THE NEW YORK HERALD.

WHOLE NO. 9853 — NEW YORK FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1863.—TRIPLE SHEET. — PRICE THREE CENTS.

OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Address by Senator Sumner at the Cooper Institute.

PERILS FROM ENGLAND.

The Anglo-Confederate Pirate Ships.

The Blunder-Crime Must be Renounced by England.

PERILS FROM FRANCE.

THE EMPEROR AGAINST US.

The Invasion of Mexico a Stepping Stone to Intervention.

The History of European Intervention.

Moral Impossibility of the Recognition of a New Slave Power.

OUR DUTIES.

No Alternative but to Crush Slavery,

&c., &c., &c.

The Hon. Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, delivered an address last evening at the Cooper Institute, on the invitation of the Young Men's Democratic Union, before an immense assemblage, in which the female element of our city was largely represented. The subject selected by him was that of our foreign relations, and as Mr. Sumner is chairman of the Committee of Foreign Relations in the Senate of the United States, his treatment of that subject deserves attention, as involving more or less the external policy of the government.

After the applause with which Mr. Sumner was greeted on his introduction had subsided, he spoke as follows:—

FELLOW CITIZENS:—From the beginning of the war in which we are now engaged, the public interest has alternated anxiously between the current of events at home and the more distant current abroad. Foreign relations have been hardly less absorbing than domestic relations. At times the latter have seemed to wait upon the former, and a packet from Europe has been like a messenger from the seat of war. Rumors of foreign intervention are constant—now in the form of mediation, and now in the form of recognition—and more than once the country has been summoned to confront the idea of England, and of France, too, in open combination with rebel slavemongers battling, in the name of slavery, to build an infamous Power on the destruction of this republic.

It may be well for us to turn aside from battle and siege here at home—from the tearing lines of Gettysburg, Vicksburg and Charleston—to glance for a moment at the perils from abroad, of course I mean from England and France, for these are the only foreign Powers that thus far have been moved to intermeddle on the side of slavery. The subject to which I now invite attention may not have the attraction of waving standards or victorious marches; but, more than any conflict of arms, it concerns the civilization of the age. If foreign Powers can justly interfere against human freedom, this republic will not be the only sufferer.

There is always a natural order in unfolding a subject, and I shall try to pursue it on this occasion under the following heads:—

First—The perils to our country from foreign Powers, especially as foreshadowed in the unexpected and persistent conduct of England and France since the outbreak of the war.

Secondly—The nature of foreign intervention by mediation, with the principles applicable thereto, as illustrated by historic instances, showing especially how England, by her conspicuous, widespread and most determined intervention to promote the extinction of African slavery, is irrevocably committed against any act or policy that can encourage this criminal pretension.

Thirdly—The nature of foreign intervention by recognition, with the principles applicable thereto, as illustrated by historic instances, showing that by the practice of nations, and especially by the declared sentiments of British statesmen, there can be no foreign recognition of an insurgent Power where the contest for independence is still pending.

Fourthly—The moral impossibility of foreign recognition, even if the pretended Power be *de facto* independent, where it is composed of rebel slavemongers seeking to found a new power, with slavery for its declared "corner stone." Pardon the truthful plainness of the terms which I employ. I am to speak not merely of slaveholders, but of people to whom slavery is a passion and a business—there are slave mongers, now in rebellion for the sake of slavery—therefore rebel slave mongers.

Fifthly—The absurdity and wrong of according ocean belligerency to a pretended Power, which in the first place, is without a prize court—so that it cannot be an ocean belligerent in fact—and which, in the second place, even if ocean belligerent in fact, is of such an odious character that its recognition is a moral impossibility.

From this review, touching upon the present and the past; leaning upon history and upon law, enlightened always by principles which are an unerring guide, our conclusion will be easy.

PERILS FROM FOREIGN POWERS.

The perils to our country, as foreshadowed in the action of foreign Powers since the outbreak of the war, first invite our attention.

There is something in the tendencies of nations which must not be neglected. Like individuals, nations influence each other; like the heavenly bodies, they may be disturbed by each other in their appointed orbits. This is apparent even in peace; but it becomes more apparent in the convulsions of war—sometimes from the withdrawal of customary forces and sometimes from their increased momentum. It is the nature of war to enlarge as it continues. Beginning between two nations, it gradually widens its circle, sucking other nations into its fiery maelstrom. Such is human history. Nor is it different, if the war be for independence. Foreign Powers may for a while keep out of the conflict, but the examples of history show how difficult this has been.

The seven united provinces of Holland, under that illustrious character, William of Orange, the predecessor and exemplar of our Washington, rose against the dominion of Spain, upheld by the bigotry of Philip II., and the barbarity of his representative, Alva; but the conflict, though at first limited to the two parties, was not slow to engage Queen Elizabeth, who lent to this war of independence the name of her favorite Leicester and the undying heroism of Sidney, while Spain retorted by the Armada. The united provinces of Holland, in their struggle for independence, were the prototype of the United States of America, which I need not remind you drew into their contest the arms of France, Spain and Holland. In the rising of the Spanish colonies, which followed, there was less intervention of other nations, doubtless from the distant and outlying position of these colonies, although they were not beyond the ambitious reach of the holy alliance, whose purposes with regard to them were so far thwarted by Mr. Canning, backed by the declaration of Mr. Monroe—known as the Monroe doctrine—that the British statesman felt authorized to boast that he had called a new World into existence to redress the balance of the old. Then came the struggle for Greek independence, which, after a conflict of several years, darkened by massacre, but relieved by an exalted self sacrifice shining with names, like Byron and Bozzaris, that cannot die, at length challenged the powerful interposition of England, France and Russia. The independence of Greece was hardly acknowledged when Belgium, renouncing the rule of the Netherlands, claimed hers also; and here again the great Powers of Europe were drawn into the contest. Then came the effort of Hungary, inspired by Kossuth, which, when about to prevail, aroused the armies of Russia. There was also the contemporaneous effort of the Roman republic, under Mazzini, which, when about to prevail, aroused the bayonets of France. And, lastly, we have only recently witnessed the resurrection of Italy, inspired by Garibaldi and directed by Cavour, but it was not accomplished until Louis Napoleon, with his well trained legions, carried the imperial eagles into the battle.

Such are famous instances, which are now so many warnings. Ponder them and you will see the tendency, the temptation, the irresistible fascination, or the commanding exigency under which, in times past, foreign nations have been led to take part in conflicts for independence. I do not dwell now on the character of these various interventions, although they have been mostly in the interest of human freedom. It is only as examples to put us on our guard that I now adduce them. The footprints all seem to lead one way.

But even our war is not without its warnings. If thus far in its progress other nations have not intervened, they have not succeeded in keeping entirely aloof. The foreign trumpet has not sounded yet, but more than once the cry has come that we should soon hear it, while incidents have too often occurred exhibiting an abnormal watchfulness of our affairs and an uncontrollable passion or purpose to intermeddle in them, with signs of unfriendly feeling. Of course this is applicable especially, if not exclusively, to England and France.

PERILS FROM ENGLAND.

There is one act of the British Cabinet which stands foremost as an omen of peril—foremost in time, foremost also in the magnitude of its consequences. Though plausible in form, it is none the less injurious or unjustifiable. Of course I refer to that inconsiderate proclamation, in the name of the Queen, as early as May, 1861, which, after raising rebel slaveowners to an equality with the national government in belligerent rights, solemnly declares "neutrality" between the two equal parties; as if the declaration of equality was not an insult to the national government, and the declaration of neutrality was not a moral absurdity, offensive to reason and all those precedents which make the glory of the British name. Even if the proclamation could be otherwise than improper at any stage of such a rebellion, it was worse than a blunder at that early date. The apparent relations between the two Powers were more than friendly. Only a few months before the youthful heir to the British throne had been welcomed everywhere throughout the United States, except Richmond, as in the land of kinsmen. And yet, immediately after the tidings of the rebel assault on Fort Sumter—before the national government had begun to put forth its strength, and even without waiting for the arrival of our newly appointed minister, who was known to be at Liverpool, on his way to London—the proclamation was suddenly launched. I doubt if any well informed persons who have read Mr. Dallas' despatch of May 2, 1861, recounting a conversation with the British Minister, will vindicate it in point of time. Clearly the alacrity of this concession was unhappy, for it bore an air of defiance, or, at least, of heartlessness towards an ally of kindred blood, engaged in the maintenance of its traditional power against an infamous pretension. But it was more unhappy still that the good genius of England did not save this historic nation, linked with so many triumphs of freedom, from a fatal step, which, under the guise of "neutrality," was a betrayal of civilization itself.

It is difficult to exaggerate the consequences of this precipitate unfriendly and unmoral concession which has been and still is an overflowing fountain of mischief and bloodshed—*hac fonte derivata clades*: first in what it vouchsafes to rebel slavemongers on sea and in British ports, and secondly in the impediments which it takes from British subjects ready to make money out of slavery—all of which has been declared by undoubted British authority, Lord Chelmsford—of professional renown as Sir Frederick Thesiger—an ex Chancellor, used these words recently in the House of Lords:—"If the Southern confederacy had not been recognized as a belligerent power he agreed with his noble and learned friend (Lord Brougham) that, under these circumstances, if any Englishman were to fit out a privateer for the purpose of assisting the Southern States against the Northern States he would be guilty of piracy." But all this was changed by the Queen's proclamation. For the rebel slavemongers there is the recognition of his flag; for the British subject there is the opportunity of trade. For the rebel slavemonger there is fellowship and equality; for the British subject there is a new customer, to whom he may lawfully sell Armstrong guns, and other warlike munitions of choicest British workmanship, and Lord Palmerston tells us, even ships of war too, to be used in behalf of slavery. What was unlawful is suddenly made lawful, while the ban is taken from an odious felony. It seems almost superfluous to add that such a concession, thus potent in its reach, must have been a direct encouragement and overture to the rebellion. Slavery itself was exalted when barbarous pretenders—battling to found a new power in its hateful name—without so much as a single port on the ocean where a prize could be carried for condemnation—were yet, in the face of this essential deficiency, swiftly acknowledged as ocean belligerents, while, as a consequence, their pirate ships, cruising for plunder in behalf of slavery, were acknowledged as national ships, entitled to equal privileges with the national ships of the United States. This simple statement is enough. It is vain to say that such a concession was a "necessity." There may have been a strong temptation to it, constituting, perhaps, an imagined necessity, as with many persons there is a strong temptation to slavery itself. But such a concession to slavemongers, fighting for slavery, can be vindicated only as slavery is vindicated. As well undertake to declare "neutrality" between right and wrong—between good and evil—with a concession to the latter of belligerent rights, and then set up the apology of "necessity."

It was natural that an act so essentially unfriendly in character and also in the alacrity with which it was done, should create throughout England an unfriendly sentiment towards us, easily stimulated to a menace of war. And this menace was not wanting soon afterwards, when the two rebel emissaries on board the Trent were seized by a patriotic, brave commander, whose highest fault was that, in the absence of instructions from his own government, he followed too closely British precedents. This accident—for such it was, and nothing else—was misrepresented, and, with an utterly indefensible exaggeration, was changed by the British nation, backed by the British government, into a *casus belli*, as if such an unauthorized incident, which obviously involved no question of self-defence, could justify war between two civilized nations. And yet, in the face of a positive declaration from the United States, that it was an accident, the British government made preparations to take part with rebel slavemongers, and it only began such ignoble preparations by keeping back from the British people the official despatch of 30th November, 1861, where our government, after announcing that Capt. Wilkes had acted "without any instructions," expressed a trust that "the British government would consider the subject in a friendly temper," and promised "the best disposition on our part." It is painful to recall these things. But they now belong to history, and we cannot forget the lesson they teach.

But this tendency to espouse the side of slavery appears in small things as well as great, becoming more marked in proportion to the inconsistency involved. Thus, for instance, where two British subjects, "suspected" of participation in the rebellion, were detained in a military prison, without the benefit of habeas corpus, the British Minister at Washington was directed by her Majesty's government to complain of their detention as an infraction of the constitution of the United States, of which this intermeddling Power assumed for the time to be the "expounder;" and the case was accordingly presented on this ground. But the British Cabinet, in its instinctive aptness to mix in our war, if only by diplomatic notes, seemed to have forgotten the British constitution, under which, in 1848, with the consent of the leaders of all parties—Brougham and Derby, Peele and Disraeli—the habeas corpus was suspended in Ireland and the government was authorized to apprehend and detain "such persons as they shall suspect." The bill sanctioning this exercise of power went through all its stages in the House of Commons in one day, and on the next day it went through all its stages in the House of Lords, passing to be a law without a dissenting vote. It will hardly be believed that Lord Russell, who now complains of our "detention" of suspected persons, as an infraction of the constitution of the United States, was the minister who introduced this bill, and that on that occasion he used these words:—"I believe in my conscience that this measure is calculated to prevent insurrection, to preserve internal peace, to preserve the unity of this empire and to save the throne of these realms and the free institutions of this country."

The complaint about the habeas corpus was hardly answered when another was solemnly presented, on account of the effort to complete the blockade of Charleston, by sinking at its mouth ships laden with stone, usually known as the "stone blockade." In common times her Majesty's government would have shrunk from any intermeddling here. It could not have forgotten that history, early and late, and especially English history, abounds in similar incidents; that as long ago as 1456, at the siege of Calais by the Duke of Burgundy, and also in 1628, at the memorable siege of Rochelle by Cardinal Richelieu, ships laden with stone were sunk in the harbor; that during the war of the Revolution in 1778 six vessels were sunk by the British commander in the Savannah river, not far from this very Charleston, as a protection against the approach of the French and American naval forces; that in 1804, under the direction of the British Admiralty, an attempt was made to choke the entrance into the harbor of Boulogne by sinking stone vessels, and that in 1809 the same blockade was recommended to the Admiralty by no less a person than Lord Dundonald, with regard to another port, saying, "Ships filled with stones will ruin for ever the anchorage of Aix, and some old vessels of the line well loaded would be excellent for the purpose." But this complaint by the British Cabinet becomes doubly strange when it is considered that one of the most conspicuous treaties of modern history contained solemn exactions by England from France that the harbor of Dunkirk, whose prosperity was regarded with jealousy, should be permanently "filled up," so that it could no longer furnish its accustomed hospitalities to commerce. This was the Treaty of Utrecht, in 1713. But by the Triple Alliance, only four years later, France was constrained to stipulate again that nothing should be omitted "which Great Britain could think necessary for the entire destruction of the harbor," and the latter Power was authorized to send commissioners as "ocular witnesses of the execution of the treaty." These humiliating provisions were renewed in successive treaties down to the peace of Versailles in 1783, when the immunity of that harbor was recognized with American independence. But Great Britain, when compelled to open Dunkirk, still united with the Dutch in closing the Scheldt, or as a British writer expresses it, she "became bound to assist in obstructing this navigation." One of the two reasons put forth by Great Britain for breaking peace with France in 1792, and entering upon that world convulsing war, was that the revolutionary Power had declared it would open the Scheldt. And yet it is Great Britain, thus persistent in closing ports and rivers, that now interferes to warn us against a "stone blockade."

The same propensity and the same inconsistency will be found in another instance, where an eminent peer, once Foreign Secretary, did not hesitate, from his place in Parliament, to charge the United States with making medicines and surgical instruments contraband, "contrary to all the common laws of war, contrary to all precedent, not excluding the most ignorant and barbarous ages." Thus exclaims the noble lord. Now I have nothing to say of the propriety of making these things contraband. My simple object is to exhibit the spirit against which we are to guard. It would be difficult to believe that such a display could be made in the face of the historic fact, exposed in the satire of Peter Plymley's Letters, that Parliament, in 1808, by large majorities, prohibited the exportation of Peruvian bark into any territory occupied by France, and that this measure was introduced by no less a person than Mr. Percival, and commended by him on the ground that "the severest pressure was already felt on the continent from the want of this article, and that it was of great importance to the armies of the enemy." Such is authentic British precedent, in an age neither "ignorant" nor "barbarous," which is now ostentatiously forgotten.

This same recklessness, which is of such evil omen, breaks forth again in a despatch of the Foreign Secretary, where he undertakes to communicate to Lord Lyons the judgment of the British Cabinet on the President's proclamation of emancipation. Here at least, you will say, there can be no misunderstanding and no criticism; but you are mistaken. Such an act, having such an object, and being of such unparalleled importance, would, under any ordinary circumstances, when great passions found no vent, have been treated by the Minister of a foreign Power with supreme caution, if not with sympathy; but, under the terrible influence of the hour, Lord Russell, not content with condemning the proclamation, misrepresents it in the most barefaced manner. Gathering his condemnation into one phrase, he says that it "makes slavery at once legal and illegal," whereas it is obvious, on the face of the proclamation, to the most careless observer, that, whatever may be its faults, it is not obnoxious to this criticism, for it makes slavery legal nowhere, while it makes it illegal in an immense territory. An official letter, so incomprehensible in motive, from a statesman usually liberal if not cautious, must be regarded as another illustration of that irritating tendency which will be checked only when it is fully comprehended.

The activity of our navy is only another occasion for criticism in a similar spirit. Nothing can be done anywhere to please our self-constituted monitor. Our naval officers in the West Indies, acting under instructions modelled on the judgments of the British Admiralty, are reprehended by Lord Russell in a formal despatch. The judges in our prize Court are indecently belittled by this same minister from his place in Parliament, when it is notorious that there are several who will compare favorably with any British Admiralty Judge since Lord Stowell, not even excepting that noble and upright magistrate, Dr. Lushington. And this same minister has undertaken to throw the British shield over a newly invented contraband trade with the rebel slavemongers, via Matamoros, claiming that it was "a lawful branch of commerce," and "a perfectly legitimate trade." The Dolphin and Peterhoff were two ships elaborately prepared in London for this illicit commerce, and they have been duly condemned as such; but their seizure by our cruisers was made the occasion of official protest and complaint, with the insinuation of "vexatious capture and arbitrary interference," followed by the menace that, under such circumstances, "it is obvious Great Britain must interfere to protect her flag."

This persistent, inexorable criticism, even at the expense of all consistency or of all memory, has also broken forth in forms incompatible with that very "neutrality" which was so early declared. It was bad enough to declare neutrality, when the question was between a friendly Power and an insulting barbarism; but it was worse after the declaration to depart from it, if in words only. The Court of Rome at a period when it powerfully influenced the usage of nations, instructed its cardinal legate, on an important occasion, first and above all things, to cultivate "indifference" between the parties, and in this regard his conduct was to be so exact that not only should no partiality be seen in his conduct, but it should not be remarked even "in the words of his domestics." If in that early day, before steam and telegraph, or even the newspaper, neutrality was disturbed by "words," how much more so now, when every word is multiplied indefinitely and wafted we know not where, to begin, wherever it falls, a subtle, wide spread and irrepressible influence. But this injunction is in plain harmony with the refined rule of Count Bernstoff, who, in his admirable despatch on this subject, at the time of the armed neutrality, says sententiously, "Neutrality does not exist when it is not perfect." It must be clear and above suspicion. Like the reputation of a woman, it is lost when you begin to talk about it. Unhappily there is too much occasion to talk about the "neutrality" of England. I say nothing of a Parliamentary utterance that the national cause was "detested by a large majority of the House of Commons," or of other most unneutral speeches. I confine myself to official declarations. Here the case is plain. Several of the British Cabinet, including the Foreign Secretary and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, two great masters of "words," have allowed themselves in public speeches to characterize offensively our present effort to put down rebel slavemongers as "a contest for empire on one side and for independence on the other." Here were "words," which, under a specious form, were understood to give encouragement to rebel slavemongers. But they were more specious than true, revealing nothing but the side espoused by the orators. Clearly on our side it is a contest for national life, involving the liberty of a race. Clearly on the other side it is a contest for slavery, in order to secure for this hateful crime new recognition and power. Our Empire is simply to crush rebel slavemongers. Their independence is simply the unrestrained power to whip women and sell children. Even if at the beginning, the national government made no declaration on the subject, yet the real character of the war was none the less apparent in the repeated declarations of the other side, who did not hesitate to assert their purpose to build a new Power on slavery—as in the Italian campaign of Louis Napoleon against Austria, the object was necessarily apparent, even before the Emperor tardily at Milan put forth his life giving proclamation that Italy should be free from the Alps to the Adriatic, by which the war became, in its declared purpose, as well as in reality, a war of liberation. That such a rebellion should be elevated by the unneutral "words" of a foreign Cabinet, into a respectability of which it is obviously unworthy, is only another sign which we must watch.

But these same orators of the British Cabinet, not content with giving us a bad name, have allowed themselves to pronounce against us on the whole case. They declared that the national government cannot succeed in crushing rebel slavemongers, and that dismemberment is inevitable. "Jefferson Davis," says one of them, "has created a nation." Thus do these representatives of declared "neutrality" degrade us and exalt slavery. But it is apparent that their annunciation, though made in Parliament and repeated at public meetings, was founded less on any special information from the seat of war, disclosing its secret, than on political theory, if not prejudice. It is true that our eloquent teacher, Edmund Burke, in his famous letter to the sheriffs of Bristol, argued most persuasively that Great Britain could not succeed in reclaiming the colonies, which had declared themselves independent. His reasoning rather than his wisdom seems to have entered into and possessed the British statesmen of our day, who do not take the trouble to see that the two cases are so entirely unlike that the example of the one is not applicable to the other, that the colonies were battling to found a new Power on the corner stone of "liberty, equality and happiness to all men," while our slavemongers are battling to found a new Power on the corner stone of "slavery." The difference is such as to become a contrast—so that whatever was once generously said in favor of American independence rises to tells with unmistakable force against this new-fangled pretension.

No British statesman saw the past more clearly than Lord Russell when long ago, in striking phrase, he said that England, in her war against our fathers, "had engaged for the suppression of liberty," but this is precisely what rebel slavemongers are now doing. Men change; but principles are the same now as then. Therefore, do I say, that every sympathy formerly bestowed upon our fathers now belongs to their children, striving to uphold their work against bad men, who would not only break it in pieces but put in its stead a new piratical Power, whose declared object is "the suppression of liberty." And yet British ministers, mounting the prophetic tripod, presume most oracularly to foretell the doom of this republic. Their prophecies do not disturb my confidence. I do not forget how often false prophets have appeared, including the author of the "Oceana," who published a demonstration of the impossibility of monarchy in England only six months before Charles II. entered London amidst salvos of cannon and the hurrahs of the people. Nor can I stop to consider how far such prophecies uttered in public places by British Ministers are consistent with that British "neutrality" which is so constantly boasted. Opinions are sometimes allies more potent than subsidies, especially in an age like the present. Prophecies are opinions proclaimed and projected into the future, and yet there are given freely to rebel slavemongers. There is matter for reflection in this instance, but I adduce it now only as another illustration of the times. Nothing can be more clear than that whosoever assumes to play the prophet becomes pledged in character and pretension to sustain his prophecy. The learned Jerome Cardan, professor and doctor, and also dabbler in astrology, of great fame in the Middle Ages, undertook to predict the day of his death, and he maintained his character as a successful prophet by taking his own life at the appointed time. If British Ministers, who have played the prophet, escape the ordinary influence of this craft, it will be from that happy nature which has suspended for them human infirmity and human prejudice. But it becomes us to note well the increased difficulties and dangers to which on this account the national cause is exposed.

But it is not in "words" only—of speeches, despatches or declarations—that our danger lies. I am sorry to add that there are acts also with which the British government is too closely associated. I do not refer to the unlimited supply of "munitions of war," so that our army at Charleston, like our army at Vicksburg, is compelled to encounter Armstrong guns and Blakeley guns, with all proper ammunition, from England; for the right of British subjects to sell these articles to rebel slavemongers was fixed when the latter, by sudden metamorphosis, were changed from lawless vagrants of the ocean to lawful belligerents. Nor do I refer to the swarms of swift steamers, "a pitchy cloud warping on the eastern wind," always under the British flag, with contributions to rebel slavemongers; for these, too, enjoy a kindred immunity. Of course, no royal proclamation can change wrong into right or make such business otherwise than immoral, but the proclamation may take from it the character of felony.

But even the royal proclamation gives no sanction to the preparation in England of a naval expedition against the commerce of the United States. It leaves the parliamentary statute, as well as the general law of nations, in full efficacy to restrain and punish such an offence. And yet, in the face of this obvious prohibition, standing forth in the text of the law, and founded in reason "before human statute purged the common weal," also exemplified by the national government, which, from the time of Washington, has always guarded its ports against such outrage, powerful ships have been launched, equipped, fitted out and manned in England, with arms supplied at sea from another English vessel, and then, assuming that by this insulting hocus pocus all English liability was avoided, they have proceeded at once to rob and destroy the commerce of the United States. England has been their naval base from which were derived the original forces and supplies which enable them to sail the seas. Several such ships are now depredating on the ocean, like Captain Kidd, under pretended commissions, each in itself a naval expedition. As England is not at war with the United States, these ships can be nothing else than pirates; and their conduct is that of pirates, unable to provide a court for the trial of prizes, they recognise for every captured ship the barbarous "ordeal of fire." Like pirates, they burn all that they cannot rob. Flying from sea to sea in lawless piracy, they turn the ocean into a furnace and melting pot of American commerce. Of these incendiaries the most famous is the Alabama, with a picked crew of British sailors, with "trained gunners out of her Majesty's naval reserve," and with everything else from keel to topmast British, which, after more than a year of unlawful havoc, is still burning the property of our citizens, without once entering a rebel slavemonger port, but always keeping the umbilical connection with England, out of whose womb she sprung, and never losing the original nationality stamped upon her by origin, so that at this day she is a British pirate ship—precisely as a native born Englishman, robbing on the high seas, and never naturalized abroad, is a British pirate subject.

It is bad enough that all this should proceed from England. It is hard to bear. Why is it not stopped at once? One cruiser might, perhaps, elude a watchful government. But it is difficult to see how this can occur once, twice, three times; and the cry is still they sail. Two powerful rams are now announced, like stars at a theatre. Will they, too, be allowed to perform? I wish there were not too much reason to believe that all these performances are sustained by a prevailing British sympathy. A Frenchman, who was accidentally a prisoner on board the Alabama at the destruction of two American ships, describes a British packet in sight whose crowded passengers made the sea resound with cheers as they witnessed the captured ships handed over to the flames. The words of Lucretius were verified—*Suave etiam belli certamina magna tueri*. But these same cheers were echoed in Parliament as the builder of the piratical craft gloried in his deed. The verse which filled the ancient theatre with glad applause, declared a sympathy with humanity; but English applause is now given to slavery and its defenders: "I am an Englishman, and nothing of slavery is foreign to me." Accordingly slavery is helped by English arms, English gold, English ships, English speeches, English cheers. And yet for the honor of England, let it be known, that there are Englishmen who have stood firm and unshaken amidst this painful recreancy. Their names cannot be forgotten. And still more for the honor of England, let it be spoken that the working classes, who were called to suffer the most, have bravely borne their calamity, without joining with the enemies of the republic. Their cheers have been for freedom and not for slavery.

But the cheers of the House of Commons seem to prevail in her Majesty's government. Municipal law is violated, while international law, in its most solemn obligation to do unto others as we would have them do unto us, is treated as if it did not exist. Eminent British functionaries vindicate the naval expeditions which, in the name of slavery, have been unleashed against a friendly Power. Taking advantage of an admitted principle, that "munitions of war" may be supplied, the Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer tells us that "ships of war" may be supplied also. Lord Palmerston echoes the Lord Chief Baron. Each vouches American authority. But they are mistaken. The steel which they strive to "impel" cannot be feathered from our sides. Since the earliest stage of its existence the national government has asserted a distinction between the two cases; and so has the Supreme Court, although there are words of Story which have been latterly quoted to the contrary. But the authority of the Supreme Court is positive on both the points into which the British apology is divided. The first of these is that, even if a "ship-of-war" cannot be furnished, the offence is not complete until the armament is put aboard, so that where the ship, though fitted out and equipped in a British port, awaits her armament at sea, she is not liable to arrest. Such an apology is an insult to the understanding and to common sense—as if it was not obvious that the offence begins with the laying of the keel for the hostile ship, knowing it to be such, and in this spirit the Supreme Court has decided that it "was not necessary to find that a ship on leaving port was armed or in a condition to commit hostilities; for citizens are restrained from such acts as are calculated to involve the country in a war." The second apology assumes that, even if the armament were aboard so that the "ship-of-war" was complete at all points, still the expedition would be lawful, if the juggle of a sale were adroitly employed. But on this point the Supreme Court, speaking by Chief Justice Marshall, has left no doubt of its deliberate and most authoritative judgment. In the case before the Court the armament was on board, but cleared as cargo; the men, too, were on board, but enlisted for a commercial voyage; the ship, though fitted out to cruise against a nation with which we are at peace, was not commissioned as a privateer, and did not attempt to act as such until she had reached the river La Plata, where a commission was obtained and the crew re-enlisted. Yet, in face of these extenuating circumstances, it was declared by the whole Court that the neutrality of the United States had been violated, so that the guilty ship could not afterwards be recognized as a legitimate cruiser. All these disguises were to no purpose. The Court penetrated them every one, saying that if such a ship could lawfully sail there would be on our part "a fraudulent neutrality, disgraceful to our government, of which no nation would be the dupe." But a "neutrality" worse even than that condemned in advance by our Supreme Court, "of which no nation would be the dupe," is now served out to us, which nothing but the fatal war spirit that has entered into Great Britain can explain. There was a time when the Foreign Secretary of England, truly eminent as statesman and as orator, Mr. Canning, said in the House of Commons—"If war must come, let it come in the shape of satisfaction to be demanded for injuries, of rights to be asserted, of interests to be protected, of treaties to be fulfilled. But in God's name let it not come on in the paltry, pettifogging way of fitting out ships in our harbors to cruise for gain. At all events let the country disdain to be sneaked into a war." These noble words were uttered in reply to Lord John Russell and his associates in 1823 on their proposition to repeal the Foreign Enlistment act and to overturn the statute safeguards of British neutrality. But they speak now with greater force than then.

Even if it be admitted that "ships of war," like "munitions of war," may be sold to a belligerent, as is asserted by the British Prime Minister, echoing the Lord Chief Baron, it is obvious that it can be only with the distinction to which I have already alluded, that the sale is a commercial transaction, pure and simple, and not, in any respect, a hostile expedition fitted out in England. The ship must be "exported" as an article of commerce, and it must continue such until its arrival at the belligerent port, where alone can it be fitted out and commissioned as a "ship of war," when its hostile character will commence. Any attempt in England to impart to it a hostile character, or, in one word, to make England its naval base, must be criminal; but this is precisely what has been done. And here are the leonine footprints which point so badly.

But not content with misconstruing the decisions of our Supreme Court, in order to make them a cover for naval expeditions to depredate on our commerce, our whole history is forgotten or misrepresented. It is forgotten that, as early as 1793, under the administration of Washington, before any act of Congress on the subject, the national government recognized its liability, under the law of nations, for ships fitted out in its ports to depredate on British commerce; that Washington, in a message to Congress, describes such ships as "vessels commissioned or equipped in a warlike form, within the limits of the United States," and also as "military expeditions or enterprises;" and that Jefferson, in vindicating this policy of repression, said, in a letter to the French Minister, that "it was our wish to preserve the morals of our citizens from being vitiated by courses of lawless plunder and murder;" that, on this occasion, the national government made the distinction between "munitions of war" which a neutral might supply in the way of commerce to a belligerent, and "ships of war," which a neutral was not allowed to supply or even to augment with arms; that Mr. Hammond, the British Plenipotentiary at that time, by his letter of 8th May, 1793, after complaining of two French privateers fitted out at Charleston to cruise against British commerce, expressly declares that he considers them "breaches of that neutrality which the United States profess to observe, and direct contraventions of the proclamation which the President had issued," and that very soon there were criminal proceedings, at British instigation, on account of these privateers, in which it was affirmed by the court that such ships could not be fitted out in a neutral port without a violation of international obligations; that, promptly thereafterwards, on the application of the British government, a statute was enacted, in harmony with the law of nations, for the better maintenance of our neutrality; that, in 1818, Congress enacted another statute in the nature of a Foreign Enlistment act, which was proposed as an example by Lord Castlereagh, when urging a similar statute upon Parliament; that in 1820 the conduct of the United States on this whole head was proposed as an example to the British Parliament by Mr. Canning; that, in 1837, during the rebellion in Canada, on the application of the British government, and to its special satisfaction, as was announced in Parliament by Lord Palmerston, who was at the time Foreign Secretary, our government promptly declared its purpose "to maintain the supremacy of those laws which had been passed to fulfil the obligations of the United States towards all nations which should be engaged in foreign or domestic warfare;" and, not satisfied with its existing powers, undertook to ask additional legislation from Congress; that Congress proceeded at once to the enactment of another statute, calculated to meet the immediate exigency, wherein it was provided that collectors, marshals and other officers shall "seize and detain any vessel which may be provided or prepared for any military expedition or enterprise against the territories or dominions of any foreign Prince or Power." It is something to forget these things; but it is convenient to forget still further that on the breaking out of the Crimean war, in 1854, the British government, jointly with France, made another appeal to the United States, that our citizens "should rigorously abstain from taking part in armaments of Russian privateers, or in any other measure opposed to the duties of a strict neutrality;" and this appeal, which was declared by the British government to be "in the spirit of just reciprocity," was answered on our part by a sincere and determined vigilance, so that not a single British or French ship suffered from any cruiser fitted out in our ports. And it is also convenient to forget still further the solemn obligations of treaty, binding on both parties, by which it is stipulated:—

> That the subjects and citizens of the two nations shall not do any acts of hostility or violence against each other, nor accept commissions or instructions so to act from any foreign prince or State, enemies to the other party; nor shall the enemies of one of the parties be permitted to invite or endeavor to enlist in their military service any of the subjects or citizens of the other party; and the laws against all such offences and aggressions shall be punctually executed.

But at the date of this treaty, in 1794, there was little legislation on the subject in either country, so that the treaty, in harmony with the practice, testifies to the requirements of the law of nations, as understood at the time by both Powers.

And yet, forgetting all these things—which show how faithfully the national government has acted, both in measures of repression and measures of compensation—also how often the British government has asked and received protection at our hands, and how highly our example of neutrality has been appreciated by leading British statesmen; and forgetting also that "spirit of just reciprocity" which, besides being the promptings of an honest nature, had been positively promised, ship after ship is permitted to leave British ports to depredate on our commerce, and [illegible] this outrage, as [illegible] all the obligations of [illegible] and we are petulantly told that the evidence against the ships is not sufficient under the statute; and when we propose that the statute shall be rendered efficient for the purpose, precisely as in times past the British government, under circumstances less stringent, proposed to us, we are pointedly repelled by the old baronial declaration, that there must be no change in the laws of England; while to cap this strange insensibility, Lord Palmerston, in one of the last debates of the late Parliament, brings against us a groundless charge of infidelity to our neutral duties during the Crimean war, when the fact is notoriously the reverse, and Lord Russell, in the same spirit, imagines an equally groundless charge, which he records in a despatch, that we have recently enlisted men in Ireland, when notoriously we have done no such thing. Thus all the obligations of reciprocal service and good will are openly discarded, while our public conduct, as well in the past as the present, is openly misrepresented.

This flagrant oblivion of history and of duty, which seems to be the adopted policy of the British government, has been characteristically followed by a flat refusal to pay for the damages to our commerce caused by the hostile expeditions. The United States, under Washington, on the application of the British government, made compensation for damages to British commerce under circumstances much less vexatious, and, still further, by special treaty, made compensation for damages "by vessels originally armed" in our ports, which is the present case. Of course, it can make no difference—not a pin's difference—if the armament is carried out to sea in another vessel from a British port, and there transhipped. Such an evasion may be effectual against a parliamentary statute; but it will be impotent against a demand upon the British government, according to the principles of international law; for this law looks always at the substance and not the form, and will not be diverted by the trick of a pettifogger. Whether the armament be put on board in port or at sea, England is always the naval base, or, according to the language of Sir William Scott, in a memorable case, the "station" or "vantage" ground—which he declared a neutral country could not be. Therefore, the early precedent between the United States and England is in every respect completely applicable, and since this precedent was established—not only by the consent of England but at her motion—it must be accepted on the present occasion as an irreversible declaration of international duty. Other nations might differ, but England is bound. And now it is her original interpretation, first made to take compensation from us, which is flatly rejected when we ask compensation from her. But even if the responsibility for a hostile expedition fitted out in British ports were not plain, there is something in the recent conduct of the British government calculated to remove all doubt. Pirate ships are reported on the stocks ready to be launched, and when the parliamentary statute is declared insufficient to stop them, the British government declines to amend it, and so doing, it openly declines to stop the pirate ships, saying, "if the parliamentary statute is inadequate then let them sail." It is not needful to consider the apology. The act of declension is positive and its consequences are no less positive, fixing beyond question the responsibility of the British government for these criminal expeditions. In thus fixing this responsibility, we but follow the suggestions of reason, and the text of an approved authority, whose words have been adopted in England:—

> It must be laid down as a maxim that a sovereign who, knowing the crimes of his subjects, as for example that they practice piracy on strangers, and being also able and obliged to hinder it, does not hinder it, renders himself criminal, because he has consented to the bad action, the commission of which he has permitted. It is presumed that a sovereign knows what his subjects openly and frequently commit and, as to his power of hindering the evil, this likewise is always presumed, unless the want of it be clearly proved.

Such are the words of Burlamaqui, in his work on "Natural Law," quoted with approbation by Phillimore in his work on the "Law of Nations." Unless these words are discarded as "a maxim"—while the early precedent of British demand upon us for compensation is also rudely rejected—it is difficult to see how the British government can avoid the consequences of complicity with the pirate ships in all their lawless devastation. But I forbear to dwell on this accumulating liability, amounting already to many millions of dollars, with accumulating exasperations also. My present object is accomplished if I make you see which way danger lies.

But beyond acts and words this same British rabbia shows itself in the official tone which has been adopted towards the national cause in its unparalleled struggle—especially throughout the correspondence of the British Foreign Office. Of course there is no friendship in any of these letters. Nor is there any sympathy with the national championship against rebel slavemongers, nor one word of mildest dissent even from the miscreant apostolate which was preached in their behalf. Naturally the tone is in harmony with the sentiment. Hard, curt, captious, cynical, it evinces an indifference to those kindly relations which nations ought to cultivate with each other, and which should be the study of a wise statesmanship. The Malay runs a muck, and such is the favorite diplomatic style in dealing with us. This is painfully conspicuous in all that concerns the pirate ships. But I can well understand that a minister, who so easily conceded belligerent rights to rebel slavemongers, and then so easily permitted their ships to sally forth for piracy, would be very indifferent to the tone of what he wrote. And yet even outrage may be soothed or softened by gentle words; but none such have come out of British diplomacy to us. Most deeply do I regret this too suggestive failure. And believe me, fellow citizens, I say these things with sorrow unspeakable, and only in discharge of my duty on this occasion, when, face to face, I meet you to consider the aspect of our affairs abroad.

But there is still another head of danger in which all others culminate. I refer to an intrusive mediation, or, it may be, a recognition of the slavemonger pretension as an independent nation; for such propositions have been openly made in Parliament and constantly urged by the British press, and, though not yet adopted by her Majesty's government, they have never been repelled on principle, so that they constitute a perpetual cloud, threatening to break in our foreign relations. It is plain to all who have not forgotten history, that England never can be guilty of such recognition without an unpardonable apostasy, nor can she intervene by way of mediation except in the interests of freedom. And yet such are the strange "elective affinities" newly born between England and slavery; such is the towering blindness, with regard to our country, kindred to that which prevailed in the time of George Grenville and Lord North, that her Majesty's government, instead of repelling the proposition, simply adjourn it, meanwhile adopting the attitude of one watching to strike. The British minister at Washington, of model prudence, whose individual desire for peace I cannot doubt, tells his government in a despatch which will be found in the last blue book, that as yet he sees no sign of a "conjuncture at which foreign Powers may step in with propriety and effect to put a stop to the effusion of blood." Here is a plain assumption that such a conjuncture may occur. But for the present we are left free to wage the battle against slavery without any such intervention in arrest of our efforts.

Such are some of the warnings which lower from the English sky, hanging over the graves of Wilberforce and Clarkson, while sounding from these sacred graves are heard strange, un-English voices, crying out, "Down with us, rebel slave mongers, whippers of women and sellers of children, for you are the people of our choice, whom we welcome promptly to ocean rights—with Armstrong guns and naval expeditions equipped in our ports, and on whom we lavish sympathy always and the prophecy of success; while for you, who uphold the republic and oppose slavery, we have hard words, criticism, rebuke and the menace of war."

PERILS FROM FRANCE.

If we cross the channel into France we shall not be encouraged much. And yet the Emperor, though acting habitually in concert with the British Cabinet, has not intermeddled so ungracefully or displayed a temper of so little international amiability. The correspondence under his direction, even at the most critical moments, leaves little to be desired in respect of form. Nor has there been a single blockade runner under the French flag, nor a single pirate ship from a French port. But in spite of these things it is too apparent that the Emperor has tried [illegible] against us in at least four important [illegible]. Duke de Choiseul, Prime Minister of France, was familiarly addressed by Frederick the Great as "the Coachman of Europe"—a title which belongs now to Louis Napoleon. But he must not try to be "Coachman of America."

Following the example of England Louis Napoleon has acknowledged the rebel slavemongers as ocean belligerents, so that with the sanction of France, our ancient ally, their pirate ships, although without a single open port which they can call their own, enjoy a complete immunity as lawful cruisers, while all who sympathize with them may furnish supplies and munitions of war. This fatal concession was opened by the concurrence of the two great Powers. But, if [illegible] prolonged, their [illegible] giving a brief vitality to slavery [illegible], will be impotent to confirm this intolerable pretension.

Sinister events are not alone, and this recognition of slavery was followed by an expedition of France, in concurrence with England and Spain, against our neighbor republic, Mexico. The two latter Powers, with becoming wisdom, very soon withdrew. But the Emperor did not hesitate to enter upon the invasion. A French fleet with an unmatched [illegible] the consummate prowess of French naval art, is now at Vera Cruz, and the French army, after a protracted siege, has stormed Puebla and entered the famous capital. This far reaching enterprise was originally said to be a sort of process, served by a general, for the recovery of outstanding debts due to French citizens. But the Emperor in a mystic letter to General Forey gave to it another character. He proposed nothing less than the restoration of the Latin race on this side of the Atlantic, and more than intimates that the United States must be restrained in power and influence over the Gulf of Mexico and the Antilles. And now the Archduke Maximilian of Austria has been proclaimed Emperor of Mexico under the protection of France. It is obvious that this imperial invasion, though not openly directed against us, would not have been made if our convulsions had not left the door of the continent ajar, so that foreign Powers may now bravely enter in. And it is more obvious that this attempt to plant a throne by our side would "have died before it saw the light," had it not been supposed that the rebel slavemongers were about to triumph. Plainly the whole transaction is connected with our affairs, and I know not if it may not be a stepping stone to some actual participation in the widening circle of the war. But it can be little more than a transient experiment—for who can doubt that this imperial exotic, planted by foreign care and propped by foreign bayonets, will disappear before the ascending glory of the republic.

This enterprise of war was followed by an enterprise of diplomacy not less hardy. The Emperor, not content with stirring against us the Gulf of Mexico, the Antilles and the Latin race, entered upon a work of a different character. He invited England and Russia to unite with France in tendering to the two belligerents (such is the equal designation of our republic and the rebel slavemonger tribes) their joint mediation to secure an armistice for six months, during which every act of war, direct or indirect, should provisionally cease, at sea as well as on land, to be renewed if necessary for a further period. The Cabinets of England and Russia having declined, the invitation [illegible] to the short of "recognizing [illegible]" [illegible] the proposed all our vast operations [illegible] suspended—the blockade itself must have ceased—while the rebel ports were opened on the one side to unlimited imports of supplies and military stores, and on the other side to unlimited exports of cotton. Trade for time would have been legalized in these ports, and slavery would have lifted its grinning front before the civilized world. Not disheartened by this failure, the Emperor alone pushed forward his diplomatic enterprise against us, as he had alone pushed forward his military enterprise against Mexico, and he proposed to our government the unsupported mediation of France. His offer was promptly rejected by the President. Congress by solemn resolutions, adopted by both houses with singular unanimity, and communicated since to all foreign governments announced that such a proposition could be attributed only "to a misunderstanding of the true state of the question and the real character of the war in which the republic is engaged, and that it was in its nature so far injurious to the national interests that Congress would be obliged to consider its repetition an unfriendly act." This is strong language, but it frankly states the true position of our country. Any such offer, whatever may be its motive, must be an encouragement to the rebellion. In an age when ideas prevail and even words become things, the simple declarations of statesmen are of incalculable importance. But the head of a great nation is more than statesman. The imperial proposition tended directly to the dismemberment of the republic and the substitution of a ghastly slavemonger nation.

Baffled in this effort, twice attempted, the Emperor does not yet abandon its policy. We are told that "it is postponed to a more suitable opportunity," so that he too waits to strike—if the Gallic cock does not sound the alarm in an opposite quarter. Meanwhile the development of the Mexican expedition shows too clearly the motive of mediation. It was all one transaction. Mexico was invaded for empire, and mediation was proposed in order to help the plot. But the invasion must fail with the diplomacy to which it is allied.

But the policy of the French Emperor towards our republic has not been left to any uncertain inference. For a long time public report has declared him to be unfriendly, and now public report is confirmed by what he has done and said. The ambassadorial attorney of rebel slavemongers has been received by him at the Tuileries; members of Parliament, on an errand of hostility to our cause, have been received by him at Fontainebleau; and the official declaration has been made that *he desires to recognize the rebel slavemongers as an independent Power*. This has been hard to believe, but it is too true. *The French Emperor is against us*. In an evil hour, under temptations which should be scouted, he forgets the precious traditions of France, whose blood commingled with ours in a common cause, he forgets the sword of Lafayette and Rochambeau flashing by the side of the sword of Washington and Lincoln, while the lilies of the ancient monarchy floated together with the stars of our infant flag; he forgets that early alliance, sealed by Franklin, which gave to the republic the assurance of national life, and made France the partner of her rising glory; *Heu pietas, heu prisca fides*[illegible]; and he forgets still more the obligations of his own name—how the first Napoleon surrendered to us Louisiana and the whole region west of the Mississippi, saying, "This accession of territory establishes forever the power of the United States, and gives to England a maritime rival destined to humble her pride;" and he forgets also how he himself, when beginning his intervention for Italian liberty, boasted proudly that France always stood for an "idea;" and, forgetting these things, which mankind cannot forget, he seeks the disjunction of this republic, with the spoliation of that very territory which had come to us from the first Napoleon; while France, always standing for an "idea," is made under his auspices to stand for the "idea" of welcome to a new evangel of slavery, with Mason and Slidell as the evangelists. Thus is the imperial influence thrown on the side of rebel slavemongers. Unlike the ancient Gaul, the Emperor forbears for the present to fling his sword into the scale, but he flings his [illegible] his sword.

But only recently we have the menace of the sword. The throne of Mexico has been offered to an Austrian Archduke. The desire to recognize the independence of rebel slavemongers has been officially declared. These two things are to be taken together—as the complements of each other. And now we are assured by concurring report that Mexico is to be maintained as an empire. The policy of the Holy Alliance, originally organized against the great Napoleon, is now adopted by his representative on the throne of France. What its despot authors left undone the present Emperor, nephew of the first, proposes to accomplish. It is said that Texas also is to be brought under the imperial protectorate, thus ravishing a province which belongs to this republic as much as Normandy belongs to France. The "partition" of Poland is acknowledged to be the great crime of the last century. It was accomplished by three Powers, with the silent connivance of the rest; but not without pangs of remorse on the part of one of the spoilers. "I know," said Maria Theresa to the ambassador of Louis XVI., "that I have brought a deep stain on my reign by what has been done in Poland, but I am sure that I should be forgiven if it could be known what repugnance I had to it." But the French Emperor seeks to play on this continent the very part which of old caused the contrition of Maria Theresa; nor could the "partition" of our broad country—if in an evil hour it were accomplished—fail to be the great crime of the present century. Trample upon the republic in France—trample upon the republic in Mexico—it remains to be seen if the French Emperor can prevail to trample upon this republic. I do not think he can; nor am I anxious on account of the new Emperor of Mexico, who will be as [illegible] against the rising tide of the [illegible] chair must be withdrawn or he will [illegible].

[illegible] to an end this unpleasant review. It [illegible], and only in explanation of our relations with foreign Powers, that I have accumulated these instances, not one of which, small as well as great, [illegible], while they all testify with a [illegible] to the perils of our country.

[illegible] INTERVENTION, BY MEDIATION OR INTERVENTION.

[illegible] another branch of the subject which is not less important. Considering all these things, and especially how great Powers abroad have constantly menaced intervention in our war, now by criticism and now by [illegible], all tending painfully to something further, it becomes us to see what, according to the principles of international law and the examples of history, will justify foreign intervention in any of the forms [illegible]. And here there is one remark which [illegible]. Nations are equal in the eye of [illegible] what is right for one is right for all [illegible] can justly exercise any right which [illegible] to concede under like circumstances. Therefore, [illegible] England and France [illegible] which they may hereafter [illegible] right to propose [illegible] France [illegible] the next revolution [illegible] reject the precedents they [illegible] be hard for them to complain if [illegible].

[illegible] is an inchoate incompatibility with [illegible] national independence, which [illegible] intrinsic right of a nation to seek [illegible] as long as it does not disturb others. If [illegible] from each other, [illegible] had little or no influence in [illegible] right. But civilization itself, [illegible] nations nearer together and bringing [illegible] them under reciprocal [illegible], so that no nation can now act [illegible] by itself alone. Out of the relations and [illegible] good neighborhood—involving, of course, [illegible] of self-defence—springs the only justification which can be found for foreign intervention [illegible] the general term to signify an interposition in the affairs of another country, whatever form it [illegible] done under the name of "good offices," whether in the form of mediation or intervention [illegible] by military power, whether in the [illegible] or directly by arms. [illegible] is also another instance [illegible]. If peaceable in [illegible] motive and tendency, if forcible it [illegible] by force.

[illegible] between two or more nations, or [illegible] the two parties to a civil war, and [illegible] only be where there is no war, foreign [illegible]. In each case it should be governed by the same principles, except perhaps that, in the case of a civil war, there should be a [illegible], not only of the rights, but of [illegible] of a nation so severely tried. This is [illegible] of humanity. Indeed intervention [illegible] is only a common form of partial [illegible], but intervention in a civil war is [illegible] the domestic concerns of another nation [illegible] whoever acts at the joint invitation of [illegible] in order to compose a bloody [illegible] to the blessings which belong to [illegible] uninvited, or acting only at the [illegible], he will be careful to proceed with [illegible], in the spirit of peace, and will [illegible] a proffer of good offices in the form of [illegible] unless he is ready for war. Such [illegible] without offence. But it can [illegible] where one side is obviously fighting for barbarism, any intervention, whatever form it may [illegible], calculated to give encouragement to the wrong side, or to secure for it time or [illegible] its final success—is plainly immoral, and contrary to the law of nations it ought [illegible].

[illegible] in the spirit of peace and for the sake of [illegible] of modern civilization, [illegible] in the spirit of war, if not for the sake of [illegible] history, ancient and modern [illegible] instances may be grouped under two [illegible] in external affairs, and, secondly, [illegible] internal affairs. The first may be illustrated [illegible] of the Elector Maurice, of [illegible] Charles V., of King William against Louis XIV. [illegible], and France, in the seven years' war, [illegible] between France and Austria, in 1859, [illegible] France and Prussia, in 1806 [illegible] France, Great Britain and Sardinia, between [illegible] in the war of the Crimea.

The intervention of Russia, Austria and Prussia in the [illegible] of Great Britain among the [illegible] of the Allied Powers, under the [illegible] of the treaty of [illegible] are illustrations of the [illegible] great examples, I [illegible] which show more especially the [illegible] first, in external, and then in [illegible] here I shall concern [illegible] against the principles which I [illegible] at least help to illustrate the great [illegible] it is.

[illegible] IN EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

[illegible] for the sake of convenience, I speak [illegible] external affairs, where two or more [illegible].

[illegible] France offered mediation between [illegible] the two crowns of the North, [illegible]. This was [illegible] in 1740, by [illegible] the beginning of our [illegible] which was neglected [illegible]