one nation by another, the ordinary method of proceeding is to go to war. I must confess it is not very common for the injured nation, on such occasions, to deliberate and weigh the impending consequences: to consider whether by war the injury already received will be

lessened or only increased; be repaired or only aggravated. Injuries are generally construed into insults, and the honor is supposed to be violated in proportion as property is injured, and there are certain bold and noble spirits who think an insult the greatest of all national, as well as individual offences; and honor, a possession that ought to be kept inviolate, by the nation as well as the private citizen, with the sacrifice, if necessary, of goods and chattels, and even of life itself.

Should any one hint to such men the propriety of looking before they leap: Should the mere enquiry be proposed whether more evil than good will not ensue from taking up arms, and a doubt insinuated with all possible diffidence, whether we ought to fight, if it should really appear that war will only augment the evil already suffered, how will the generous blood of such men boil; what a noble indignation, will be awakened in their bosoms: how will the fine sounds of national honor, national dignity, national character, flow from their inspired lips. What terrific names will they fix upon the cautious counsellor. How will they rail at him as a foreigner in spirit if not in blood; as a mean trickler to the enemy, the hired advocate of meanness and submission.

Anger has no ears, and it is therefore needless to remind such perturbed spirits that the subject urged upon them is the safety and welfare of their native country: that the interests of Spain, to come to the present point, are not commended to their pity or their tenderness, nor the conduct of Spain, either formerly in detaining our ships in America or allowing others to maltreat us in Europe, been vindicated. That subject has been expressly waived. Allowing the injury to be atrocious in the first case, and allowing the refusal of redress to be in the second place unjustifiable, it has merely been made a subject of enquiry whether the interest (not of Spain, but) of America will be promoted by hostile measures. The enraged patriot has been entreated to check the torrent of his vengeance, not for the sake of his enemy, but for his own sake.

The truth is, these angry champions are actuated by resentment for their own wrongs. If their personal honor has been wounded, or their commercial schemes been frustrated, and their immediate property been pillaged, they call upon their country to go to war. As to themselves, they hazard nothing. Their own safety, in particular, is not endangered. They can afford therefore to bluster about vengeance, national honor, insulted dignity and all that.

But these men are made not only deaf by their passions, but they are blinded by them. They see not that tho' threats and demands may possibly yet succeed in extorting compensation for their own losses, yet war, whatever benefits the nation may receive from it, can in no way, restore to them the money they have lost or atone for the affronts that they have received.

Neither do they recollect that not all the classes of their fellow citizens, nor all the members even of the merchantile classes have suffered by Spanish injustice, that to others therefore, it will be necessary to suggest some other motive than vengeance for insult.

The resentment which they represent as general, is confined to very narrow limits, and is, we hope, very far from rendering the bulk of the community blind to the obvious dictates of duty and discretion.

Whatever may be said of other nations, we have not hitherto acted in relation to foreign states, totally without consideration or foresight--we have not suffered ourselves to be whirled away to the field of battle by the first whisperings of injury, the first gust of resentment. We have paused, we have negociated, we have compromised:: when unable to obtain absolute and complete redress, what have we done? we have given up our claims, or have postponed the discussion

of them.

There are certain ardent spirits who have poured the whole flood of their resentment on such tame, truckling maxims. They hesitate not in the career of their heroic indignation, to disturb hallowed ashes, and revile the memory of Washington himself, because he was always the friend of a pacific policy. But all this noisy rhetoric will hardly change the steady tenor of public opinion. People will still be inclined before they go to law, to enquire not only into the justice of their claim, but the possibility of their establishing it. They will generally be loath to pay twenty pounds of costs, to obtain a debt of ten pounds, after argument and persuasion have failed, they will not resort to violence, till they have enquired whether violence will get, what could not be obtained by argument.

There are, no doubt, individuals whose passions may incline them to <sup>^</sup>attack a stone wall with their fists, on whose top the object of their enmity or vengeance is posted, and though the enemy exults in that ire which only injures and destroys itself, and the surrounding spectators bestow nothing but pity and contempt on his conduct, yet the madman stands acquitted in his own eyes, and receives comfort in the midst of his bruises, from the recollection that he has obeyed

the dictates of a just resentment,and has sought a noble revenge.

This folly and infatuation has sometimes been exemplified in the conduct of nations,but,to the honor of America,it will always be remembered,that her conduct has been widely different.

The warlike spirits may continue to revile the Old President for meanly submitting to pillage and insult,and for wanting spirit in the midst of two warring nations,to side with either:but happy is he who can quote the example of the illustrious Washington in favour of the measures he commends,and surely most unlucky are those disputants who brand as infamous,cowardly,or traitorous,the counsel or the motives by which Washington regulated his conduct.

POPPLICOLA.