THE WASHINGTON TREATY.

CONTINUED FROM SEVENTH PAGE.

ment have received that communication with deep regret, because it opens a discussion which might unsettle the cordial understanding it has been their earnest endeavor to maintain with the Russian empire. Upon the above mentioned reasons it is impossible for Her Majesty's government to give any sanction on their part to the course announced by Prince Gortschakoff. If, instead of such a declaration, the Russian government had addressed Her Majesty government and the other Powers who are parties to the treaty of 1856, and had proposed for consideration with them whether anything has occurred which could be held to amount to an infraction of the treaty, or whether there is anything in the terms which, from altered circumstances, presses with undue severity upon Russia, or which, in the course of events, had become unnecessary for the due protection of Turkey, Her Majesty's government would not have refused to examine the question, in concert with the co-signatories. Whatever might have been the result of such communications, a risk of future complications and a very dangerous precedent as to the validity of international obligations would have been avoided. I am, &c., GRANVILLE.

You will read and give a copy of this despatch to Prince Gortschakoff.

Earl Russell's Endorsement of Granville's Reply to Gortschakoff.

Shortly after England's sending of this note Earl Russell wrote to Earl Granville the following letter:—

[From Earl Russell's Letter to the London Times.]

PEMBROKE LODGE, Nov. 23, 1870.

* * * It seems to me that we ought to stand as a nation upon the ground which Lord Granville's despatch, if the Russian Emperor asks for a conference on the Treaty of 1856, at a time when such a conference can be assembled, let us meet him in a fair spirit and consider with France, Prussia, Italy, Austria and Turkey in what manner we can find a substitute for the neutralization of the Black Sea.

But if the Czar proposes to set aside the Treaty of 1856 by force, let us meet him by force, and the sooner the better. RUSSELL.

The London Times on Russia's Abrogation of the Treaty of Paris.

The London *Times*, supposed to be the exponent of the sentiment of the English people, in this instance at least, discussed Russia's action with all the vigor at its command. From its files we take the following extracts, which are interesting in view of the fact that present complications with England place her in a position not unlike that then held by Russia.

The Czar Bound to Observe the Treaty.

[From the London Times, Nov. 16, 1870.]

* * * If Russia has any good grounds for revising the Treaty of 1856 let her produce them in a proper manner. She will find Europe ready to listen to argument, but combined against her if she is rude and arrogant. We cannot, of course, pretend that a treaty once made can never be revised. Time passes and circumstances change, and the arrangement which may be judicious and politic today may become pernicious in after years. Nay, it has sometimes happened that later men have found that their predecessors in public life have agreed to treaties that could not be defended, because they contravened essential principles of national life. Belgium was separated from Holland, Lombardy and Venice have reverted to Italy, and we have approved and even assisted at those changes in spite of the settlements of 1815, because we were obliged to confess that those settlements overrode in an arbitrary fashion the liberties of nations. But at present we can find no excuse for putting aside the settlement of 1856. Its essential principles are principles of peace, and no circumstances have arisen to warrant a departure from them. If Turkey declines to accept the freedom from the obligations of the Treaty of Paris which the Czar offers the Sultan, and insists upon holding the Emperor bound to observe the stipulations to which he agreed, we shall not be able to forget our own obligations as parties to the settlement. The prospect is grave, and while we face it without shrinking we do not face it with a light heart; but, in spite of the gravity of the prospect, we protest that our sharpest feeling at this moment is pain at the apparent faithlessness of the Czar and at the rudeness with which he has denounced the treaty. What trust can be reposed in treaties when the first hour of disquiet is seized for the repudiation of any obligation that may be deemed unpleasant? Public opinion in Russia has supported us in recommending peace between Prussia and France on the basis of stipulations for the dismantlement of fortresses and the like as sureties of peace; but how can we hope that Prussia would accept such guaranties when she sees the Emperor of Russia denouncing similar engagements at the first moment he vainly thinks he may escape from them?

Russia Should Not Be Judge of the Revision of the Treaty of Paris.

[From the London Times, Nov. 17, 1870.]

* * For, as Lord Granville has ably pointed out, the treaty must stand or fall as a whole; its clauses represent only various phases of the same agreement, and it is obvious that if the Czar can release himself from one he is bound by none. Indeed, as far as we understand the circular, the whole treaty is at an end; but the Russian government is willing to enter into new negotiations for the purpose of re-enacting some of them. Thus, on the most flimsy pretences, a recent and solemn contract has been contemptuously broken, and the moment chosen for the act, which clearly shows that Russia has hitherto not been bound by her own plighted word, by respect for her neighbors or by regard for the general peace, but solely by fear of the united strength of the two Western Powers. To such an act there could be but one response on the part of England—to protest against the insolent manner in which the treaty has been denounced, and to declare, without entering into the merits, that we still hold Russia bound by all the provisions of the Treaty of 1856 and reserve to ourselves the right of acting according to circumstances. * * * * Any just grievance we ought to listen to with attention and remove with willingness; but Russia has not chosen this course, and has, in fact, materially damaged her case, if she has any, for the revision of the treaty by assuming the right to be sole judge in a matter in which she was only a party. Europe might have been ready to hear her grievances had she been reasonable; but Russia must not think that because France has been visited by sudden calamity she can therefore fly into a passion and tear up the treaty which she solemnly signed.

"Russia Making as Free with Her Stipulations as Any Lawbreaker."

[From the London Times, Nov. 18, 1870.]

Treaties in our days, in the opinion of the Russian government, are of no greater value than laws were said to be in semi-civilized times—mere cobwebs to entangle the weak, but to be broken through at his own pleasure by the strong. Between nations, apparently, there is no other compact than sheer force. So long as the Western Powers had the means of binding Russia over to keep the peace the Treaty of 1856 was held sacred at St. Petersburg. But upon the first symptom of helplessness of one of these Powers, Russia makes as free with its stipulations as any lawbreaker might do with the sentence of a magistrate upon removal of the terrors of the constable and jailor. It is important to observe how a government, which may have had some ground of complaint, has managed to place itself deliberately and irreparably in the wrong. Apart from any just grievances which Russia might have urged, there would have been no indisposition to entertain her demand for reconsideration of terms, which she had accepted at her conqueror's dictation. The whole offence consisted in her assumption of a right to modify those terms without the intervention of the Powers, and there is aggravation in the very act of holding out, by way of reciprocity, an inducement to Turkey to join her in her high-handed conduct. * * * If she wishes that any clause in the Treaty of 1856 should undergo revision at the hands of those who are parties to it her first act must be a withdrawal of the note by which the consent of those Powers has been dispensed with and their authority has been set at naught; it must be a renunciation on her part of any right to independent action in the matter. In the event of her having any just grievance let Russia come into court; but she will never be allowed to take the law into her own hands. Indeed, the mere attempt to do this has thrown almost insurmountable obstacles in her way. As things stand now, Russia has placed herself in the position of a public enemy.

The Fatal Objection to Russia's Declaration.

[From the London Times, Nov. 19, 1870.]

* * * The fatal objection to Prince Gortschakoff's circular, that it represented the Emperor as affecting to free himself from the obligations of the Treaty of 1856 by a determination of his own will, remains unaltered. If the assumption of such a power were suffered in silence the obligation of law would be destroyed, and unless we are prepared to consent to this the despatch of Prince Gortschakoff must be met as Lord Granville met it, with a clear statement that it is impossible for Her Majesty's government to give any sanction to this course announced by the Chancellor. * * * Taking, however, this lowest ground of all—admitting, for example, that the balance of power in the East might be secured by the principle of counterpoise in the Black Sea instead of on the principle of its perfect neutrality, we are still landed on the question whether a Power bound by an obligation of a valuable character, that might conceivably be exchanged for other obligations tending to a similar end, can be permitted by a simple expression of a resolution to that effect to free itself from the existing obligation, and we must per force answer the question in the negative.

Is a Treaty Merely a Political Mask?

[From the London Times, Nov. 21, 1870.]

* * * The Treaty of 1856 did but carry out our accepted notions and the national sentiment. Its sense was that Russia should thenceforth be content with what she had and what she was, at least in that part of the world. Has she succeeded in power, in wealth, in influence or in any point? That is not even alleged. She suffers, her Foreign Minister says, in feeling. The treaty is intolerable. She will stand it no longer. It is a mark of degradation. Not so, it seems, in the opinion of Russia, to fly from one's word and to declare one's signature waste paper at the very first moment when it seems safe to do so. Is this European opinion also—and is Old World diplomacy come to this—that a treaty is no more than the clever mask with which the political engineer hides a battery or a mitrailleuse? Such an admission throws a sinister and disastrous light on that doctrine of races and nationalities now taught and acted on as the salvation of society.

Russia Endangering All Confidence Between Nations.

[From the London Times, Nov. 24, 1870.]

* * * The force of public law is something we cannot lightly permit to be despised. It is in vain to talk of peace,—it is worse than vain to dream of sitting in judgment upon other nations for endangering peace—if we do not recognize the truth that the whole and sole sanction of public law must be found in the resolution of nations to use their force to punish and restrain infractions of it. All confidence between nations will be lost if we practically admit Russia's claim to satisfy the stipulations of 1856, and our interest in peace and in the international confidence which is the support of peace must compel us to resist the claim if it be carried beyond a verbal demand. Yet it is true that few treaties are perpetual, and Mr. Mill, arguing that treaties, like constitutions, dynasties, laws and dispositions of property cannot be irrevocable, suggests that no more should be made, except for terms of years. With the greatest respect for a master of logic, we must avow the opinion that his analogies are fallacious and his conclusion an error. Constitutions, dynasties and laws are domestic acts of a nation, while treaties are contracts with foreigners. To confound them together is like confounding a vow with a promise to a fellow man. Nor can the device of treaties for terms of years get rid of the difficulty. Suppose the Treaty of Paris had been made for twenty years Russia might have been content to endure it for the next six years; but if she is inclined to brave the possible action of its signatories now she would certainly be more emboldened to risk the chance that they would wage war to enforce a stipulation that had only six years to run. If a treaty be founded on just principles at the time it is made it is not easy to see how a case can arise destroying its obligatory force, unless circumstances have occurred that make it voidable whether it was drawn for a time or in perpetuity. Speaking generally, we may say that our rule of conduct must be simply to scrutinize the justice of a treaty at the time of its inception.

A Treaty Should Not Be Violated at the Will of Any One Party.

[From the London Times, Nov. 25, 1870.]

* * * To accept the principle that a treaty can be denounced and violated at the will of any party to it would be an overthrow of public law, and the most deadly blow to the political system under which the States of Europe, in spite of their national feuds and the jealousies and ambition of the rulers, have been enabled to maintain themselves at the head of civilization. From the strong position which Lord Granville has taken up there must be no withdrawal; the country will not only support the government in the principles of their despatch, but insist that no after resolve shall practically nullify it. National order and influence are terms which have been much abused; they have been perverted within the present year to the basest purposes of dynastic ambition, but they are not vain words. England's honor and that legitimate influence which the ablest and just-minded men of all countries admit to be used for the benefit of Europe must not perish in irresolution and in that over-scrupulosity which is always searching after excuses for an opponent. * * * Though there is no insurmountable obstacle to a revision of the treaty the matter is beset with great difficulties. The first arises from the rudeness and violence of Russia herself. She has thought fit to declare the treaty abrogated by her own independent will, and thus makes it difficult for the other Powers to meet her in friendly and equal discussion. She cannot expect them to place themselves in a false and humiliating position. They cannot consent to meet only to register a foregone conclusion, arrived at without consulting them, and published in the manner most offensive to their dignity. Should Russia really desire to repair the wrong she has committed, and to obtain, in a legitimate manner, a release from the disability of which she complains, she must assume such a demeanor toward the other Powers as will allow them to enter into discussion with the feeling that they are in no way prejudiced or compromised by what has passed.

The London Times Repudiates Russia's Claim.

[From the London Times, Nov. 26, 1870.]

* * * We detest war; but there are evils still more detestable. To allow that in force lies the only obligation of treaties, because the resort to force is their sanction—to allow that robbery is wrong only because there may be a policeman at hand to apprehend the robber—would be fatal to all sense of international security. The doctrine of the Russian note has received universal reprobation. A few eminent persons have endeavored to palliate the action of Russia—we ought perhaps rather to say that one eminent person has done so, and has deprecated making it a cause of war, but the attempt has only served to show the practical unanimity of the national opinion. The difficulty is to restrain the indignation that has been excited by the pretensions of the Russian Chancellor. There are men ready to demand that the mere claim of Russia to repudiate the Treaty of 1856 should be made a *casus belli* if immediately retracted. * * * The Chancellor claims to repudiate the obnoxious stipulations of the settlement of 1856. We repudiate the claim. He declares that the Emperor must henceforth regard himself as freed from such obligations. We reply that we are forced to treat the declaration as a nullity. He affects to reassume for his Imperial master the liberty of arming in the Black Sea. We protest against the assumption, and reply that we cannot connive at any action in pursuance of it. If nothing more happens we shall simply exchange a confident and trustful for a wary and watchful peace. The feeling of security is gone; the necessity of being ready for any contingency is brought home to us; but no shot will be fired in anger on our side, unless the Russian government recedes from verbal claims to acts in defiance of its obligations, and if such a fatal step be taken the responsibility of the consequences will be upon the Emperor and his Ministers.

Russia's Bad Faith a Deadly Blow to the Spirit of Peace.

[From the London Times, Nov. 29, 1870.]

* * * The intense indignation that has been provoked by the Russian note is due to the feeling that it is in itself a deadly blow to the spirit of peace, inasmuch as it strikes at the root of international confidence. Europe was described some four years ago by Mr. Disraeli as an armed camp, so great was the multitude of troops which the jealousy of the Continental Powers had marshalled one against the other; but if mutual engagements are worth nothing every nation must be armed to the teeth and the ships of war of naval Powers multiplied till they sweep all the seas. We shall do our best, in the interest of peace, to support the pacific action of Count Bismarck, while we can not withdraw a hair's breadth from the position we have taken in repudiation of the principles of Prince Gortschakoff's circular. * * * When the offensive circular has been withdrawn England will be found willing to examine all the grievances Russia can allege, and we believe we can say that our representative at the Conference would be instructed to mitigate as far as possible the stringency of the stipulations of 1856, which have wounded the susceptibilities of the empire. It is impossible that we can do or say more. Desiring peace, we take our stand on the maintenance of due guarantees of peace. We repudiate altogether the claim to set aside the obligations of 1856, and we cannot acquiesce in any attempt to violate them.

The Essential Wrongfulness of Repudiating a Solemn Engagement.

[From the London Times; Nov. 30, 1870.]

The position of the British government with regard to Russia is one of extreme simplicity. No one can fail to understand it when it is placed before them, and only a little care is necessary to prevent it from being complicated by the ingenuity of our opponents. An important clause of the Treaty of Paris, and by implication the whole treaty, has been denounced by one of the parties, who declares that he will consider it null and void and take any action in the matter which he pleases. The Russian government has asserted the right of a State to repudiate a solemn engagement in defiance of those with whom it was made, and the occasion and manner of the declaration add to its essential wrongfulness, since they manifestly show that up to the present time Russia has been restrained only by fear of the great Continental military Power which has now collapsed. Unless the remaining parties to the treaty are dead to their own national honor and to the public interests of the European community, they must oppose a firm front to such an outrage. It is not too much to say that if the Treaty of 1856 can be thus set aside, England ought never to be a party to a continental treaty, again. She would be almost bound to say that if such engagements can be repudiated by any one on any occasion they are intrinsically worthless; and it is better to acknowledge the fact at once that each Power holds what it can and should be ready to cede what it must without any international obligations at all. All that restricts, however inefficiently at times, the ambition and cupidity of continental monarchs must be abandoned, and the principle accepted that the natural state of the European races is one of war. Fatal, indeed, to Europe would be the conviction that it is really so. Reflecting men already begin to despair of the future of a continent divided by horrible animosities of which no end appears in prospect. We must not be surprised if in such a case all that constitutes the vigor, the enterprise, the intellect, the virtue of our part of the world inclines to abandon the old homes, and, shaking from its feet the dust of lawless and demoralized Europe, sets forth for another hemisphere, where man is not a wild beast to his fellow, and the best energies of his nature are not occupied with schemes of aggression or anxious preparations for defence. The maintenance of public law in Europe is not a question to be judged by a petty expediency which regards only the case in hand; it is of vital importance as a general principle. Firmness with respect to it is absolutely necessary for the well being of Europe; it is the only thing that can save us.

German Opinion of the Granville Circular.

The *Cologne Gazette* of December, 1870, writing on Earl Granville's position as set forth in the circular given above, said:—

We can only subscribe to every word written by Lord Granville. The peace and order of Europe rest upon the sanctity of treaties; and if any Power *dare venture upon withdrawing itself from a particular stipulation* that may not suit it, each of the contracting Powers has the same right with respect to the remaining clauses. In that case the moral law that binds nations together is dissolved, and brute force takes its place. It is evident *that every Power must be more concerned in the peaceable state of the world, brought about and settled by public treaties*, than in this or that particular stipulation that may be prejudicial to it.

THE ART OF HAIRSPLITTING.

PARADOXES FROM THE PAST.

How Treaties of Peace Become Proclamations of War—Courtship and Negotiation—Marriage and Hostilities—No Terms the Best Terms Between Nations.

[From Knickerbocker's History of New York. Book 5, chapter 4.

It was the opinion of that poetical philosopher Lucretius that war was the original state of man, whom he described as being primitively a savage beast of prey, engaged in a constant state of hostility with his own species, and that this ferocious spirit was tamed and ameliorated by society. The same opinion has been advocated by Hobbes, nor have there been wanting many other philosophers to admit and defend.

For my part, though prodigiously fond of these valuable speculations, so complimentary to human nature, yet in this instance I am inclined to take the proposition by halves, believing, with Horace, that though war may have been originally the favorite amusement and industrious employment of our progenitors, yet, like many other excellent habits, so far from being ameliorated, it has been cultivated and confirmed by refinement and civilization, and increases in exact proportion as we approach towards that state of perfection which is the *ne plus ultra* of modern philosophy.

The first conflict between man and man was the mere exertion of physical force unaided by auxiliary weapons. His arm was his buckler, his fist was his mace and a broken head the catastrophe of his encounters. The battle of unassisted strength was succeeded by the more rugged one of stones and clubs, and war assumed a sanguinary aspect. As man advanced in refinement, as his faculties expanded, and as his sensibilities became more exquisite, he grew rapidly more ingenious and experienced in the art of murdering his fellow beings. He invented a thousand devices to defend and assault—the helmet, the cuirass and the buckler, the sword, the dart and the javelin, prepared him to elude the wound as well as to launch the blow. Still urging on in the career of philanthropic inventions, he enlarges and heightens his power of defence and injury. The Aries, the Scorpio, the Balista and the Catapulta give a horror and sublimity to war, and magnify its glory by increasing its desolation. Still insatiable, though armed with machinery that seemed to reach the limits of destructive invention and to yield a power of injury commensurate even with the desires of revenge—still deeper researches must be made in the diabolical arcana. With furious zeal he dives into the bowels of the earth; he tolls mid poisonous minerals and deadly salts—the sublime discovery of gunpowder blazes upon the world—and finally the dreadful art of fighting by proclamation seems to endow the demon of war with ubiquity and omnipotence.

This, indeed, is grand! This, indeed, marks the powers of mind and bespeaks that divine endowment of reason which distinguishes us from the animals, our inferiors. The unenlightened brutes content themselves with the native force which Providence has assigned them. The angry bull butts with his horns as did his progenitors before him—the lion, the leopard and the tiger seek only with their talons and their fangs to gratify their sanguinary fury; and even the subtle serpent darts the same venom and uses the same wiles as did his sire before the Flood. Man alone, blest with the inventive mind, goes on from discovery to discovery—enlarges and multiplies his powers of destruction, arrogates the tremendous weapons of Deity itself, and tasks creation to assist him in murdering his brother worm!

In proportion as the art of war has increased in improvement has the art of preserving peace advanced in equal ratio; and as we have discovered, in this age of wonders and inventions, that proclamation is the most formidable engine in war, so have we discovered the no less ingenious mode of maintaining peace by perpetual negotiations.

A treaty, or, to speak more correctly, a negotiation, therefore, according to the acceptation of experienced statesmen learned in these matters, is no longer an attempt to accommodate differences, to ascertain rights and to establish an equitable exchange of kind offices, but a contest of skill between two Powers which shall overreach and take in the other. It is a cunning endeavor to obtain by peaceful manœuvre and the chicanery of Cabinets those advantages which a nation would otherwise have wrested by force of arms, in the same manner as a conscientious highwayman reforms and becomes a quiet and praiseworthy citizen, contenting himself with cheating his neighbor out of that property he would formerly have seized with open violence.

In fact, the only time when two nations can be said to be in a state of perfect amity is when a negotiation is open and a treaty pending. Then, when there are no stipulations entered into, no bonds to restrain the will, no specific limits to awaken the captious jealousy of right implanted in our nature; when each party has some advantage to hope and expect from the other, then it is that the two nations are wonderfully gracious and friendly; their Ministers professing the highest mutual regard, exchanging *billets doux*, making fine speeches and indulging in all those little diplomatic flirtations, coquetries and fondlings that do so marvellously tickle the good humor of the respective nations. Thus it may paradoxically be said that there is never so good an understanding between two nations as when there is a little misunderstanding, and that so long as they are on no terms at all they are on the best terms in the world!

I do not by any means pretend to claim the merit of having made the above discovery. It has, in fact, long been secretly acted upon by certain enlightened Cabinets, and is, together with divers other notable theories, privately copied out of the commonplace book of an illustrious gentleman, who has been member of Congress and enjoyed the unlimited confidence of heads of departments. To this principle may be ascribed the wonderful ingenuity shown of late years in protracting and interrupting negotiations. Hence the cunning measure of appointing as ambassador some political pettifogger, skilled in delays, sophisms, and misapprehensions, and dexterous in the act of baffling argument, or some blundering statesman whose errors and misconstructions may be a plea for refusing to ratify his engagements. And hence, too, that most notable expedient—so popular with our government—of sending out a brace of ambassadors, between whom, having each an individual will to consult, character to establish and interest to promote, you may as well look for unanimity and concord as between two lovers with one mistress, two dogs with one bone or two naked rogues with one pair of breeches. This disagreement, therefore, is continually breeding delays and impediments, in consequence of which the negotiation goes on swimmingly, inasmuch as there is no prospect of its ever coming to a close. Nothing is lost by these delays and obstacles but time; and in a negotiation, according to the theory I have exposed, all time lost is in reality so much time gained. With what delightful paradoxes does modern political economy abound!

Now, all that I have advanced is so notoriously true that I almost blush to take up the time of my readers with treating of matters which must many a time have stared them in the face. But the proposition to which I would most earnestly call their attention is this, that, though a negotiation be the most harmonizing of all national transactions, yet a treaty of peace is a great political evil and one of the most fruitful sources of war.

I have rarely seen an instance of any special contract between individuals that did not produce jealousies, bickerings and often downright ruptures between them; nor did I ever know of a treaty between two nations that did not occasion continual misunderstandings. How many worthy country neighbors have I known, who, after being in peace and good fellowship for years, have been thrown into a state of distrust, cavilling and animosity by some ill-starred agreement about fences, runs of water and stray cattle! And how many well-meaning nations, who would otherwise have remained in the most amicable disposition towards each other, have been brought to swords' points about the infringement or misconstruction of some treaty which in an evil hour they had concluded by way of making their amity more sure!

Treaties at best are but compiled with so long as interest requires their fulfilment; consequently they are virtually binding on the weaker party only, or, in plain truth, they are not binding at all. No nation will wantonly go to war with another if it has nothing to gain thereby, and, therefore, needs no treaty to restrain it from violence; and if it have nothing to gain I much question, from what I have witnessed of the righteous conduct of nations, whether any treaty could be made so strong that it could not thrust the sword through—nay, I would hold ten to one the treaty itself would be the very source to which resort would be had to find a pretext for hostilities.

Thus, therefore, I conclude that though it is the best of all policies for a nation to keep up a constant negotiation with its neighbors, yet it is the summit of folly for it ever to be beguiled into a treaty, for then comes on non-fulfilment and infraction, then remonstrance, then altercation, then retaliation, then recrimination and finally open war. In a word, negotiation is like courtship—a time of sweet words, gallant speeches, soft looks and endearing caresses; but the marriage ceremony is the signal for hostilities.

If my painstaking reader be not somewhat perplexed by the ratiocination of the foregoing passage, he will perceive at a glance that the great Peter in concluding a concluding a treaty with his Eastern neighbors was guilty of lamentable error in policy. In fact, to this unlucky agreement may be traced a world of bickerings and heart-burnings between the parties about fancied or pretended infringements of treaty stipulations, in all which the Yankees were prone to indemnify themselves by a "dig into the sides" of the New Netherlands. But, in sooth, these border feuds, aloeit they gave great annoyance to the burghers of Manna-hata, were so delightful in their nature that a grave historian like myself, who grudges the time spent in anything less than the revolutions of States and fall of empires, would deem them unworthy of being inscribed on his page. The reader is therefore to take it for granted—though I scorn to waste in the detail that time which my furrowed brow and trembling hand inform me is invaluable—that all the while the Great Peter was occupied in those tremendous and bloody contests, which I shall shortly rehearse, there was a continued series of little, dirty, snivelling scourings, broils and maraudings, kept up on the eastern frontiers by the moss troopers of Connecticut. But, like that mirror of chivalry, the sage and valorous Don Quixote, I leave these petty contests for some future Sancho Panza of an historian, while I reserve my prowess and my pen for achievements of higher dignity; for at this moment I hear a direful and portentous note issuing from the bosom of the great council of the League, and resounding throughout the regions of the West, menacing the fame and fortunes of Peter Stuyvesant. I call, therefore, upon the reader to leave behind him all the paltry brawls of the Connecticut borders and to press forward with me to the relief of our favorite hero, who I foresee will be wofully beset by the implacable Yankees in the next chapter.

THE ARION BALL.

The jolliest of all the German societies, named after that rare old harpist whose music enchanted even the finny tribe, gave their annual *bal masque* at the Academy of Music last evening. Prince Carnival bestows his most winning smiles on the merry Arions as his favorite children, and for years past his reception at their hands has been always of the most brilliant description. The war between Germany and France deprived the friends of the Arions of the masquerade ball last year, and they seemed determined to make up for the disappointment by assembling *en masse* this time. Long before the grand procession moved towards the dancing floor the boxes and lobbies were thronged with masks of all kinds. The curtain went up and the procession started about ten o'clock, in the following order:—Prince Carnival's police, terrible looking fellows, in preposterous uniforms; two trumpeters, of the Middle Ages, blowing away for dear life; the Floor Committee, in Caucasian mountaineer costume, looking like gallant followers of old Schamyl; then a wild horde of Tartars from the steppes (of the Academy), representing the Lobby Committee; two standard bearers preceding Prince Carnival and his brilliant staff; Grand Duke Alexis, riding on a buffalo, and Catacazy on an immense fish; the Vienna Ladies' Orchestra; Brigham Young and his score of wives, with all their household furniture packed up; the heroes of the Tammany Ring, with repeaters in mourning, and the bursted savings banks on wheels; a woman's rights convention, with the husbands carrying the babies; and lastly, the Ku Kluxes, scallawags and carpet-baggers of the South. Some of the caricatures were capital, and excited much merriment. After the procession was over the floor was immediately inundated by a glowing, restless tide of masks, in which all ages, from the golden down to the present one; all climes, from the Laplander to the gay colors of the tropics, and even all varieties of animated nature, were to be found. At midnight the scene was inspiring to the highest extent. The strains of Strauss and Gungl from the fine orchestra of Rietzel floated over the vast ballroom, rippling the glittering surface of the stream of gaily costumed masqueraders like a summer breeze on a flower prairie of Iowa. There was not the disagreeable crush and throng of past years, but room enough for dancing, a rare occurrence at any of these balls. As the small wee hours creep on the fun becomes more contagious and enjoyment more general. The Arion Society may congratulate themselves on the entire success of their *bal masque* of 1872.

Grand Masquerade in Hoboken.

The annual festivities of the Young Men's Social Club, of Hoboken, were held under the most favorable auspices in the spacious hall of Busch's hotel on Wednesday night. The organization numbers many of the city's respectable inhabitants, and the preparations for the occasion were on a correspondingly magnificent scale. The decorations of the hall glittered among dazzling chandeliers, and the rich masks of the assembled gentlemen excited much admiration among a "store of ladies, whose bright eyes rained influence and judged the prize." A few ridiculous figures stalked through the assemblage, creating much merriment. The customary midnight summons called away the revellers to a sumptuous repast, after which music and the dance were mingled with the night's enjoyments until dawn.

ART SALE.

The sale of the Wellington and Williams and Everett collections fully justified the brilliant anticipations which had been formed in their regard. The 187 paintings which composed the combined collections realized an aggregate of $75,547 50. We cannot afford space to give a full list of the prices realized, but the following are some of the largest:—"The Mother and Child," by C. P. Huntingdon, $3,900; "What Shall I Answer?" by Toulmouche, $1,900; "Happy Companionship," Meyer von Bremen, $2,000, Edward Clarke; "Out of School," by Rudolph Epp, $1,875; Carl Becker's "Petition to the Doge," $1,900, C. P. Huntingdon; Willems' "Still Life," $1,750, Mr. E. Morgan; "A Drop to Keep Out the Cold," $1,000, Mr. Paine; "Completing the Toilet," Jules Goupil, $1,000, Gustave de Jonghe; "Lady with Kitten," $850, Mr. Robins; Modon's "Jolly Musicians," $1,550, Mr. Wilmer; Achenbach's "Italian Landscape," $1,575; "The Approaching Tempest," $1,000, Mr. Praiser; "Mount Blanc," by Gignoux, $1,750, Mr. W. C. Browning; Hart's "Lily Pad," $1,325; Mignot's "Moonlight in Tropics," Mr. Hueler, $500; "View on the Androscoggin," by William Hart, $460.

EUROPEAN MARKETS.

LONDON MONEY MARKET.—LONDON, Feb. 8—5 P. M.—Consols closed at 91¾ for money and 91¾ for the account. American securities flat; United States five-twenty bonds, 1862's, 91¾; 1865's, old, 91¾; 1867's, 91¾; ten-forties, 89½.

LIVERPOOL COTTON MARKET.—LIVERPOOL, Feb. 8—5 P. M.—The cotton market closed steady; middling uplands, 11½d. a 11¾d.; middling Orleans, 11½d. a 11¾d. The sales of the day have been 15,000 bales, including 5,000 for speculation and export. Sales at sea nearly due from New Orleans have been made at 11½d.; on ship named at New Orleans at 11¾d., and on ship named at Savannah or Charleston at 11¾d. Sales of cotton on ship named at New Orleans have been made at 11⅝d. for middling.

HAVRE COTTON MARKET.—HAVRE, Feb. 8.—The cotton market is quiet.

LIVERPOOL BREADSTUFFS MARKET.—LIVERPOOL, Feb. 8—5 P. M.—The breadstuffs market is quiet.

LIVERPOOL PRODUCE MARKET.—LIVERPOOL, Feb. 8—2 P. M.—Tallow, 44s. 9d. per cwt.

SHIPPING NEWS.

Almanac for New York—This Day.

Sun rises	7 01	Moon sets....eve	— —
Sun sets	5 28	High water...eve	9 13

OCEAN STEAMERS.

DATES OF DEPARTURE FROM NEW YORK FOR THE MONTH OF FEBRUARY.

Steamer.	*Sails*	*Destination.*	*Office.*
City of New York	Feb 10	Liverpool	15 Broadway.
Pereire	Feb 10	Havre	58 Broadway.
Europa	Feb 10	Glasgow	7 Bowling Green
Minnesota	Feb 14	Liverpool	29 Broadway.
C'y of Wash'ton	Feb 17	Liverpool	15 Broadway.
India	Feb 17	Glasgow	7 Bowling Green
Republic	Feb 17	Liverpool	19 Broadway.
Atlantic	Feb 24	Liverpool	19 Broadway.
Anglia	Feb 24	Glasgow	7 Bowling Green
City of London	Feb 24	Liverpool	15 Broadway.
St. Laurent	Feb 24	Havre	58 Broadway.

PORT OF NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 8, 1872.

CLEARED.

Steamship Missouri, Morton, Havana and Nassau—Atlantic Mail Steamship Co.

Steamship Rapidan, Howes, Savannah—Livingston, Fox & Co.

Steamship Champion, Lockwood, Charleston—H R Morgan & Co.

Steamship Zodiac, Chapin, Newbern—Murray, Ferris & Co.

Steamship Glaucus, Walden, Boston—H F Dimock.

Ship Golden Hind, Robbins, San Francisco—Geo D Sutton.

Bark Inverary (Br), Hutton, Adelaide for orders—Arkell, Tufts & Co.

Bark Madre & Figli (Ital), Esposito, Penarth Roads for orders—Siscovich & Co.

Bark Folkvang (Nor), Ebbol, Cork or Falmouth—Funch, Edye & Co.

Bark Amelia, Smith, Havre—J Atkins & Co.

Brig Johanna Margaretha (Nor), Rasmussen, Gibraltar for orders—Funch, Edye & Co.

Brig Mozart (NG), Tietchens, Rio Janeiro via Richmond, Va—Funch, Edye & Co.

Brig Hyperion, Woodbury, Matanzas—Winchester & Towne.

Brig A G Jewett, Reid, Havana—J E Ward & Co.

Schr John Rose, Howell, Demerara—Edwin Rowe & Co.

Schr Jamestown, Brown, St Johns, PR—Slight & Petty.

Schr Mabel F Staples, Coffin, Havana—Brett, Son & Co.

Schr Carrie E Woodbury, Woodbury, Charleston—Evans, Ball & Co.

Schr C E Paige, Grau, Wilmington, NC—Overton & Hawkins.

Schr Dart, Williams, Stamford.

Brig Alta Vela, reported yesterday, was cleared by E Sanchez y Doiz.

ARRIVALS.

REPORTED BY THE HERALD STEAM YACHTS.

Steamship Charleston, Berry, Charleston, Feb 5, with mdse and passengers, to R L Morgan & Co. 6th inst, off Cape Lookout, exchanged signals with steamship Meredita, hence for Fernandina; 7th, lat 37, exchanged signals with steamship Georgia, hence for Charleston. Had heavy winds from the NE.

Steamship Benefactor, Jones, Wilmington, NC, 60 hours, with naval stores to the Lorillard Steamship Co.

Steamship Wyanoke, Couch, Richmond, City Point and Norfolk, with mdse and passengers, to Old Dominion Steamship Co.

Ship Nestor (Fr), Prichard, Manila, Sept 17, with mdse, to order. Passed the Cape of Good Hope Jan 10, in lon 37 W, Jan 28, lat 25 N, lon 71 W, had a heavy gale from NW, with very heavy sea, in which lost and split sails, stove boat and caused the vessel to leak; since strong, variable gales.

Ship Plymouth Rock, Williams, London, Dec 7, and the Isle of Wight 10th, with mdse to Grinnell, Minturn & Co. Took the Southern passage and had light, variable winds to Bermuda, from thence 12 days, with strong NW gales.

Bark Ankathor (Nor), Henricksen, Leith, 68 days, with railway iron to order; vessel to Tetens & Bockman; took the northern passage and had fine weather up to lat of Bermuda; from thence, 28 days, heavy westerly gales; was up to lon 72 and was blown off to lon 66 again. Jan 30, lat 38 43, lon 66 35, fell in with schr Warren Blake, Clark, from Dix Island, Me, for New York, with loss of boat, forward house, and in a sinking condition; took off the captain and crew, seven in number, and brought them to this port.

Bark Eliza A Cochran, Swazey, Havana, 21 days, with sugar to R P Buck & Co. Had a continuation of westerly gales the entire passage; lost and split sails, stove water casks and bulwarks.

Brig Mary Stewart (Br), McDonald, Havana, 15 days, with sugar to order.

Brig Bessie (Br), Locke, Havana, 15 days, with sugar to Spence, Montague & Co; vessel to Snow & Burgess. Had heavy westerly gales up to Hatteras; from thence 5 days with moderate winds.

Brig Uncle Sam, Glover, San Blas, 18 days, with cocoanuts, &c, to J W Elwell & Co.

Brig Geo Amos, Bunker, Portland, 8 days, with lumber to Simpson, Clapp & Co; vessel to S C Loud & Co. Had moderate weather; was three days in the ice on Nantucket Shoals.

Schr Merit (Br), Caunter, Pernambuco, Jan 1, with sugar to H H Swift & Co. Had a continuation of gales from Jan 22 to Feb 4. 4th inst, lat 37 10, lon 72 31, spoke brig Gipsy (Dan), hence for St Croix.

Schr Marguerite (Fr), Olivier, St Pierre, St Mart, 29 days, with sugar to H A Swan & Son. Had heavy variable gales.

Schr S C Noyes, Lee, Baracoa, 10 days, with fruit to Wm Douglas; vessel to S J Wemberg. Had strong variable winds; been 3 days north of Hatteras.

Schr John W Dodge, Taylor, San Blas, 16 days, with cocoanuts to J A Stetson & Co; had fine weather to Hatteras, since strong SW and NE gales; sprung bowsprit and carried away jibstay; Jan 22, off San Blas, spoke schr Artie Garwood, hence, for Aspinwall (since arrived); Feb 5, 20 miles NE of Cape Hatteras, saw the main deck of a vessel.

schr Florence Mayo, Hall, Boston for Richmond.

Schr West Dennis, Crowell, Boston for Philadelphia.

Schr F M Freeman, Paine, Provincetown for Philadelphia.

schr Blondel, Chapman, Provincetown for Philadelphia.

Passed Through Hell Gate.

BOUND SOUTH.

Schr Quickstep, Knowles, Providence for New York.
Schr Angie Amesbury, Jones, Boston for Baltimore.
Schr Angeline, Robinson, Somerset for New York.
Schr Edith May, Gross, Vinalhaven for New York.
Schr Bartie Pierce, Hall, Boston for Potomac River.
Schr Cora Morrison, Higgins, Boston for Potomac River.
Schr Modesty, Weaver, Lanesville for New York.
Schr Richard Higgins, Hayes, Boston for Potomac River.
Schr John E Sanford, Pressey, Providence for Baltimore.
Schr Minnehaha, Douglas