INTERESTING FROM EUROPE

Arrival of the Mails of the Arabia.

The Relations of France to the United States.

The New Pamphlet on France, Mexico and the Confederates.

THE FLORIDA AT BREST.

Capt. Maffitt's Account of his Career and Adventures.

THE REBEL RAMS IN ENGLAND.

Rumors about an Alliance between France, Russia and Prussia.

The mails of the Arabia reached here yesterday. We receive by her three days later foreign files, which furnish many interesting additions to the summary of news, already published.

From the Paris Correspondent of The Daily News.

FRANCE IN AMERICA.

THE NEW PAMPHLET ON MEXICO AND THE CONFEDERATE STATES.

I have hurriedly run my eye over the proof sheets of a pamphlet to appear to-morrow at Dentu's, entitled, "France, Mexico, and the Confederate States." The usual means have been resorted to by the publisher for inducing a belief in the public mind that this opuscle is officially inspired. Whether this be so or not—and adhering to the opinion I had occasion to express some time ago, that the pamphlet dodge has been very much overdone—I find in this production such a perfect harmony with the known leanings of the French Emperor that I think it worth while to make some quotations from it. The general scope of the argument is that Mexico, if governed under French influence, will be of infinite use to France, and that the expected benefits are only to be obtained by the recognition of, and subsequent alliance with, the Confederate States of America.

If Mr. Slidell, the Southern envoy, who has lately had repeated interviews with M. Drouyn de Lhuys, following upon audiences with the Emperor himself, had received a *carte blanche* to publish a pamphlet in Paris, he could not have written more favorably to the Southern cause or apologized more ingeniously for the institution of Slavery than does this pamphlet. I do not think, however, that Mr. Slidell, or any American, even though a Southerner, would have really coincided in the overthrow of the Monroe doctrine and the preachment about the Latin race and the benefits of French influence in Mexico which this pamphlet contains. But, on the principle that necessity makes us acquainted with strange bedfellows, I think it quite possible, nay, likely, that Mr. Slidell or some of his clique may have contributed to the Confederate paragraphs of this pamphlet, while accepting by way of compromise the French views on Mexico. The pamphlet, in an early page, admits with as much candor as perfect truth, that the Mexican expedition in its present condition was the personal work of Napoleon III. alone.

While, in the eyes of "everybody else" (meaning the ministers, the Parliament, the public—everybody who ought to have a voice in committing a nation to a serious and costly enterprise), the war in Mexico was a simple military question, the Emperor alone had settled in his own mind "the basis of an entirely new policy." In support of this view, differing entirely from M. Billault's vehement assevérations in the Senate and Corps Legislatif, and fastening upon the Emperor an amount of personal responsibility which one day may be found burdensome, the pamphlet quotes the following extract from the Imperial instructions to Gen. Forey:

"In the present state of civilization the prosperity of America is not indifferent to Europe; for it is American which feeds our manufactures and commerce. We are interested in seeing the United States powerful and prosperous; *but it is not for our interest that she should get possession of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and from that basis of operations dominate over the Antilles and the South, and become the sole dispensator of the products of the New World.*"

France, therefore, it is argued, is bound to oppose the absorption of the South by Northern America. She has also a duty to support the "Latin races" on the Western continent. An "immense French commercial army" is to know that of Marshal Forey, and "the recognition of the South will be the consequence of the intervention." We are further informed that what Napoleon III. wills he wills steadily and patiently, and that he will "see his will accomplished."

Another section of the pamphlet enlarges upon the fine climate of Mexico (except just in a strip of unhealthy coast land), upon its rich productions, its corn, unequaled in other hot countries, its "precious" timber, its fine dyes, and, above all, its tempting mines. Hitherto it is admitted that the only paying mines are in English hands; but the mining field is represented to be unlimited, "what the English have done we can do." A doctrine highly congenial to the empire of universal suffrage is then laid down—namely, that in Mexico all the anarchists belong to the higher orders of society. The *pleb*—*i. e.*, the people who have no education, no property, no influence, and who must necessarily submit to the powers that be—are all lovers of order; but rich people, general officers, and even aides-de-camp of presidents, are mostly brigands.

This is the very exceedingly convenient doctrine in virtue of which Bonaparte pretends, in the name of virtue, order, religion and property, to gag everybody who has a voice, and to speak on behalf of the multitudes of hewers of wood and drawers of water, who have none. Emigration to Mexico on a large scale, under French protection, is recommended. The pamphlet is careful to say, and I have no doubt upon good grounds, that whether the Archduke Maximilian accepts the throne or not, emigrants may be quite sure that "French influence will prevail." That I take to be a settled thing, and I attach not the slightest importance to rumors which I have heard within the last day or two, that M. Drouyn de Lhuys assured Mr. Dayton "upon his honor" that the Emperor was anxiously awaiting the earliest opportunity to withdraw his troops from Mexico. An apology for Slavery, carefully toned down for French readers, is subjoined to the above arguments. Ignoring the fact that the South is fighting for Slavery, and boasts that it is the corner-stone of its institutions, the pamphlet represents that the Southern leaders would be quite disposed to relax its leading principle in obedience to the persuasive voice of France.

The argument is—"The first power which recognizes the Confederate States will have a right to obtain, in favor of the negroes, much larger concessions than the Federal States would make in case of their restoring the Union by victory. . . That which is impossible during the struggle will become easy in time of calm. The emancipation of the blacks, the complete abolition of Slavery, can only be the work of peace and of time; and from our alliance with the South will proceed that great social renovation which England has pursued in vain by the right of visit." Observe here how artfully the pamphleteer, who professes to speak in the name of the Emperor (whose personal schemes we were told in the beginning were at the bottom of the Mexican expedition) is obliged, in deference to French public opinion, to affect disapprobation of Slavery. He proposes, it is true, an alliance with the slaveholders, whose only reason for war is the maintenance of Slavery, but pretends that abolition of Slavery will be the result of that alliance. The pamphlet concludes in the following words:

"As soon as the Confederate States shall be recognized by France, their strength will be quintupled, and all their gain will be their adversary's loss. For other States are only waiting the signal from France to follow her example. Among the secondary commercial nations, there are many who desire the constitution of a Confederate Republic; and although they have hitherto been restrained by the phantom of Slavery, these nations will follow France because they know that we never lend our support to any work which is not one of social renovation. To these nations will naturally rally Spain, which possesses Havana, and Austria, which, if the Archduke Maximilian accepts the throne of Mexico, will be more directly connected with the affairs of the New World. After that, England will do likewise. She will recognize the South. The Northern States will no longer persevere in a useless struggle. The Navy of France is an argument which, if need be, will support its diplomatic acts."

From The Paris Temps.

FRANCE AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

The *France* laughs at the Monroe doctrine, and will not admit that this display of Anglo-Saxon temper can be regarded seriously. If the *France* had remembered that the Monroe doctrine was enunciated for the first time against the Holy Alliance at the moment when reactionary Europe had just re-established order in France—it would have seen that this Monroe doctrine has for us Frenchmen a character which inspires anything but ridicule. It was in fact against the Holy Alliance and its projects that the manifesto of President Monroe was directed in 1823, and strangely enough it was an attempted monarchical restoration in Mexico which occasioned it. Do not let us ridicule this doctrine, therefore, even though we refuse to admit it. But to judge it on its own merits, is it "absurd," as the *France* pretends; and admitting that it is not well-founded, is that a reason for exposing ourselves to a more or less distant war with the United States? This is the question to examine.

What, after all, is this Monroe doctrine? It is the policy of non-intervention localized; the American States do not mix themselves up in the affairs of Europe, they do not enter into what is called the European concert; on the other hand, they wish to settle their own affairs among themselves, and do not consider that the European States should mix themselves up more in the affairs of America than the American States mix themselves up in the affairs of Europe. This is the basis of the Monroe doctrine, and in criticising it we have merely to suppose our positions inverted. Let us suppose, therefore, that North America, during one of the revolutions which have occurred in Spain, Italy, Greece, or Belgium, wished to interfere under the pretext of re-establishing order; that she took possession of the capital of the country in a state of revolution; that she suspended the liberty of the press; and that, finally, she proclaimed a republic with or without the co-operation of an assembly of notables, what would the European Powers have said, especially those nearest the State in question? Would they have accepted the American intervention, or would they have protested?

It may readily be believed that they would have invoked on such an occasion the doctrine of European equilibrium, which, after all, is not more sacred or more defensible than the Monroe doctrine. Why should not the United States do with regard to Mexico what France would do with regard to Belgium? Let us leave this part of the question; let us admit that from a lofty point of view the principle of the solidarity of nations is superior to the Monroe doctrine; let us admit, moreover, that to possess its full value the principle of nonintervention ought not to be circumscribed. But, then, let us seriously examine the question of interests, and let us ask ourselves what interest France can have in inflicting upon American patriotism one of those injuries that are never forgiven. Is it merely the question of founding a monarchy in Mexico? We really see no interests which justify our intervention, for directly we have quitted Mexico an intervention in favor of Juarez or some other would follow our intervention in favor of the clericals.

What reason should we have for being astonished by such an intervention, and could the most serious diplomatist gravely say that France, which is a thousand leagues from Mexico, has a right to interfere while the United States could not do so without committing a crime? And yet, if we did not defend the Government established by us, to what end establish it? At the bottom of all this, therefore, is the French protectorate establishing itself at first in Mexico, advancing step by step, now by the recognition of the Slave States, perhaps, and now by successive interventions among the various Latin republics; in a word, it is the French flag opposed to the Union flag, a conflict the consequences of which are incalculable. Either there is or there is not something at the bottom of the Mexican question, and, if there is, we do not hesitate to say that we consider it deeply to be regretted, and that in such an antagonism we see a source of expense, of loss of life, of dangers of all kinds, which the *France* has no right to treat lightly. Under any circumstances we should be at the same time compelled to admit that the Americans are not quite without justification in feeling alarmed when they see a government established in Mexico which seems to have rather an ardent sympathy with the Rebel States.

THE REBEL STEAMER FLORIDA IN BREST—OFFICIAL DECLARATION OF THE PARIS MONITEUR.

PARIS, Sept. 4.—The *Moniteur* of this morning says:

"The privateer Florida, sailing under the Confederate flag, has entered Brest, to repair damages. Her reception was in accordance with the ordinary principles of international law.

"At the opening of the war, the Emperor's Government, in accord with other Powers, recognized the Confederates in the character of belligerents, and declared its intention of observing a strict neutrality between the two parties. In like cases it is right as well as the duty of neutrals to permit the vessels of belligerents to procure themselves means, not for fighting purposes, but for navigation.

"It has, therefore, been decided that the Florida could be permitted to procure all that was indispensable to maintain her in a good navigable state, without being able to make purchases tending to recruit her armament of war."

THE JOURNAL DES DEBATS ON THE FLORIDA.

The *Journal des Debats* makes the following remarks respecting the Confederate steamer Florida, in which the same views are maintained as were recently expressed by the *Siècle*:

"A Confederate corsair, named the Florida, some days ago entered the roadstead at Brest, and disembarked the crew of a vessel which it had burnt near the English coast. The *Phare de la Loire* has on this subject urged complaints which we consider well founded. It would, in fact, be well were it possible to interdict from access to our ports veritable sea rovers, for the Florida is nothing else. Now we believe that is possible. The rights of belligerents have without doubt been conceded to the Southern States; but it is evidently on the condition that they conform to the regulations of international law. If it be possible to show conclusively that the Southern States have the right to arm corsairs, since they have not acceded to the treaty of Paris, it is not possible to admit that the corsairs armed by the South, and assimilated to a too generous toleration—it is now clearly seen—to vessels of war, may substitute themselves substantially for maritime tribunals, and make themselves judges of the validity of their captures.

"They have not the right, as they assume, to stop vessels which they meet on the sea, to take possession of the cargo, whether it belong to Northern Americans or to neutrals, and to burn the vessels, although a captain of the State navy, wearing the uniform of his country, and presenting many other guarantees for honesty and impartiality, would be obliged to take his prize before a court of justice. That is evidently intolerable. It is in vain that Southern people allege that, their ports being blockaded, they have no maritime tribunals. That is their affair, and not ours. Let them attack the American ships of war, and compel them to raise the blockade, as they have a right to do, but taking possession of the goods of others without a legal judgment is in all languages called robbery.

"We do not know whether it is true, as pretended, that the Florida has seized merchandise belonging to neutrals, that it has burned the Southern Cross on her voyage from Mazatlan to Marseilles, with a cargo of dye wood, which was French property, or that it has stopped a French bark, the Fleur du Pays, to transfer to it some persons it had made prisoners upon the vessels burned.

But if all these circumstances are correct, we agree with the *Phare de la Loire* (that an embargo ought to be placed upon the Florida, and that its captain and crew should be punished for violating the rights of neutrals). The notice dated April 17, 1861, in which Mr. Jefferson Davis announces that he will issue letters of marque, contains what follows: "Before a letter of marque is accorded to vessels, the owners and commanders shall be required to give security to the Confederate States to the amount of $5,000, or, if the ship has more than 150 men, $10,000, on condition that the owners, officers, and crews employed on board the vessel shall observe the laws of these Confederate States and the instructions given to them, and pay for all the damage caused contrary to the tenor of those instructions."

It appears evident, then (adds the *Debats*), that this is not a question of some few exceptional cases, but that these corsairs, in committing such offenses, obey their instructions, and this is what Europe is justified in not tolerating.

Correspondence of The London Times.

CAPT. MAFFITT'S ACCOUNT OF HIS CAREER AND ADVENTURES.

SIR: Arriving in Brest the day before yesterday by way of Quimper and Chateaulin, the first thing I heard on getting on board the steamer which navigates the picturesque little River Elorn from the latter place to Brest was the arrival of the Confederate States cruiser Florida, and on crossing the glorious Rade de Brest for the mouth of the harbour I had no difficulty in making out this now celebrated vessel as she lay at anchor among some of the giants of the French navy—a long, low, black, rakish-looking craft, not over smart in appearance, yet useful every inch of her—a pigmy among these monsters, and yet a formidable pigmy, even to the unpracticed eye, the Palmetto flag flying proudly from her mizen. We happened to have a French Vice-Admiral, a Russian Vice-Admiral, and a Senator of the Empire on board, and you may imagine there was an infinity of gossip, but no reliable information.

When we landed at the Cale in the harbor, the crowd which usually assembles to welcome or pester newcomers was full of "*La Floride*" and her doings. "*Elle a,*" cried an enthusiastic *commissionnaire* to me, "*elle a, Monsieur, je vous assure sur ma parole d'honneur, pour deux millions de livres sterling a bord, tout en or, je vous assure.*" "*Eh! mon Dieu! c'est beaucoup!*" cried a smart little *mousse* from the Turenne. I could not help agreeing with the *mousse* that the sum was certainly a great deal.

That evening (aided by my fellow-traveler, Mr. Henry Tupper, Vice-Consul of France in Guernsey and one of the jurats of that island), I found some of the officers of the Florida at the Hotel de Nantes (Rue d'Aiguillon). Lieut. Lingard Roode (a young man, who apparently did not number more than 23 years) received us courteously, and gave us his card to assure us admission on board. He stated, however, that his superior officer, Capt. Maffitt, was generally to be found on board his vessel, and would be glad to see us. The frankness, courtesy, and total absence of boasting manifested by this young officer impressed us most favorably.

All next day it blew a gale of wind in the Rade, and we could not find a boat to venture out. To-day, however, the weather was most propitious, and early morning found us alongside of the Florida. We sent our cards to Capt. Maffitt, and were immediately admitted on board, the captain himself coming to the topof the companion to receive us. Directly Capt. Maffitt understood that we were British subjects he invited us below into his little cabin, and when I told him that there were many people in England who regarded his career with great interest, he entered very freely into a recital of his adventures.

I will here subjoin a copy of some notes which Capt. Maffitt subsequently handed to me relative to the career of the Florida, proceeding, at the same time, a continuation, which has not yet arrived. They are as follows:

"The Confederate States' steamer Florida, Commander J. N. Maffitt.—This steamer was built in Liverpool and sent to Nassau in April, 1862; was put in the Admiralty Court; cleared on the 6th of August, when her present commander took charge with some eighteen men, went to sea, met her tender, and received guns, &c. On the 16th of August the yellow fever appeared on board, and Capt. Maffitt had to perform surgeon's duty, until necessity forced the vessel into Cardenas. There she lost nearly all her crew, her paymaster, and third engineer. She ran the blockade off Havana in and out, and on the 4th of September appeared off Mobile. The entire blockading fleet put after her. Capt. Maffitt was brought up from a bed of sickness (yellow fever) to take her in. For two hours and 48 minutes she was under a close fire. All the crew were sent below, and the officers only remained on deck, for she had but eleven men on duty, and her guns were not furnished with rammers, quoins, beds, or sights; in fact she was almost helpless. Three heavy shots struck her hull. One shell struck her amidships and passed through, killing one man and wounding seven. Her standing rigging was shot away, and some 1,500 sharpnel shot struck her hull and masts."

So far the notes which Capt. Maffitt has as yet found time to send me. Of the Captain himself I may say that he is a slight, middle-sized, well-knit man, of about 42; a merry-looking man, with a ready, determined air, full of life and business; apparently the sort of man who is equally ready for a fight or a jollification, and whose preference for the latter would by no means interfere with his creditable conduct of the former. His plainly furnished little state-room looked as business-like as a merchant's office. The round table in the center was strewn with books and innumerable manuscripts, and on the shelves were formidable looking rows of account-books, charts, &c. I may observe of the cabin, as of every part of the Florida, that none of it appears to have been built for ornament—all for use. "You see," said the captain, pointing to the heaps of papers, letters on files, account-books, &c., which literally littered the table, "you see I've no sinecure of it. Since my paymaster died I've had to be my own paymaster. There's a young man, named Davis (no relation to our President), who does paymaster's duty; but he's not yet quite up to the work."

Capt. Maffitt forthwith began an animated recital of his career and adventures. He is 42 years old, and is the oldest officer on board. All the officers were born in the Confederate States, and most of them were officers in the United States Navy before the outbreak of the war. The oldest of the officers is not more than 23. The men are more mixed. There are about 100 able seamen on board the Florida, and about 13 officers. Four fine fellows are from the neighborhood of Brest. Capt. Maffitt says that he has hardly ever taken a prize but what some of the crew of the prize have come forward to say, "Should like to serve with you, Sir." Generally speaking, he has to refuse; but if he sees a very likely fellow, he takes him on.

Capt. Maffitt was a Lieutenant of the United States Navy before the outbreak, and in that capacity distinguished himself greatly. In 1858 he commanded the brig Dolphin, when he captured the slaver Echo with 400 slaves on board, and took her into Charleston. For this feat his health was drunk at a public dinner at Liverpool; and it is a curious fact, for those who maintain that the civil war in America is founded upon the slave question, that the commander of this important Confederate cruiser should be the very man who has distinguished himself actively against the slavetrade. In 1859 Capt. Maffitt commanded the United States steamer Crusader, and captured four slavers.

The captain had a great deal to say about his successful feat at Mobile. In his opinion it has been the greatest naval feat of modern times. He dwelt long and warmly upon the incidents of the affair, and pointed proudly to the marks of sharpnel, which are numerous enough, upon the masts and smoke-stacks. The Florida was struck with three heavy shots on that occasion, and one can easily perceive in the side of the ship where the mischief caused by the 11-inch shell has been repaired. The Florida made no endeavor to reply to the fire which she received, the sea running too high to admit of steady aim, and her small crew being too much occupied in the management of the ship. The captain showed me a water-color sketch (very well drawn by one of the midshipmen) of the Florida running the blockade. It would not have disgraced a professional artist.

The only broadside which the Florida has fired in anger was against the Ericsson, an armed merchantman, which she encountered some 40 miles from New-York. The Ericsson, a very large vessel, did not reply, but made the best of her way off, and succeeded in escaping. When they ventured within 40 miles of New-York they did not know that the arrival of the Tacony (one of their "outfits") had put the New-Yorkers on their guard, and they soon found that there were about 70 armed vessels out searching for them, and so were glad to retreat. "We never seek a fight," said Capt. Maffitt, "and we don't avoid one. You see we've only two vessels against 1,500, so we should stand a poor chance. Our object is merely to destroy their commerce, so as to bring about a peace. We've taken altogether 72 prizes, and estimated the value at about $15,000,000. The Jacob Bell alone was worth $2,000,000." The Captain exhibited a book in which all the prizes were regularly entered, and all particulars relating thereto. He explained that their mode of procedure was to burn and destroy the property of the Northern States wherever they found it. I asked if they took gold and precious articles, and the reply was, "Pretty quick when we get them."

The papers of the burnt prizes are all kept and a valuation is made before the destruction of the vessels, in the expectation that when peace is restored the Confederate Government will make an appropriation of money equivalent to the claims of the captors. In consequence of this arrangement there is very little actual treasure on board the Florida, and the officers and crew are working mainly on the faith of the future independence and solvency of the Confederacy. "Anyway," said Capt. Maffitt, "we have cost the Government very little, for we've lived on the enemy. Oh, yes, we've served them out beautifully." In reply to some questions as to the method of capture, the Captain said, "We only make war with the United States Government, and we respect little property. We treat prisoners of war with the greatest respect. Most of those whom we have captured have spoken well of us. To be sure we have met with some ungrateful rascals; but you meet with those all the world over. The last prize we took was the Anglo-Saxon, which we took in the English Channel the other day, in mid channel, about 60 miles from Cork. She had coal on board, and we burned her.

"The pilot was a saucy fellow, and maintained that he was on his hunting ground. He insisted on being landed in an English port, but we could not do that. I brought him and 24 men here (to Brest) and sent them to the English Consul. If the pilot has any just claim upon us it will be settled by the Confederate Government. That is not my business. My business is to take care of the ship."

When the Florida came into Brest she had been at sea for eight months without spending more than four entire days in port. Before entering the port of Brest she had not been more than 24 hours in any one port, although she had visited Nassau, Bermuda, Pernambuco, and Sierra (Brazil). "Yes, indeed, Sir!" said the captain, "245 days upon solid junk, without repairs or provision." During all this time they have only lost 15 men, including those who were killed and wounded at Mobile, the paymaster (who died of consumption), and one officer who was accidentally drowned. They have come into Brest to repair the engines, which are somewhat out of order, the shaft being quite out of line. The Emperor has given orders that the Florida is to be admitted into the port for all necessary repairs, and is to be supplied with everything she may require except munitions of war.

In the course of conversation Capt. Maffitt gave me an account of what he called "the cutlets" of the Florida. These have been three in number. The Clarence was captured off Pernambuco on the 5th of May, and Lieut. Reed was put on board with 20 men and one gun. These were afterward changed to the Tacony, a better vessel, which was captured shortly after, and (to borrow Capt. Maffitt's expression) "she captured right and left." Finally, she took the revenue cutter off Portland Harbor. The other "fit-out" was the Lapwing, on board of which Lieut. Avrett was put to cruise on the Equator. He made several captures, and has now returned to his ship.

Capt. Maffitt showed us over his ship, which was in pretty good order considering the eight months almost uninterrupted cruise, and he presented us both with a photographic picture of her, which was taken at Bermuda. The Florida mounts only eight guns—six 48 pounders of the Blakeley pattern, made at Low Moor, and stern and bow chasers.

On taking our leave I asked Capt. Maffitt whether he expected to be interrupted on leaving Brest, pointing at the same time to the Goulet, the narrow passage which affords the only ingress and egress to and from the Rade. "Well," replied he, "I expect there will be seven or eight of them out there before long, but I'm not afraid. I've run eight blockades already, and it'll go hard but I'll run the ninth."

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Brest, Aug. 31. J. L.

From The Daily News.

THE REBEL RAMS IN ENGLAND.

There can be no doubt that the attention of the Government is anxiously directed to the nefarious steam-rams now lying in the Mersey. It is felt that if these terrible engines of war are allowed to leave the river and to prey upon Federal commerce, a serious scandal will be cast upon our law, and suspicions will be excited as to the sincerity of our neutrality. It cannot be too often repeated that even in the very infancy of the American commonwealth it had strength enough to maintain the most honorable neutrality, in spite of the strongest temptation to violate it, and amid the most vehement popular excitement. No one denies that if these steam-rams are intended to follow the career of the Florida and the Alabama, those who are concerned in fitting them out are doing violence to our territorial sovereignty, and making us against our will parties to the war which is now raging in America.

This is not to be endured, and some means must be found for preventing Mr. Jefferson Davis and his colleagues from dragging us into war. If the British Act resembled the American Act, there would be no difficulty in the matter, for the Custom-House officers would be entitled to call upon the owner of the ship to give a bond that the armed vessel should not be employed against those with whom we are at peace. But there is no such provision in our Foreign Enlistment Act. If the Southern Confederacy were an acknowledged Government, there would be no difficulty in dealing with the matter. Remonstrance would be addressed to their Minister, and he would be called upon to undertake not to commission any more ships from our ports, and to disarm those which might have escaped the vigilance of our Government. It seems difficult to understand why the same course should not still be pursued. The circumstance that the Confederates are not an independent nation, nor are likely to become such, is surely no reason why they should enjoy privileges which are not enjoyed by established Governments. The Confederate Government is permitted to grant commissions; without this permission the Alabamas and Floridas would be mere pirates.

But the right thus granted ought to be exercised in the ordinary way. What other nation has ever got the whole of its navy built, armed, and manned in neutral building yards, and been allowed to commission them on the high seas? What other nation has been permitted to burn indiscriminately all the prizes taken by their cruisers thus illegally fitted out, and thus to determine whether the property captured belongs to a neutral or to an enemy? The Confederates are the first who have been permitted to exercise these unheard-of privileges, and this they have succeeded in doing by boldly violating the territorial sovereignty of this country. If Lord Russell had known the career marked out for the Alabama before she left the port of Liverpool, she would certainly have been arrested. But her owners and builders having by all sorts of ingenious devices succeeded in eluding the Government officers, there is good ground for remonstrance.

According to Lord Russell, there is no evidence as to the purpose for which these steam-rams are intended, and therefore the Foreign-office finds a difficulty in interfering. Lord Russell must have been aware of this difficulty long before the rising of Parliament, and he might have applied to Parliament to strengthen his hands. But if the Ministers are really of opinion that the peace of the country is endangered by the proceedings of Mr. Laird—if they think that the Americans have reason to be irritated with these violations of neutrality, their course is clear. There is a power in the Crown to prohibit the export of arms by an Order in Council, and this power was exercised in the case of sulphur and lead within the last two years. It is impossible to doubt that "the two powerful iron-plate rams" described by Lord Russell come within the definition of arms, and therefore that they may be stopped.

As things at present stand, part of the Queen's subjects are in alliance with the Confederates, and are making war against the North. Such is the interpretation which, according to the doctrine of international law, ought to be put upon the conduct of Mr. Laird and the Confederate agents in this country. As Mr. Goldwin Smith says—"The Confederates are abusing our ports, corrupting our seamen, dishonoring our flag, compromising our neutrality, and designedly exposing us to the risk of war." And shall it be said that the Government cannot prevent this? Is a nation to be involved in war without being consulted, and even against its will?

Is any subject to be permitted to carry on war on his own account? It is simply preposterous. Nor is there any difficulty in putting a stop to such unwarrantable proceedings. A distinct intimation should be conveyed to the Confederates that any armed vessel built or equipped in the ports of this country will not be recognized as a regularly commissioned ship, or that belligerent rights will no longer be accorded to the Confederate Government. But, beside this, measures ought to be taken under the Customs Act to prohibit the export of armed vessels of war, except upon such conditions as may be approved by the Custom-House.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM PROFESSOR GOLDWIN SMITH.

THE SHIPS OF WAR FOR THE CONFEDERATES.

To the Editor of The Daily News.

SIR: The case of the Confederate war-ships is, as the *Times* says, urgent. The Americans have already, it is true, one war on their hands; but, as experience shows, it is a mistake to think that they will not, if provoked, go into another. A pacific nation is not easily roused to a war pitch; but being roused it is very apt to become violently warlike, and to fly, as the French Republic did, without calculating the odds, at the throat of nation after nation. The fancy in which the disciples of the *Times* have been so assiduously nursed that the Americans were a herd of poltroons, fighting their battles with hired Irish and Germans, and disaffected to the despotic government which forced them into war, has vanished, it may be presumed, with the smoke of Vicksburg and Gettysburg. We see at last that these people are a nation with our blood in their veins; and no nation with blood like ours in their veins ever bore, even in extremity, such outrages as these.

If a war with America comes it will bring devastation and misery to both sides. It will stop the outlet of emigration, which is alike needful at this moment to replenish America and to relieve England; it will sweep the commerce of England from the seas, which will swarm with privateers under the fatal precedent which we have ourselves established, and it will deprive America of her best customer; it will carry terror into American seaports, and havoc into the homes of English colonists; it will prevent America from putting out the last fires of the Rebellion, and it will, perhaps, before it has ended, kindle similar fires in Ireland. But it will do worse than all this in the eyes of those who, not blinded by the passions of the hour, look forward to the future of our race.

It will undo, and much more than undo, the work of reconciliation, of which the affection—for it was something deeper than enthusiasm—with which the Americans received but the other day the descendant and heir of George III. was the pledge and the expression. It will put enmity for another bitter century between the two portions of the Anglo-Saxon race, one in blood, in language, in religion, in literature, in the essence, whatever may be the outward forms, of their free institutions, and one in their destined action on the future progress of mankind. And it will do this at the very moment when a rival race is seeking, in open enmity to ours, to plant the foot of despotism and sacerdotalism in Mexico, and is about to be aided in that attempt by the renegades to Anglo-Saxon liberty and greatness, who have gone forth from a land of freedom, to found a nation on Slavery in the Southern States.

Two exceptions there will be to the general calamity on both sides of the Atlantic. The great builders of steam rams will ply a brisk trade, and the great journalists whose ferocious cowardice has goaded the two nations to this extremity will thrive, as they always do, by the passions of war. The people, as usual, will bleed and suffer—unenfranchised, mute, and helpless they will bleed and suffer, as usual, for the gain of wealthy filibusters, and for the passions of a class.

As to the question in issue there is, perhaps, little to be said, which was not said and said better and with more authority than I can say it five or six months ago; but what was then treason and absurdity is now fast becoming patriotism and sense. And perhaps those who, after leading the nation into a fatal error, are just awakening to the truth, are not very likely to state that truth with all the breadth and firmness which the emergency requires.

Suffer me, then, first to repeat the truism—no truism, it seems, to prime ministers and leading journalists—that no Foreign Enlistment act or other municipal law can determine the measure of our duties toward foreign nations. If our Government does not possess, under the present law, sufficient power to restrain its subjects from violating the public faith and exposing the nation to the penalties of war, it is our business to give it further power. And further power would probably be now sought if Parliament were sitting; but when Parliament was sitting the North was not victorious, and then it seemed safe and profitable to indulge in ignominious bluster about sparning foreign dictation and scorning to change the law. It is fair to admit that the American Minister in some degree countenanced the fallacy by making himself too active in the detection of practices which, as being offenses against our laws, it was the province of our Government to repress.

He would have put his case on better ground and played a more dignified part, if, after calling the attention of our Government to the criminal practices which were going on, he had left it to them to take the proper measures for maintaining the good faith of the nation.

Not that our municipal law has been carried into effect. The Foreign Enlistment act provides not only that the crime shall be prevented, but that the criminal shall be brought to justice. The wealthy and powerful criminal triumphantly avows his crime in full parliament. The Government cowers, and the House applauds. Has there ever, in the history of the English Parliament, been a more disgraceful scene than the debate on the Alabama? And can Englishmen doubt that the report of that debate must have gone to the heart of the whole American people?

Next, let me once more submit that this is not a mere case of the sale of contraband of war; and that the question does not turn merely on the difference between ships and other contraband. Let an iron-clad steamer, with her steel prow and turrets, and all the appurtenances of a man of war, be exported to a Confederate port; let her there be manned with Confederate seamen, and thence go forth against the Federal commerce; and though we may put the men who carry on such a trade personally on a level with smugglers, there will be no ground for complaint on the part of America that England is violating the rights of nations. But these vessels are not exported, nor built for exportation; nor are they sent, nor do their builders expect them to be sent, to the Confederate States, or manned by Confederate crews. They go forth, and their builders know that they will go forth, from an English port, manned by English seamen, to cruise against the commerce of an allied nation.

Their real basis of operations is the territory of this professedly neutral country. A faint show is made of equipping and commissioning them, and of turning their crew from ordinary seamen into man-of-war's men when they are out at sea. That process is a mockery, and the Southerns are glad that it should be seen and known by all to be a mockery, because their object is to drag us, through the criminal cupidity of our shipbuilders, into a war with the North.

The manner in which these ships carry on war is enough in itself to show that they are not regular and honorable belligerents. They burn their prizes at sea, instead of taking them into a Prize Court—a practice contrary to the usages of civilized nations, and obviously liable to the grossest abuse. If, as has been asserted in full Parliament, and never, so far as I am aware, denied, they burn vessels at night to lure others into the snare, they are enemies of the human race, and ought to be arrested as such wherever they are found.

Further, I will venture to assert again, however rash and absurd the assertion may seem, that this question is not to be settled on technical grounds, by the professors of that which calls itself international "law." There is no such thing as a "law" of nations, in the proper sense of the term, because there is no legislator, no enactment, no tribunal, no means of giving legal effect to a decision. The duties of nations to each other are regulated, in the absence of express treaties, by those broad rules of morality and justice which are to mystery confined to the initiated, but as well known to every honest and sensible man as to the doctors whose learning is darkening this plain question. There are indeed usages of nations which it is most important to know and respect, though it is not desirable to stereotype them as "laws," because as humanity advances they are always undergoing tacit improvement.

But there is no usage, none at least recorded in history, which will cover such a wrong as this; and if there were one it would be honored rather in the breach than in the observance. The propensity of writers on international questions to assume the existence of a technical law where there is none is fertile in deception, and in deception which, if substantial wrongs are defended on technical pretexts, will lead nations into war. People whose ships are being destroyed and their goods burned with every circumstance of contumely, by cruisers issuing from the ports of a power professing to be their ally, are told that they must not think of being discontented with this treatment, since they are "dying by the Faculty" and it would all have been approved by Bynkershoek and Vattel! The physicians of Moliere are not yet extinct.

Finally, let me point out again that this is a question not only between our Government and the shipbuilders, or between our Government and the Federals, but between our Government and the Confederates. The Confederates are abusing our ports, corrupting our seamen, dishonoring our flag, compromising our neutrality, and designedly exposing us to the risk of war. For this they ought to be promptly called to account by the guardians of the national interests and honor; and if a real Chatham were at the head of England they would have been called to account long ago, or rather they never would have dared to offer this outrageous insult to the character of the country. I am, &c.,

Oxford, Sept. 2. GOLDWIN SMITH.

RUSSIA AND POLAND.

THE CONSTITUTION FOR POLAND AND RUSSIA.

PARIS, Sept. 3.—The *Patrie* for this evening says: "A special courier arrived yesterday from St. Petersburg, with important dispatches."

The *France* says: "It is asserted that the family council held at Tsarskoe Selo pronounced itself in favor of granting a Constitution. Prince Gorchakoff was the only person not belonging to the imperial family who was present at the council. All the commissioners intrusted with the elaboration of the scheme of the Constitution belong to the enlightened portion of Russian society."

The Emperor Napoleon will preside to-morrow at a Council of Ministers to be held at St. Cloud.

The *Pays*, in common with the *Journal des Debats*, says that before entering into a discussion on the Russian projects of reform, it would be wise to wait until they have obtained more consistency.

From the Paris Correspondence of The London Times.

AN ALLIANCE BETWEEN RUSSIA, PRUSSIA AND FRANCE.

A certain class of newsmongers still persists in maintaining the report of the Russo-Prusso-French alliance, but it will be quite time enough to attach importance to it when some official fact or document shall come to confirm it. What obtains more credit, in quarters where the first canard which flies across from the Bourse or the newspaper offices is not usually accepted as fact, is that there is just now, in the upper regions here, a feeling of great irritation and discontent with Austria. It seems that there was an expectation that Austria would go further ahead in the Polish question than she ultimately showed herself disposed to go. On England less reliance was placed, but good hopes, it appears, were cherished of Austria's disposition to go with France.

If it was believed that she would go the length of war with Russia in France's company, one is justified in suspecting that this Government was ill informed as to the real state of feeling in Vienna. Possibly M. de Metternich's French partialities misled that into holding out hopes too flattering. Perhaps M. de Gramont's experience of Austrian subtlety has not yet been long enough to enable him to detect the real meaning and intentions of a Rechberg. However this may be, it is generally believed that Austria is in extremely bad odor here at present, and it is said that the Frankfort meeting is one cause of the annoyance and hostility felt.

From the Paris Correspondent of The Daily News.

The article in yesterday's *Pays*, admitting the important facts that there is an understanding between France, Russia, and Prussia on the special point of the Frankfort Congress, and that the *rapprochement* may, under certain circumstances, extend further, has not made quite so much sensation in Paris as might have been expected. Some of the journals, no doubt, affect to find fault with the publication of several decrees upon financial matters. It is said that one of these orders will modify the export duties on oil, sulphur, and rags.

Intelligence has been received from Naples that the trial of Princess Sciara Barberini and Signor dei Quattromani has commenced. The public prosecutor has undertaken to prove the latter guilty of conspiracy, and the Princess of being his accomplice.

VIENNA, Sept. 2.—The *General Correspondenz* announces that Count Rechberg and Herr Von Bregelcben will remain at Frankfort. The actual conference of Ministers will not take place in that city at present, but a meeting of statesmen charged with completing the work examined and sanctioned by their sovereigns, and preparing to carry it into practice.

The official *Evening Post* publishes the following in conspicuous type:

"It is quite natural that the development of Mexican affairs should also be watched in Austria with lively interest, after the name of a conspicuous member of the Imperial House has been brought into close connection with the question. Contradictory reports of a decision having been already arrived at, afford us the opportunity of declaring that we are again able to affirm the position stated by us upon the 4th ult. to be in no way changed."

The *Est Deutsche Post* of the 1st inst. says: "The King of Denmark, in his quality of Duke of Schleswig-Holstein, will not obey the resolutions of the Federal Diet. He believes that the Federation will think twice before proceeding to the execution of a measure which would be regarded by Denmark as a declaration of war, and against which Sweden and Norway have promised aid. What the Federal Diet will do, we have no means of knowing. But we are unable to repress a hope that the Danish boldness will turn out for the benefit of the