

TO RUBUS KING, Esq.

Sir, From your silence on the subject of my letter of the 4th instant, I presume that I am not to be honored with a reply. Perhaps this may be owing to my temerity in addressing him, whom Mr. Coleman calls "the first man in the country."

Though you, sir, have not honored me with your notice, I have been abundantly honored by your friends; and yet extraordinary as it may appear, I mean to pay little attention to their assidities, but to envelop myself in dignity like your own. As far as they have attempted to attack my character, I shall leave it to be defended by others, or rather to defend itself. Not that I affect to be insensible to the value of public opinion; but in truth, and in the present pressure of professional business, I have not time to do justice both to you and to myself; and I think it of infinitely more importance to the community, in the existing crisis, to make known what you are than what I am.

Another charge made against me, is that I am an alien interfering in the politics of this country. Be it so for a moment, and let me ask why is it that I am an alien in this my adopted country at this day? Because in consequence of your interference, I was prevented from coming to it in 1798, & from being naturalized upwards of three years ago.

As a witness, then, sir, I come forward to testify, not to my countrymen, but to the electors of this city, to the whole of the U. States, if you should ever aspire to govern them, and I now present you with my evidence.

In the summer of 1798, after the attempt of the people of Ireland for their emancipation had been completely defeated; after every armed body had been dispersed or had surrendered, except a few men that had taken refuge in the mountains of Wicklow; while military tribunals, house-burnings, shootings, torture, and every kind of devastation, were desolating and overwhelming the defenceless inhabitants, some of the state-prisoners then in confinement entered into a negotiation with the Irish ministers for effecting a general amnesty; and as an inducement, offered, among other things not necessary to the examination of your conduct, to emigrate to such country as might be agreed upon between them and the government.

The offer was accepted; the bloody system was stopped for a time, and was not renewed until after your interference, and after the English ministry had resolved openly to break its faith with us. On our part, we performed our stipulations with the most punctilious fidelity, but in such a manner as to preserve to us the warmest approbation of our friends, and to excite the greatest dissatisfaction in our enemies. Government soon perceived, that on the score of interest it had calculated badly, and had gained nothing by the contract. It was afraid to let us go at large, to develop, and detect the misrepresentations and calumnies that were studiously set afloat, and had therefore, I am convinced, determined to violate its engagements, by keeping us prisoners as long as possible. How was this to be done? In the commencement of our negotiation, Lord Castlereagh declared, as a reason for our acceding to government's possessing a negative on our choice, that it had no worse place in view for our emigration than the U. States of America. We had made our election to go there, and him to have our agreement carried into execution.

Your friends when they accuse me of want of moderation in my conduct towards you, are wonderfully mistaken. They do not reflect, or know, that I have never spoken of you without suppressing (as I now do) personal feelings that rise up within me, and swell my heart with indignation and resentment. But I mean to confine myself to an examination of your conduct, as far as it is of public importance.

The step you took was unauthorised by your own government. Our agreement with that of Ireland was entered into on the 26th of July. Your prohibition was notified to us on the 16th of September; deduct seven days for the two communications between Dublin and London, and you had precisely 42 days, in the calms of summer, for transmitting your intelligence to America and receiving an answer. As you had no order then, what was the motive of your unauthorised act? I cannot positively say, but I will tell you my conviction. The British ministry had resolved to detain us prisoners, on our contrary to their pledged honour; and you, sir, I fear, lent your ministerial character to perpetrate. Whether our conduct in Ireland was right or wrong, you have no justification for yours. The constitution and laws of this country gave you no power to require of the British government that it should violate its faith, and withdraw from us its consent to the place we had fixed upon for our voluntary emigration.

power. What inference ought fairly to be made from the facts I have stated, every man must decide for himself. On me they have a forced conviction, which, if you can shake it, I shall much more gladly forego than I state it here, that in the instance alluded to, you degraded the dignity and independence of the country you represented, you abandoned the principles of its government, and its policy; and you became the tool of a foreign state, to give it a colourable pretext for the commission of a crime. If so, is it that you should hereafter be entrusted with any kind of delegated authority? What motives you may have had for that conduct, if in truth it was yours, I cannot undertake to say. Mr. Marsden seemed to doubt whether you wish for republicans in America—and I shrewdly suspect he spoke what the British ministry thought of your politics.

Perhaps it may be said, that you were yourself deceived by those very calumnies of which I have complained. I sincerely wish I could believe that such were the fact—but observe this argument. We contradicted the misstatements of the committees of the lords & commons of Ireland, by an advertisement written in prison signed by our names, and published on the 3d of September; it must have reached London on the 7th or 8th; your remonstrance must have been made on or before the 12th, for it was communicated to us on the 16th. The effect produced by our advertisement was electrical; and the debate which it caused on the very evening of its appearance in the Irish house of commons, was most remarkable. As you doubtless read the newspapers of the day, these facts could not have been unknown to you. Why then should you be deceived by misrepresentations which we had recently contradicted under circumstances so extraordinary? Mr. King, did you enter so deeply into the revolution of your country, as to implicate your life in the issue of its fortunes? From the strong attachment of your political friends, I presume you were a distinguished leader in those eventful times.—If not, you had certainly read their history. Did you remember the calumnies which had been thrown out by British agents against the most upright and venerable patriots of America? Did you call to mind the treatment given in South Carolina to Gen. Gadsden, Gen. Rutherford, Col. Isaacs, and a number of others who had surrendered to that very Lord Cornwallis, with whom, thro' his ministers, we negotiated, and that those distinguished characters were, in violation of their capitulation, and of the rights of parole, sent to St. Augustine, as we were afterwards sent to Fort George? How then is it possible that you could have been a dupe to the misrepresentations of the British government?

These remarks I address with all becoming respect to "the first man in the country"—yet in fact, sir, I cannot clearly see in what consists your superiority over myself. It is true you have been a resident minister at the court of St. James; and if what I have read in the public prints be true, and if you be apprised of my near relationship and family connection with sir John Temple; you must acknowledge that your interference as a resident minister at the court of St. James, against my being permitted to emigrate to America, is a very curious instance of the caprice of fortune. But let that pass. To what extent I ought to yield to you for talents and information, is not for me to decide. In no other respect, however, do I feel your excessive superiority. My private character and conduct are, I hope, as fair as yours; and even in those matters which I consider as trivial, but upon which aristocratic pride is accustomed to stamp a value, I should not be inclined to shrink from competition. My birth certainly will not humble me by the comparison; my paternal fortune was probably much greater than yours; the consideration in which the name I bear was held in my native country, was as great as yours was ever like to be, before I had an opportunity of contributing to its celebrity. As to the amount of what private fortune I have been able to save from the wreck of calamity, it is unknown to you or to your friends; but two things I tell you: I never was indebted, either in the country from which I came, nor in any other in which I have lived, to any man, further than the necessary credit for the current expenses of a family; and am not so circumstanced that I should tremble "for my subsistence;" as the threatened displeasure of your friends; so much for the past and the present—now for the future. Circumstances which cannot be controlled, have decided that my name must be embodied into history. From the manner in which even my political adversaries, and some of my cotemporary historians, unequivocally hostile to my principles, already speak of me, I have the consolation of reflecting, that when the falsehoods of the day are withered and rotten, I shall be respected and esteemed. You, sir, will probably be forgotten when I shall be remembered with honor, or if, peradventure, your name should descend to posterity, you will be known only as the recorded instrument of part of my persecutions, sufferings and misfortunes.

I am, sir, &c.

THOMAS ADDIS EMMET.

Mr. King, when a lad, was a servant to, and wore the livery of sir John Temple, the near relative of Mr. Emmet. I assert this fact on the authority of a respectable gentleman in this city.—Citizen.

own declaration, upon oath, I charged Mr. Emmet, with the falsehood he had uttered; adding, that if I did not make this charge good, to the satisfaction of the public, I would consent to be branded as a calumniator.

The proofs of the falsehood which I have adduced, on which I relied and still do rely, are two papers, each bearing the signature of Thomas Addis Emmet, and one of them subscribed under the solemnity of an oath.

The first of these papers is the advertisement itself; from which it has appeared that the contradiction was originally stated to apply, not to the reports (which it is now averred the prisoners had not then even seen) but to "publications, in the different newspapers, pretending to be abstracts of the reports of the secret committee of the house of Commons," and of the "deposition" of the prisoners, "before the committee of the Lords and Commons." The words are these:—

"Having read, in the different newspapers, publications pretending to be abstracts of the reports of the secret committee of the house of commons, and of our deposition before the committees of the lords and commons, we feel ourselves called upon to assure the public, that they are gross, and to us astonishing misrepresentations, not only unsupported by, but in many instances directly contradictory to the facts we really stated on those occasions."

These, it is admitted, are the terms of the genuine advertisement, and to which the names of Arthur O'Connor, Thomas Addis Emmet & William James M'Nevin are subscribed.

The second paper is a sworn examination of Emmet, the direct object of procuring which was, to ascertain, on the part of the committee of the Irish house of lords, whether the prisoners had meant, in the foregoing advertisement, to impeach the accuracy of the evidence given? In this examination Emmet distinctly swears that the advertisement had alluded, not to the reports, but "solely to the misrepresentations in the newspapers."

Thomas Addis Emmet, esq. sworn. Admits that the advertisement which appeared in the Hibernian Journal and Saunders's News Letter on Monday, the 27th day of August last, under the signatures of Arthur O'Connor, Thomas Addis Emmet & William James M'Nevin was published by their authority—Says he did not by said advertisement, nor does he in any manner mean to contradict or retract any thing stated by him before this committee of the secret committee of the house of commons, but is willing to authenticate the whole of the evidence which he gave on those occasions in any manner that may be thought fit. Declares that the said advertisement alluded solely to misrepresentations in the newspapers. Says that he has read the evidence stated in the Appendix to the report of the secret committee of the house of lords, as having been given by him before that committee, and admits that the evidence so stated, expressed nothing but the truth, but omits many reasons which he gave in justification of his own conduct and of that of the members of the union at large.

In reply to all this, on which I relied for my proofs, and as a humble effort at defence, Mr. Emmet has produced what is called forsooth a document, upon the strength of which it is hoped to throw back the charge of falsehood upon me, and to prove me a calumniator.

Here follows the document, faithfully copied from the Citizen. If it succeeds in convincing any man, that Mr. Emmet has not sworn, that the contradiction given in the advertisement "solely alludes to the misrepresentations in the newspapers;" I must submit to the consequences.

This document turns out to be a private minute of a speech delivered by Mr. Emmet as he now says, to the committee and reduced to writing immediately after his return from that examination, at which he made oath as above. Here it is.

Emmet.—In the first place, my lords, I disapprove of saying, that the misrepresentations in the newspapers are not supported by the reports of either house of parliament,—because that will be considered as implying that neither of those reports contain any misrepresentation. It is true the newspapers contained a number of misstatements and calumnies, which are not warranted by either report; but you must permit me to say nothing as to the statements contained in those reports—because if I say anything of them, I must say the truth; and, if I say the truth, I am afraid I shall offend against the privilege of parliament. I am however free to express to you, my lords, certainly without meaning to offend, that although I admit nothing is mentioned in them, as upon my authority, that is not true, and although every fact in them should be equally true, yet I conceive them to contain many false and injurious misrepresentations of myself and of those with whom I acted. They abound with imputations of vicious and dishonourable motives, which I have negatived upon my oath. One, in particular, occurs to me at the instant. It is stated we prevented a large French force from coming here, through motives of ambition. Now, my lords, I cannot conceive any imputation more injurious or unjust; nor can I look upon it as unintentional. We expressly declared, that the reason for our doing so was, to secure to the people of Ireland a perfect control over their own country. To suppose that such conduct originated in ambition, seems to me most extravagant folly. Another objection I have to those reports is, that they omit many circumstances, which, if it is to be permitted to the public to judge between you and us) ought in fairness to have been made known to that public. In short, my lords, I shall take with me from this country very little more than my character; but as I am determined to take with me that character, I must be excused from giving any sanction to those reports. Another alteration I should wish to make in this paper, is where it seems to imply as if all the details of correspondence and connexion of the Irish Union with the French government were accurate. Those given from me are so; but in reading that part of your report this morning in the Freeman's Journal, I observe one in which I am sure you are mistaken.

Under some aspects, indeed, this curious speech might call forth many observations; but, under that in which alone we have at

present any business with it, a single one shall suffice.—It has nothing to do with the question.

The language here held had nothing to do with the points upon which the committee examined Mr. Emmet, and however he might indulge himself in using it, and however they might indulge him in hearing it, it was totally irrelevant. What the points were, has appeared in the examination; and it there also appears, that in spite of Mr. Emmet's rhetoric, the committee obtained from him on those points, distinct and conclusive answers. They examined him as to the accuracy of the statements which they had given of his own evidence, and not as to his opinions of their report in general. The latter was a subject on which the parties were not at all likely to agree, and on which the committee could have no right of anxiety for Mr. Emmet's sanction.

Though not immediately necessary, I shall allow myself one or two further remarks. The Citizen offers the document "as a clue to what Mr. Emmet did say"—Are we to understand by this expression, that it is pretended Mr. Emmet did not say that which appears in his written examination—If so, let him speak out—this were indeed a defence—it is his only defence, and for God's sake let him seize it.—Or is it insinuated, that he can swear one thing and mean another; and that, when we have his words written down, we are still in the dark, till we have obtained the clue and the key?

Great stress is laid by the Citizen on Mr. Emmet's pretended refusal, before the committee, to insert, in his examination, after the words "solely to the misrepresentations in the newspapers," the words, "which are not supported by the report of either house of parliament," because says Mr. Emmet, that would be considered as "implying that neither of those reports contain any misrepresentation," and is attempted, as the last resource, to twist this pretended private struggle into a virtual and public contradiction of the reports themselves! Unhappily, however, all that could possibly be gained by this little trick, is lost by the inadvertent concession of his associate, Dr. M'Nevin, whose oath happens to be on the other side!

Dr. William James M'Nevin, sworn.—Admits that the advertisement which appeared in the Hibernian Journal and Saunders's News Letter of Monday the twenty seventh of August last, under the signatures of Arthur O'Connor, Thomas Addis Emmet, and William James M'Nevin, was published by their authority. Says he does not mean to contradict or retract any thing stated by him before this committee or the secret committee of the house of commons. The advertisement alluded solely to the misrepresentations of the newspapers which are not supported by the report of either house of parliament.

One comment more. Mr. Emmet is represented as talking much of "misrepresentations";—let us understand what the word means, in his mouth.

Does it ever mean false as to fact? He declares expressly that it does not.

Mr. Emmet confines his charge of misrepresentation to two articles:

He says, he is misrepresented, first, by the assignment of false motives, and, secondly,—by the omission of the fine things which he had said in justification.

The facts, then, which are contained in the reports have never been contradicted. It is those facts and those alone, that I have brought forward, against Mr. Emmet. But it is said, and this is all that can possibly remain to be said, that the committee did the prisoners injustice, in "imputing to them vicious and dishonourable motives;" which, on the contrary, they assert were innocent and even praise worthy. Thus, Mr. Emmet would have had the committee make itself a medium for the spreading of rebellion, by circulating all the sophistry and all the flourishes of the state-prisoners!—He would have had a Government employ the press for the dissemination of the fine speeches of insurgents, that go to "the public might judge between them"—So too the thief, the burglar and the highway robber could equally assign their motives! They might talk of the pressure of personal want of the sufferers of an indigent and amiable family, or they might make as they sometimes have made, a flourishing speech against the injustice of conditions between the rich and poor, and in favour of a community of goods. All this and more of the same import may be actually found in the last speeches of some of the most hardened wretches whose convictions and deaths are recorded in the Newgate Calendar. But it was reserved for United Irishmen, headed by a Tone, an O'Connor, a M'Nevin and an Emmet, to justify and recommend assassination in a public print and to furnish the ignorant, phrenzied multitude with an excuse for its perpetration on the ground of motives.

That it may be seen to what I allude and that I do not exaggerate, take the following article at full length from the Union Star published at Dublin during the rebellion and denominated by the rebels an official paper.

"We are constantly witnessing the impudent affectation of cowardly moderation acting in partnership with tyranny, against the Union Star, which they accuse of inculating the principles of ASSASSINATION."

"We certainly do not advise, though we do not decry ASSASSINATION, as we conceive it is the only mode at present, within the reach of Irishmen to bring to justice the royal agents who are constantly exercising rape, murders and burnings, through our devoted country."

"We appeal to thy noble & venerated name, O Brutus! who bravely assassinated the tyrant of your country amidst his cohorts, and in the presence of his pensioned senate.—It is not our solitary suffrage that has attempted to honor thy name, and worship thy spirit. The patriot, the sage and hero, in every honourable state of life, for eighteen centuries, have given thy name the first and most unequivocal recommendation to the admiring earth, as one that deserves the highest rank among the benefactors of the human race."

"Yes! prince of patriotic assassins! thy noble and virtuous spirit should pervade our land; the infant whom a British, or a British Irish butcher, has left fatherless, should be taught, through his progress to manhood, that thy example should be rigidly imitated, as an honest duty to his parents and his country. The Irish seaman, maimed in the service of his country's tyrant, whose banners he often led to victory, perhaps, at the same moment when his aged mother lived to see her daughter violated by a horrid soldiery, who had mingled the sales of her husband with those of their humble habitation—in such a son, ASSASSINATION would be a holy duty, commanded by nature, and approved of by heaven. Thus we defend assassination, and clear it from the rubbish of ignorance, and the falsehoods of despotism, which were too often successful in confounding the characters of the man who destroyed a tyrant, and him who, to gratify private revenge, or urged by avarice, might sell himself to murder an innocent fellow-creature."

Extract of a threatening Letter from No. 68 of the Press, to an officer of State.

"At such a moment, if unhappily perseverance in your present conduct should induce in