THE MARYLAND NEWS SHEET.

PUBLISHED BY

CARTER & NEILSON.

TERMS

Served in the city, and payable only to the carriers.
TWELVE AND A HALF CENTS WEEKLY.
Mailed to subscribers out of the city at SIX DOLLARS A YEAR, or for a shorter period at proportionate rates, payable invariably in advance.
4 liberal reduction to Clubs and News Agents.

THE TRI-WEEKLY NEWS SHEET.

Mailed to subscribers:

1 copy, one year	$3
Do. six months	2
Do. three months	1

ADVERTISING RATES.

One square, six lines	one insertion	50
" "	two insertions	75
" "	three "	$1 00
" "	one week	1 25
" "	two weeks	1 75
" "	three "	2 25
" "	one month	3 00
" "	three months	7 00

* Longer advertisements at proportionate rates. Yearly contracts to be matters of special agreement.

BALTIMORE.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1861

WAR AND OTHER NEWS.

Although there have been many rumors afloat of a movement in force on the part of General McClellan along the whole line of the Potomac, we have nothing reported from Washington which indicates an immediate advance. It has, however, been stated by Secretary Chase, during his recent interview with the committee of Bank Presidents in New York, that the army would not go into winter quarters; and from information derived from other sources it is quite possible that the various naval expeditions to the Southern coast, under Sherman, Burnside and Butler, the expedition down the Mississipi, and the grand forward movement on the Potomac will commence active operations as nearly simultaneously as possible. Upon the strength of this theory it is confidently predicted that the campaign will reopen with increased vigour, on or about the 10th of December next, when the gun boats now fitting out on the Ohio and Missouri rivers will be ready for service.

The campaign in Western Virginia is virtually closed. Cheat Mountain Pass will be held by a portion of Reynold's Division, but the remainder of his command has already been divided. One portion of it being sent to Kentucky and the other in the direction of Romney to reinforce General Kelley, who it is said "will commence a forward movement in concert with an expected movement of the grand army of the Potomac."

The concentration of the Federal troops under General Halleck at St. Louis, and a similar massing of the Kentucky troops preparatory to an advance upon Buckner, at Bowling Green, are said to be parts of the same plan of operations. When these arrangements are perfected, the real, earnest, vigorous work of the campaign is to begin. In the meantime the Confederates, since Hunter fell back upon St. Louis, have retraced their steps and have succeeded in capturing a large quantity of ammunition at Warsaw. The town is reported to have been burnt to prevent it from being used as winter quarters for the Federal troops. A large train of wagons, containing Government stores and guarded by two hundred men, is also reported to have been captured on the road between Sedalia and Leavenworth.

We have received full files of Richmond papers to the 20th instant, from which we make copious extracts of a very interesting nature. The lateness of the hour at which the papers came to hand, and the already crowded state of our columns, precludes the possibility of a more extended notice. We are sure our summary of Southern intelligence will be read with interest.

We are in receipt of a pamphlet copy of the message of President Davis to the Confederate Congress, now in session at Richmond. It will be so generally read that we scarcely need do more than state its chief points. He refers to the trying vicissitudes of an arduous campaign soon to be partially interrupted by the approach of winter, and to the services of the volunteers as rendering them worthy of the praise and gratitude of the people of the Confederate States. He asserts that after seven months of war the Federal Government has not only failed to extend its occupancy of the soil of the seceded States, but that now States and territories have been added to the Confederacy, and that instead of a march of unchecked conquest, the Federal troops have been driven at more than one point to assume the defensive. He praises the people of Missouri for the bold and successful stand which they have made "in the face of almost unparalleled difficulties, and justifies the occupation of the soil of Kentucky by Confederate troops, on the ground that the State had been invaded against the will of the people by the Federal forces; but that the Confederate Government sincerely desired to respect "free to decide their own destiny according to their own will." Financial matters are next touched upon, and the Treasury note system is said to be working well. The provision enabling the holder to convert the notes into 8 per cent. stock insuring them against a depreciation below the value of that stock, no considerable fall in that value is apprehended so long as the interest shall be punctually paid. For the payment of this interest a rate of taxation has already been imposed as must provide sufficient means. By husbanding the means of the States, and judiciously using their resources, it is contended that the war could be carried on for an unlimited period. A reconstruction of the old Union is declared to be an impossibility. The separation is final and for the independence which has been asserted no alternative will be accepted. The arrest of Messrs. Mason and Slidell is briefly touched upon. It is concluded that those gentlemen when seized were under the protection and within the dominions of a neutral nation and were as much under the jurisdiction of the British government upon that ship and beneath its flag as if they had been on English soil. The inefficiency of the blockade of the Southern ports is alluded to, but whilst it is admitted that the Confederate States would be benefited by the enforcement of the rules of international laws in regard to the blockade, the declaration is also made that the Confederate States are not dependent on that enforcement for the successful prosecution of the war. The message concludes by saying that "liberty is always won where there exists the unconquerable will to be free."

So much has been said in justification of the act of Commodore Wilkes, in forcibly taking Messrs. Mason and Slidell from on board the English mail steamer Trent, and so much anxiety is naturally evinced to learn what may be said on the other side of the question, that we reprint from the New York *Albion* a statement of the case from a purely English point of view. It will be perceived that the editor of that journal, in an article as courteous as it is able, takes a very different view of the matter from that which has been presented by our American editors and jurists. He argues that the Trent was a public vessel, and was, therefore, privileged from being stopped on the high seas—that Messrs. Mason and Slidell were not embassadors, but merely passengers on board the vessel, and as such, were not liable to arrest—that as the Federal Government has not recognized the Confederate States as a belligerent power, it cannot exercise belligerent rights; that no proclamation of war having been made, but only a blockade of our own ports, nothing has been done to convert the Confederates from rebels into enemies. The *Albion* writer contends that Captain Wilkes has been guilty of a very serious breach of international *comity*, but leaves jurists to decide whether he has also violated international *law*. What the British Government may do or demand is held to be a serious question, and one which is not to be dismissed quite so easily as the press affects to believe. The *Albion* reasserts its previously expressed opinion that war between the two countries is utterly improbable; but declares, nevertheless, that if Great Britain sought a pretext for bringing one on, she has now an opportunity for pushing a dispute into hostilities.

The steamer Etna, with English advices to the 13th instant, has arrived at New York. At the Lord Mayor's banquet, in London, the United States Minister, Mr. Adams, made a speech, which is reported to have been well received. He made no allusion to the war, but the entire speech was marked by the most friendly feelings toward England. Messrs. Dudley Mann and Wm. L. Yancey were guests at the grand banquet of the Fishmonger's Club. The latter responded to the toast for the restoration of peace. He defended the Confederate cause, eulogized England for the recognition of belligerent rights, and said there could be no basis for negotiations so long as the Confederates were treated as rebels. It is reported that it was through the instigation of England that America is to be invited to join the expedition against Mexico.

We present our readers this morning with several articles of interest, but want of space prevents us from doing more than briefly naming them. We particularly call attention to the letter from an Englishman to the London *Times*, headed "Civil War in America;" the proceedings of the Confederate Convention in Kentucky; a letter to the New York *Herald*, stating that "vessels of war are sold to the Confederates under the nose of the British Government;" and an article from the London *Herald*, entitled "What are the Americans fighting about?" We also re-publish from the New York *Herald* an accurate list of the privateers fitted out by the Confederates; the vessels now in their employ, and a full list of the officers connected with the Confederate marine service. These lists may prove valuable for future reference.

Received via New York Albion, Nov. 23.

THE SEIZURE OF MESSRS. SLIDELL AND MASON.

The British royal mail steam packet Trent, on her voyage from Havana to St. Thomas and Southampton, was brought to by the U. S. frigate San Jacinto, Captain Wilkes, on the 8th inst., in the Great Bahama Passage, was boarded by a Lieutenant with an armed boat's crew of thirty-five men, and compelled to deliver up Messrs. Slidell and Mason, passengers reputed to be on their way to England and France respectively as agents or commissioners from the Confederate States of America. Messrs. Slidell and Mason, with their two Secretaries, were carried off as prisoners, were brought to Fortress Monroe by the San Jacinto, and were sent on thence to Fort Warren in Boston harbor, which divides with Fort Lafayette in the Bay of New York the custody of political offenders. The families of the captured gentlemen were offered the privilege of accompanying them, but decided on proceeding to their destination. There is no dispute about the facts. It is patent also that Captain Wilkes was not acting under the orders of his Government; while it is already indicated that the Cabinet at Washington will approve the act and accept any issue that may ensue. Scarcely, indeed, were the tidings made public, and scarcely had a few voices ventured to hint the possibility that international offence had been committed, when there rose up a universal cry that Captain Wilkes was a hero, and a hundred judicial opinions were spread abroad through the press, to the effect that this arrest was legally and politically defensible on the ground of British precedents and Admiralty decisions.

In such a question as the one that here occurs, there is the legal mode of looking at it and there is the popular mode. Your mere lawyer does not care a fig for newspaper articles or crowded meetings. Your moborator holds Grotius and Puffendorff in contempt. Rulers, however, are apt to dally with both views, and with both perhaps simultaneously, arguing by book and acting from policy. Editors also are no less glad to avail themselves of chapter and verse, falling back, if need be, upon such sentiments as happen to animate the masses. In the present case, having the field almost entirely to themselves, the latter are doubly jubilant. Captain Wilkes has snapped his fingers in the face of John Bull, which is a triumph for the reckless; for a defiant attitude or an unprecedented act exercises an irresistible charm over the American mind. The nation could hardly fail to sympathize therewith; but when the act is borne out—as this is said to be—by an irresistible weight of testimony proving it justifiable, the public delight is unstinted. Nevertheless it seems to us that below the surface there is some slight uneasiness; and that though men ring the changes to each other on what Wheaton has written and Lord Stowell has decided, they are not all confident that the right, as well the gain, is on their side. Let us look at the matter in some of its aspects, suggesting perhaps a thought or two that have not yet appeared in print.

There can be no greater mistake than for a Briton to fret and fume on this occasion, and swear that his flag has been outraged, simply because the neutral flag of his country has been stopped on the high seas by an American frigate. It must not be forgotten that the rights of war are universally acknowledged, however frequent and long and foolish may have been the squabbling over certain maritime rights in peace. A belligerent may stop and search any merchant vessel anywhere at sea, on suspicion that the latter may be in whole or in part employed in the enemy's service. The offence here lies not in the fact that the Trent is a neutral and bound from one neutral port to another, having never been upon the enemy's coast at all; it consists in the peculiar occupation and character of the ship, which should have exempted her from search and the consequences thereof, so soon as visitation had established what she was and how engaged. For, it is to be remarked that this steamer Trent is not a mere letter-carrier between three or four ports. Her mission is of no small importance to the great world of Commerce. France, Spain, Denmark, Holland, all powers among which the West India Islands are distributed, Mexico, Central America, and the several continental States that lie facing the South Pacific Ocean—all these are in some degree aggrieved, when delay is imposed upon their communications.

It would perhaps be stretching a point too far, to say that this line of steamers is virtually in the service of all these various nationalities; yet few will deny that on land and at sea the carriers of mail's have been always invested with privileges, greater or less according to the greater or less advance in civilization of the people who granted or guaranteed them. Has every one forgotten how, almost thirteen years ago, Commerce and "Progress" were linked together in pæans and congratulations, when it was proclaimed to the world that the two undoubted leaders in commercial enterprise, as in love of liberty, had taken a new step in the right direction?—Are we rambling from our subject? You shall see. On the 15th of December, 1848, there was signed in London by Mr. Bancroft as U. S. Minister, and Lord Palmerston as Foreign Secretary, a certain Postal Convention, whereof Article XX. was expressed in these words:

In case of war between the two nations, the mail-packets of the two offices shall continue their navigation without impediment or molestation, until six weeks after a notification shall have been made on the part of either of the two governments, and delivered to the other, that the service is to be discontinued; in which case they shall be permitted to return freely, and under special protection, to their respective ports.

Nearly all the American writers, who have favored the public with their opinions during the past week, having adopted what may be termed the *a fortiori* view of the case, we commend the above extract to their calm consideration, and beg them to apply it after that fashion. For if in war time it was deemed desirable that no let or hindrance should be thrown in the way of these quasi public messengers, in the interest of the commercial world at large, to sacrifice the commonest hostile rights—what might be, what ought to be expected in time of peace between friendly peoples, still standing mutually in the position of allies, though as regards third parties one was a belligerent and the other a neutral? Singular pains seem to have been taken, in the above clause, to hedge round mail steamers with peculiar jealousy. Up to the moment of their compulsory return to port, they were still to be under "special protection." What constitutes, we would ask, special protection and freedom from impediment or molestation? At least these privileges were denied to the British royal mail steamer Trent—her comings and goings being regulated, moreover, by a Lieutenant in her Majesty's Navy, whose presence on board might be supposed an additional plea for respect.

We may be told, and there is no denying it, that the Postal Convention just named was designed for a specific object—lines of steamers running between Great Britain and the United States. That is true; but the principle remains, and we will not readily believe that the American nation is willing to sink itself to the level of Washington politicians, and of editors, their friends and eulogists, by limiting the application of an agreement voluntarily made for the benefit of commerce at large. A naval officer might also perchance have recollected something of the claims of this class of vessels, for a century has not elapsed since they were permitted to enter and depart from the port of Vera Cruz, then blockaded or invested by an American fleet. They were "visited," we know, on arrival and on sailing; but they were not considered liable to subsequent "impediment or molestation." It remained for Captain Wilkes to violate a tacit understanding; one that he might have traced back to the absolute agreement cited above, if the temptation of popular applause had not induced him to make a bold stroke for it, and run the risk of being cashiered if his government did not choose to approve.

We have said enough, we think, to justify us in holding Captain Wilkes guilty of a very serious breach of international comity. Whether he has also violated international law, jurists must decide. The case is untouched by precedent. We believe ourselves that the Trent is to all intents and purposes a public vessel; but Attornies General, we say, and Judges must decide. Let us glance briefly at Captain Wilkes's proceedings, after he had broken down the barriers that should have restrained him. He forcibly took off two passengers, on the plea that they were ambassadors from an enemy, or that they carried despatches, or both; for the case of their Secretaries may be adjourned. Now we deny point-blank that Messrs. Slidell and Mason had any ambassadorial character whatever. A Confederacy, that has no recognised national existence, cannot send forth an official representative, whose very *status* presupposes recognition.—To the Captain of the Trent these persons could have been no more than any ordinary passengers, whatever he may have heard of their career by common report—for thank Heaven we have not retrograded to a passport system!—and they were therefore entitled to such protection as his neutral flag could afford, and to such an asylum on board his ship as her special character should have secured.

They themselves, we repeat, had no official position. They were not ambassadors, they certainly were not soldiers; they could not be legally seized on board a neutral ship at sea without some justifiable pretext, however easy it is for a Secretary of State on shore to consign whom he pleases to a military prison for an alleged civil offence. "Oh, but they were bearers of despatches," say the volunteer legists, arguing again on their *a fortiori* principle. "If the carrying of despatches, according to all authorities, subject a vessel to forfeiture, of course the bearers must be liable to seizure." The argument is weak; law and practice run the other way. Breakers of blockade and carriers of contraband incur risks—but no personal risks, save the inconvenience of temporary imprisonment. But were these gentlemen bearers of despatches? We know not, and certainly the Captain of the Trent had no means of knowing, since it is not the custom on board our ships to search passengers' persons or baggage on embarkation; or to pry into the contents of the mail-bags. Indeed, so far as the latter are concerned, Messrs. Slidell and Mason had no control whatever. Therefore, we do not pretend that Messrs. Slidell and Mason were not enemies and most flagrant enemies of their captors; but we do pretend that international law does not warrant the seizure after this fashion of individuals not designated by public law; and further, that no single word in the Queen's oft-quoted proclamation prohibited the Captain of the Trent from taking these individuals on board, all rumor as to their mission, or commission, to the contrary notwithstanding.

And now, if there be any force in the position we have assumed, the cloud of so-called precedents, set forth by our American contemporaries, dissolves into thinnest air. We admit the unquestioned right of belligerents to visit and search neutral merchant ships; the Trent is a public vessel. An enemy's ambassador may unquestionably be stopped upon the high sea; Messrs. Slidell and Mason are not Ambassadors. Private ships "*fraudulently*" carrying despatches (says Sir W. Scott, the word italicised being conveniently omitted just now by all the American commentators) are subject to confiscation; the Trent was not fraudulently carrying despatches, nor was any attempt made to seize her. In addition to this, any right whatever in this case is a war right. When did the United States proclaim war against the South? They proclaimed a blockade of their own ports, not of an enemy's. They have done nothing whatever, officially, to convert the Southern Confederates from rebels into foes. Nor can it be pleaded that our Government has acknowledged both parties as belligerents. The United States Government must have done so itself, ere it could lawfully exercise one belligerent's rights toward another belligerent, in presence and to the detriment of a neutral.

Looking at all these doubts and discrepancies, we cannot quite agree with writers around us that the American view of the case is indisputably the correct one. We fail even to be convinced by the solemn announcement of Professor Theophilus Parsons, of the Cambridge Law School, that the legality of the capture is "beyond all doubt or question." It may be an awful risk, this differing with a Professor on his own ground; but we dare hope that we are warranted in our belief that at least there are two sides to the question. With all respect, therefore, we take leave of this intensely positive Professor, adjuring him in the words of the Apostle Paul—O Theophilus, "keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called."

Out of all the cases cited as applicable, two only—though not in truth applicable at all—are interesting. The one is that of Prince Lucien Bonaparte, seized on board an American ship in a Sardinian port, fifty years ago, which seizure we hold to have been a flagrant and double outrage. But in order to deduce from it a justification of Captain Wilkes, it would be necessary to show that Piedmont and the United States concurred in approval or toleration of the deed. To what extent the former remonstrated—which was all she could do—we are ignorant, but we remember that the U. S. soon afterwards went to war with Great Britain, and we doubt not that in the list of grievances of that day, this very one may be found. The capture of Mr. Henry Laurens, President of Congress, taken by a British frigate in 1780, from a vessel bound to Holland, appears at the first blush curiously in point. But neither will this instance bear the test of examination. It has pleased the searchers after precedent to designate the vessel stopped on the high seas "a Dutch ship." They have even loaded her with tobacco. This is a neat Knickerbocker device; but we declare, on the authority of Lord Mahon's history, the Annual Register for 1780, and Admiral Keppel's Life, that the ship was an American (rebel?) packet. Any precedent analogy therefore fails to the ground; neither could the Dutch have raised a question as to the seizure of traitors (not being acknowledged belligerents) under the protection of their flag, seeing that among the captured despatches on that occasion was a quasi-treaty between certain dignitaries of Holland and the Colonies themselves, then in revolt against the British Crown.

Here we must halt for to-day; since if articles be overlong, they are sure to be overlooked. What the British Government may do or demand is a serious question, not to be dismissed quite so easily as the press affects to believe. We may perhaps, in our next issue, add our speculations to those already uttered. We have upheld for years past, for months past, for weeks past, the utter improbability of war between the two countries; nor do we imagine that war will grow out of this new difficulty. We must say however that if Great Britain sought a pretext for bringing one on—as she is perpetually accused of doing—there is now an opportunity for claiming such reparation as would not be granted, and for pushing a dispute into hostilities.

Letter of an Englishman to the London Times, Nov. 6.

THE CIVIL WAR IN AMERICA.

SIR:—A letter of your American correspondent from New England, in the *Times* of October 30, concludes with an extract from a speech of Mr. Johnson, a Senator from Tennessee, which contains so much misrepresentation as to the state of feelings and condition of the people in the Southern States, that I am induced to ask you to insert a refutation of misstatements which, from late personal experience, I am able to afford. I will not follow Mr. Johnson through his details of the cold-blooded shooting of a woman, further than to say that I totally disbelieve the occurrence; but I will inform him, should he peruse these lines, that he will, if he inquires, hear well-authenticated stories of violence and brutalities on the part of soldiers in the Federal forces—to Southern resident ladies—in Maryland far surpassing the one he narrates. Atrocities may occasionally be committed in the sad state of things now existing on the other side of the Atlantic, but it is as unfair to brand the Southern cause with the terms of "coercion, outrage, insult, blasphemy and crime," as it would be to stigmatize the Northern cause with similar epithets on account of a case of dreadful violation, which I know was committed by some men of the so-called Excelsior Brigade.

What I more particularly wish to disabuse your readers of who have read Mr. Johnson's speech, is his statement that the whole Secessionist career has been one of coercion, and that they never got anything except by coercion. He says, "They coerced Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, and Virginia out of the Union. They attempted it in Maryland, and the Government stopped it." Now, this is notoriously incorrect. These States all passed ordinances of secession, and as to Maryland, does not Mr. Johnson know that nothing but Fort McHenry's guns keep Baltimore quiet, and nothing but the large Federal force in Maryland and the absence of arms prevent a unanimous rising?

Again, he says, "They (the Confederates) are attempting coercion in Kentucky, but the Government have prevented them." This is as incorrect as the rest; the Confederates moved into Kentucky in self-defence. Any one looking at the map will see that the South could not allow the North to occupy Kentucky, as they meant gradually to accomplish, without exposing their whole frontier to attack. But what are the facts? Why, General Buckner, the Confederate General, publicly proclaimed that he would withdraw the Confederate troops simultaneously with the withdrawal of the Federal army, proclaiming also that every inhabitant, whatever were his opinions, should be protected, which, having been in Kentucky at the time, I can vouch for as having been strictly observed.

Now, a few words on coercion generally in the Confederate cause. From ample experience I completely deny it. I was in all the States Mr. Johnson mentions, and, so far from there being coercion, more united people, more a more fixed determination in any people to achieve their independence. A gentleman of Louisiana said to me, "The Northerners do not know what they have undertaken; to succeed, it must be a war of extermination, not only of every man, but of every woman and child." To judge of the unanimity of the feeling in the States Mr. Johnson alludes to, it is only needed to pass through them. Secession flags flying from every house, women and children cheering and waving flags to the trains passing filled with soldiers, and from every part sending clothes and supplies to their relations and friends in the army. I travelled with one gentleman who had charge of 100 boxes for one regiment from Alabama, and I know myself that all the railway depots were encumbered with similar contributions, and these not so much luxuries, but real home-made necessaries, such as knitted goods, home-spun clothes; in which patriotic work most of the Southern women are now occupied.

I cannot give a better proof of the absence of coercion, and a more forcible instance of the confidence of the people in the Government, than the fact that the Confederate notes are taken at par throughout the whole Confederacy. Let Mr. Johnson contrast this with the fact of the Washington Bank having refused the Northern Treasury notes, and the report that on this account they are to be suspended as a disloyal establishment.

While in the Northern States the Government have suspended the *habeas corpus*, suppressed trial by jury, interfered with the liberty of the press, and imprisoned extensively both men and women for political offences even on suspicion, the Southern Government have maintained both the *habeas corpus* and trial by jury. In no case has there been suspension of a paper or imprisonment for political opposition; and though confiscation of Northern property has been adopted in the South, it has only been in retaliation of the course first wildly adopted by the Federal Government. These are facts—let any one read them and say whether Mr. Johnson is justified in his assertion as to the coercion of the Confederates, or in his statement that secession is robbery, rapine and murder.

For myself, I can fully sympathize with the feelings of a Northerner, who sees with regret the division of this great Federation; but, at the same time, I cannot but admire the judgment, courage, and determination that the Southern States have shown in the present lamentable struggle. It is impossible to travel in their States without recognizing the admirable law and government that they have maintained since their separation, or to entirely withhold sympathy from a people who, cut off, or nearly so, from all foreign resources, with naught but their own energies and will, have hitherto successfully maintained a defence of the independence they are determined to achieve.

With these feelings, I deeply deplore the continuance of this contest, so pregnant with disasters to the combatants, so fruitful of loss and misfortune to the world entire. It is unfortunately now continued by the North under an erroneous idea that there is a strong Union feeling still existing in the Southern States. Alas! the wish with them is father to the thought, which wishes no basis. It only needs to go there to find out that Union feeling has ceased to exist, and has been replaced by a bitterness of hatred that I could not have credited had I not personally become convinced of it.

There is another equally fallacious aid that the North have counted on—namely, disaffection, not to say worse, among the slave population,—the facts being, on the contrary, that they never were in a more peaceful condition. Instead of an element of weakness in the Southern cause, it is proved to be one of strength, as the whole tillings and culture of the country go on uninterrupted by the drain of the white population to the scene of war. In the South their limit is, not as to men in the army, but in number of arms to equip them; while in the Northern States they already talk of having to resort to draughting, or conscription, and have at present their pay for privates up at $16 or 21 15s. a month, with $100 or 20l. bounty, and the promise of 150 acres of land at the end of the war. So much for "patriotism" and "the North rising as one man for the Union." Take also finance. Mr. Chase's popular loan has only obtained $40,000,000, while the Southern planters have placed their whole crops, if needful, at the disposal of the Government, and will, I feel sure, burn every bale rather than dispose of their cotton to the Northerners.

There is much more I could write on all these points, but I must not encroach too much on your space. I will only, on the question of the cotton supply, express my satisfaction in the perusal of the letter of your correspondent "G. S. A.," London, also in the *Times* of the 30th, which so ably and truly controverts the error that the Southern Government entertain any idea of endeavoring to coerce Europe into a recognition of their independence by laying an embargo on cotton. One of the most leading men of their Government expressed to me his surprise that such a statement should have been credited in England. One of the main causes of secession has been the determination of the South to adopt the principles of free trade; and one of the greatest inducements to the North to prolong this contest is the desire again to enchain them with a protective if not a prohibitive tariff. The South are longing for the day when they may freely exchange their raw materials for the manufactures of England and France, unenhanced by the dues of the Northern ports. As one of their Government said to me, "We shall look to England to be our workshop and our carriers; it is not our interest to be either a manufacturing or a naval Power. We, therefore, are surprised, in these days of independence of nationalities, that you do not give us encouragement to accomplish ours, by which you will so largely profit."

Since I commenced this letter I have read Mr. Fay's letter in your journal of Friday, which I need not dwell upon, as it is so admirably answered in your leader of the same date. I will only say that I am not surprised to read Mr. Fay's appeal to the anti-slavery feeling in this country. It is not the first instance of the insincerity that endeavors to represent this as an emancipation war, when these very declaimers know that the Federal Government would give fresh guarantees on slavery if the South would return to the Union.

How will Mr. Fay explain Mr. Lincoln's cancelling General Fremont's emancipation proclamation, and the general condemnation that Massachusetts afforded to Mr. C. Sumner's abolition speech of last month? This much, however, I will add as to slavery. I believe it has been the ill-judged movements of the small abolition party in the North that has partly contributed to produce this severance, and has also delayed ameliorations in the slave condition, which would have been before this introduced in the Southern States but for unwise Northern interference.

Of this your readers may be convinced—that Lord Russell's definition of the contest is the correct one, the North are fighting for empire; but in that empire is included the government of the minority by numbers, *ergo* the coercion of the Southern States to the interested commercial policy. The South are fighting for independence, but in that independence is the wish to free themselves from the tyranny of Republicanism, the desire to conservatise their institutions, and to establish a system of free trade with Europe, as the one most fitted to the requirements of their country and the enlightened views of the day.

* * * *

When I saw General Beauregard at Manassas, while staying with General Johnston (who, by the bye, I may here say now commands the Confederate army, General Beauregard and General Smith commanding each a corps under him), General Beauregard expressed his satisfaction that I should not have returned to England without seeing something of the South, and, further, his regret that more Englishmen did not come to judge for themselves. "We wish," he said, "we lived in a glass house, as to our feelings and motives, that Europe might see and judge us; and we would wish that the North sent a commission to inquire into our unanimity, determination, and general state. We would give them every facility on condition that they told the truth on their return." I wish General Beauregard's desire could be accomplished, for I feel that this might lead to the North being convinced of the hopelessness of the contest they are waging—they might listen to the warning an admirable article in your paper gave them, ending thus: —"The advice we offer is only what the Americans have given to all the world—it is a shank of their own cotton—a pipe of their own tobacco."

Let them consider what they can do and what neither they nor all the world can do. At present they are giving a triumph to many a foe, for there is not a circle of old absolutist statesmen and diplomatists who do not read the stories of their difficulties and reverses with a bitter smile. They will hear with at least respect, perhaps with disappointment, that the North and South have agreed to part friends. Would that this much-wished for solution could be brought about. It is in no hostility to the North that I write. I am convinced, as the sun shines, that it is the only possible ending. How much better to arrive at it, if it is inevitable (as all impartial judges know it is,) without the further infliction of this sad and gigantic contest.

Your obedient servant,

ANGLICANUS.

CONFEDERATE CONVENTION IN KENTUCKY.

From the Nashville-Louisville Courier.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOUTHERN CONFERENCE AT RUSSELLVILLE.

RUSSELLVILLE, KY., Tuesday, October 29, 1861.

In accordance with a notice previously given, a number of gentlemen from several counties in the State, assembled at Odd Fellows' Hall, in the city of Russellville, on Tuesday, October 29, 1861, for the purpose of conferring together in reference to the situation of the country, and the steps to be taken to better preserve domestic tranquillity and protect the rights of person and property in the State of Kentucky.

On motion of Colonel George W. Johnson, of Scott county, Hon. H. C. Burnett, of Trigg county, was chosen temporary chairman of the Conference.

About thirty-five counties were represented at the meeting.

George W. Johnson, from the Select Committee, reported the following resolutions, which were, without debate, unanimously adopted by the Conference.

RESOLUTIONS.

WHEREAS, The majority of the Legislature of Kentucky have violated their most solemn pledges made before the election, and deceived and betrayed the people; have abandoned the position of neutrality assumed by themselves and the people, and invited into the State the organized armies of Lincoln; have abdicated the government in favor of the military despotism which they have placed around themselves, but cannot control; have abandoned the duty of shielding the citizen with their protection; have thrown upon our people and the State the horrors and ravages of war, instead of attempting to preserve the peace, and have rotted men and money for the war waged by the North for the destruction of our constitutional rights; have violated the express words of the Constitution by borrowing five millions of money for the support of the war without a vote of the people; have permitted the arrest and imprisonment of our citizens, and transferred the constitutional prerogatives of the executive to a military commission of partisans; have seen the writ of *habeas corpus* suspended without an effort for its preservation, and permitted our people to be driven in exile from their homes; have subjected our property to confiscation, and our persons to confinement in the penitentiary as felons because we may choose to take part in a contest for civil liberty and constitutional government, against a sectional majority waging inexpiable war upon them, and the old Federal Union, and have done all these things deliberately against the warnings and vetoes of the Governor, and the solemn remonstrance of the minority in the Senate and House of Representatives; therefore be it

Resolved, That the unconstitutional edicts of a factious majority of a Legislature thus false to their pledges, their interests, are not law, and that such government is unworthy of the support of a brave and free people, and we therefore denounce their unconstitutional acts and usurpations, and bid defiance both to the Federal and State governments.

Resolved, That, abandoned and betrayed as we have been by the Lincolnite majority of the Legislature of Kentucky, and proscribed by the abolition party, who have usurped the Federal government and broken down the Constitution of the Federal Union, and being as yet no part of the Southern Confederacy, and therefore altogether without the protection of law, the people have, by the laws of God and the express letter of the Constitution of Kentucky, "at all times an inalienable and indefeasible right to alter, reform, or abolish their government, in such manner as they may think proper;" and in the language of the same Constitution we declare, "that absolute and arbitrary power over the lives, liberty, and property of freemen exists nowhere in a republic"—not even in the largest majority.

Resolved, That we hereby declare that the majority of the Legislature, by their acts, have abandoned, betrayed, and abdicated the government, and that the people have now a right to a fair representation of their will, and that the Governor be, and he is hereby invited to convene a Legislature to meet outside the lines of the Lincoln army, to be composed of such members as are now elected and may attend, or new members to be chosen by the people.

And Whereas, We have reason to believe that the Governor is unable to convene the Legislature outside the lines of the Lincoln army, therefore,

Resolved, That we recommend a convention, to be chosen, elected, or appointed in any manner now possible by the people of the several counties of the State, to meet at Russellville on the 18th of November, and we recommend to them the passage of an ordinance severing forever our connection with the Federal government, and to adopt such measures, either by the adoption of a provisional government or otherwise, as in their judgment will give full and ample protection to the citizens in their persons and property, and secure to them the blessings of constitutional government.

Resolved, That we recommend to the people in every county where they have the power to do so, to organize at once a County Guard of at least one hundred men, to be armed by the people in every county, and mounted if possible, to be paid as Confederate troops, and subject to duty in their own and adjoining counties, and subject also to the rules and regulations of the Confederate States, and to the orders of the Commanding General.

Resolved, That we will never pay one cent of the unconstitutional loan of five millions of dollars, obtained by this Legislature from the banks for the prosecution of this war, instituted for the coercion and subjugation of the slaveholding States, and that we will resist by force of arms if necessary, the collection by the sheriffs of all taxes intended to be paid over to the Lincoln party in the Legislature, and that we denounce as enemies to their country all those who may advocate the payment of the same to the sheriffs for the purpose aforesaid.

Resolved, That Robert McKee, John C. Breckinridge, Humphrey Marshall, Geo. W. Ewing, H. W. Bruce, G. B. Hodge, William Preston, G. W. Johnston, Blanton Duncan, and P. B. Thompson, be, and they are hereby, appointed a committee to carry out the above resolutions.

The cotton speculation is going on in England at a tremendous rate; it is at present carried on by ladies, clergymen, lawyers, and others not regularly engaged in business, who have fallen into the mania as others did into the railway mania of 1845. The professional cotton speculators have retired from action. They know that the bubble must burst.

The Dublin *Freeman* of the 9th of November reports that at a meeting of tobacco manufacturers, held that day, it was agreed to advance the price of manufactured tobacco two pence per pound from that date, in consequence of the great rise in the price of the leaf.

The Philadelphia *Counterfeit Detector* (Peterson's) cautions the public against counterfeit "tens" on the Waterbury Bank of Connecticut. It is the best executed and most dangerous counterfeit that has been out for years.

The British Board of Trade return for the month of September show a falling off in the exports of $1,250,000, as compared with the same month last year. In the past nine months the decrease is $40,000,000 from the first nine months of 1860.

The visit of Ex-Secretary Toucey to Washington is reported to have been for the purpose of being examined as a witness before the Senate's Naval Investigating Committee.

The Irish citizens of New York are to hold a meeting this week, for the purpose of urging upon the Government the necessity of an exchange of prisoners.

There are now about seventy officers of the regular army on duty at the military posts in New York Harbor, Governor's Island, Bedloe's Island, Fort Lafayette and Fort Hamilton.

The Northern "Black Horse" Cavalry, recruited at Troy, have arrived at New York on their way to the seat of war. They have no horses, very few arms, and the men are not half uniformed.

The county jail at Port Tobacco, was broken into on Monday night last, and four negroes—the only prisoners—released. How or by whom the deed was done remains a mystery.

EUROPE.

From the London Morning Herald.

WHAT ARE THE AMERICANS FIGHTING ABOUT?

Lincoln and Seward, their secretaries and their generals, have all held the same language; have all asserted, as solemnly as words can affirm anything, that they have no desire to interfere with slavery; that they are fighting, not to emancipate the negroes, but to enforce a Constitution which binds the free States to assist in maintaining and perpetuating the system of negro servitude, a Constitution which embodies in a most carefully worded clause a distinct and unequivocal fugitive slave law.

The men of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts cared as a rule very little about the "domestic institution" of the South until this war broke out. The merchants of New York were bitter partisans of slavery. But the ironmasters of Pennsylvania and the manufacturers of New England have taxed the South for their benefit so long that they cannot bear the thought of losing the power of doing so for the future, the brokers of the Empire City are furious at the prospect of seeing their lucrative trade diverted to Charleston or New Orleans, and carried on with English capital. The lust of money has had ten times more to do with the sudden patriotism of the North than their love of liberty.

* * * *

Every act of Mr. Lincoln's, since the taking of Fort Sumter, has been a violation of that "fundamental law of the Anglo-Saxon race beyond the Atlantic" —or would-be so, but that the Constitution has ceased to exist, and, therefore, cannot be correctly said to be violated. Secession, perhaps, is unconstitutional, but coercion is equally so. Mr. Davis governs by the authority of a successful revolution. Mr. Lincoln governs in the name of an authority which forbids everything that he does and cannot help doing, save that the Constitution were in vigor he must be impeached for high treason, without a chance of defending himself, and would be liable at the same time to actions for false imprisonment which would ruin a Rothschild.

He has ordered his officers to set at defiance the Supreme Court of the Republic. He has suspended the *habeas corpus*. He has proclaimed martial law. He has set up a new Legislature in Western Virginia in opposition to the authority of the lawful Governor. He has suppressed the Constitution and imprisoned the collective Legislature of Maryland. He has put down freedom of the press and annulled the right of petition. In a word, he has committed many hundred distinct acts of high treason, or what would be such, had America any longer a law or a legal Government. * * * *

Are we, then, to believe that a war undertaken in defiance of every constitutional principle, is a war in defence of the Constitution—that President, Ministers and Generals are fighting for a law, the operation of which, if really enforced, would be to hang them all? We waive the obvious impossibility of constitutionally governing the South, if re-conquered, because the contingency is too improbable to be worth discussion. But we think it is too bad to accuse Sir John Packington of "hatred to free institutions" because he desires to see a stop put to the war. In the first place, free institutions in the North mean mob law, and in the South vigilance committees; what we understand by the phrase is nowhere known in the United States. In the next place, the necessary effect of the restoration of constitutional law in the North would be to stop the war at once.

VESSELS OF WAR SOLD TO THE CONFEDERATES UNDER THE NOSE OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT.

The New York *Herald* publishes the following letter from London, addressed to its editors, and signed by George Francis Train:

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK HERALD.
No. 18 ST. JAMES STREET, LONDON, Nov. 9.

When steamships owned by Englishmen, loaded by Englishmen, despatched by Englishmen, manned by Englishmen, continue to leave English ports, under English colors, under the very eyes of the American Legation and the English Foreign office, full of goods contraband of war, in aid of a people in open rebellion against the Federal Government; when Lord Palmerston replies to Mr. Adams, "Yes,