

with barbarous races. It would be hard to bring any charge against WALKER, of which Russian generals in the Caucasus, and French generals in Algeria have not been guilty. Regret it as we may, we cannot get rid of the fact that civilization and commerce are determined upon taking possession of the globe—honestly if they can, but forcibly if they must. Wherever the civilized trader has come in contact with the barbarian, we see the one advancing remorselessly and invincibly, and the other receding helplessly and hopelessly. Look in what direction we may, from Tartary to Texas, the same movement is going on. We detest most of the consequences of the doctrine of "manifest destiny," but there is no escaping from the fact that the march of civilization is irresistible, and, moreover, that its track is but too frequently marked by violations of abstract right and justice.

We must say, however, that nothing we read of fillibustering in past ages, or amongst foreign nations, reconciles us to the form it has taken, and the agents it has chosen, in those latter days. The great mass of those who in former times have made their names famous in connection with it were men whom simplicity, enthusiasm and faith, and an ambition which, if ferocious and cruel in many of its manifestations, was at least devout and lofty, raised far out of the common order of freebooters. They were "gentlemen" in an age when a "gentleman" was a better, braver, freer man than his fellows; a man who, if unscrupulous in the selection of his means, was at least lofty in his aims. They were men who rose to the level of great undertakings in an age when great deeds were a necessity, and when man had to accomplish them with but little aid from art, and mainly by his own courage and his own faith. Our modern fillibusters are the scum of our society, not men whom "quick bosoms" drive upon desperate adventures; but men whom rascality has outlawed, men whom society, instead of sending forth with blessings, kicks out with contempt. Broken down gamblers, drunken lawyers, unsuccessful publicans, dissipated shoemakers, detested swindlers, men under whose feet every plank has broken, are those who now-a-days assume the bearing, and attempt to walk in the footsteps, of CORTEZ or of CLIVE. If modern civilization can find no better materials for its advanced guard than the scrapings of bar-rooms and jails, it were almost better it should become stationary. If we cannot propagate "Americanism" by any more decent agents than "Colonel" TRUSS or "General" WHEAT, it were better that the eagle should furl his wings. The voice of a great nation should not make itself heard through the stammerings and belchings of drunkards. We confess we should like to see Central America a busy seat of commerce governed by our laws, and progressing under our auspices. If fillibustering means the spread of freedom of speech, of trial by jury, of equal rights, of law and order, to regions which Providence has hitherto shrouded in barbarism, we confess we are fillibusters. But if it mean simply, as its history in Nicaragua would seem to indicate, a sort of extension of South Carolina or Mississippi, with their various "peculiarities," their mob law, their ferocious manners, their lazy habits, their sham "chivalry," their censorship of the press, their stagnation and inanity,—if it mean a reproduction *ad infinitum* of public men like Governor WISE and Colonel DAVIS, and the late lamented P. S. BROOKS,—if it mean simply niggers and hominy and cocktails,—we will none of it.

The Ethics of Fillibusterism.

Fillibusterism owes a great deal of the evil repute which has fallen upon it of late years, more to the malpractices, or bad character of those who have made it their calling, than to any peculiar atrocity in itself. The aggression of the civilized upon the uncivilized, of the active upon the lazy, of the enterprising upon the timid and cautious, is not a thing of yesterday, and was not begun by General WALKER. England, France, Spain, Portugal, and Holland have been fillibustering for the last four hundred years. The Spanish colonization of South America, and the French and English colonization of North America, and the Dutch occupation of the Spice Islands, were all undertakings which, whatever the law of nations may say, were certainly not in accordance with the law of nature. Most of the great names of the Elizabethan era, DRAKE, HAWKINS, FROBISHER, RALEIGH, ESSEX, and others, were the names of men whose greatest glories were reaped in enterprises which no diplomatist now-a-days would attempt to justify. Their great talents and great virtues, their sterling simplicity of character and romantic daring, hide from our view the thousand dark spots which sullied most of their undertakings. One of the most popular of modern novelists has made the fillibusters of the sixteenth century the heroes of one of his most popular novels; and we venture to say, few people have risen from the perusal of it without feeling all the better of being cheated into sympathy with the bold adventurers who three centuries ago fought, reveled and plundered along the shores of the Spanish main.

We may come down a good deal nearer our own time, and find plenty of "historical parallels," for anybody who is fond of them. We should like to know whether every European settlement that has been planted in Hindostan, has not been planted by fillibusters. CLIVE was a fillibuster, and so was WARREN HASTINGS,—and they were both none the less heroes for that. Sir JAMES BROOKE, the well-known "Rajah of Sarawak," is *tout bonnement* a fillibuster. Most of the Indian officers who have done most to maintain, and to extend the influence of the English East India Company, have been men who acted sternly and promptly in their dealings with the natives on their own responsibility, without any regard to the "law of nations," and without altering their conduct by one jot or tittle because they happened to fight under a "recognized flag." No "recognized flag" appears to entail any peculiar restrictions upon men fighting in remote places