THE NEW ORLEANS DAILY BEE,
PUBLISHED DAILY (SUNDAYS EXCEPTED) AT
No. 73 Chartres Street.
PRICE, TEN CENTS.
TUESDAY MORNING, JAN. 9, 1866.

Maugin, Bailey and Roberts, clerks of New Orleans, Vicksburg and Red points on Quitman, have our thanks for Vicksburg papers of the 6th.

We are obliged to Mr. John Wilen, clerk of the steamer Mississippi, for Cincinnati papers of a late date.

AMUSEMENTS.

St. Charles Theatre.—Notwithstanding the increased prices of admission, a crowded house witnessed the appearance last night at this theatre of Mr. and Mrs. Kean in the Merchant of Venice. This evening their interesting and celebrated representations of the Shakspearean drama will appear in Hamlet.

Varieties Theatre.—Miss Charlotte Thompson received an appreciative welcome by a full house on her return to these boards, where she was a great favorite. Her Pauline was applauded, and she was the Clarice of Mr. Maeready who ably supported her throughout. She will this evening appear as Julia in the Hunchback, enlisted by Mr. Maeready.

Academy of Music.—A varied programme, comprising ballet, pantomime, opera, melodrama, &c., will be given this evening by a family of artistes of the Richards Brothers, who will be found here this evening.

Masonic Hall.—This hall was crowded last evening on the occasion of the exhibition and lecture of Artemus Ward in illustration of the Salt Lake country and the character of the Mormons. What all his drollery, Mr. W. does not let it somewhere with the interesting features of his entertainment.

Tivoli Opera.—The opera for the evening of the New Opera House by Max Strakosch's Italian Company, will be Lucia di Lammermoor.

Reaction Against the Re-called Rebel Secession.

Reaction is evidently deepening and widening against the demagogical cant and the popular prejudice, known as the power of cotton. Four or five years ago, the power of cotton was still so strong that even in the North there was scarcely a journal, if we except the Bee, which ventured to impugn the wisdom, justice, and expediency of the policy involved in the application of the Secession, or to question the historical correctness of the imputed origin. Yet it was easy, reasoning only conclusively and logically upon premises, to expose the fallacy of the cotton theory to paternity and early nurture. Almost in the first glance of investigation, almost at the first touch of analysis, it stood forth in the real form, conceived as Milton's fiend at the prick of Ithuriel's spear, a naked impostor, as in the language of the Mobile Register, a fiend humbug. If journalists and conducted scribes in the intelligent portions of the union, and men in the circumstances of hankering, may could not have been so long wanting in the simple candor and logic needed for the exposure in this case, and would not have so long flooded the Mexican question with muddy sophistry and sensational smug.

Four or five months have wrought a considerable change in the popular sense of the doctrine in its relation to Mexican affairs. A corresponding change is witnessed in several leading journals, and some high official utterances are plainly adverse to what the doctrine, so far as it intelligible in its practical intents and tendencies, is now supposed to be.

Not the least noticeable fact connected with the Mexican doctrine, so-called, is that it was not the doctrine of President Monroe; nor was it ever mentioned by any of his successors. Clumsy attempts have been made to trace it to a passage in President Monroe's message in December 1823. But when examined, the text of the passage referred to we find it is something very, very innocuous, though firm and dignified, in tone, as the doctrine in question is in its tenor and spirit aggressive, threatening, provocative, and blustering. No such progeny as this could have had birth in any message of President Monroe. Snakes and crocodiles are not hatched from doves' eggs.

President Monroe simply declared the sentiment, in refusing to no supposed designs of the "Holy Alliance," that "we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety." And this declaration he was careful to qualify by saying: "It is only when our rights are invaded, or seriously menaced, that we resent injuries, or make preparations for our defence."

Then again President Monroe as the organ of what was then a comparatively weak American Republic, for whose integrity and even existence he feared in view of the powerful alliance of reactionary despotisms that followed the downfall of the first Napoleon. He did not propose that the United States should stand over the two Americas, become the protector of all the Spanish American States, and dictate precisely what relations of peace or war should subsist between those States and European nations, and precisely what political institutions those States should maintain within their borders. The object of President Monroe, as his policy was subsequently interpreted by President John Quincy Adams who was his Secretary of State, was to have it clearly understood that the United States stood by herself, and each Spanish American country stood for itself, within their respective territories, by their own means, from recent or colonial intrusion on the part of European powers.

He then seen that the policy of President Monroe was eminently conservative, strictly defensive, totally destitute of menace and a disposition to intermeddle and dictate in the affairs of other countries.

On the other hand, the Monroe doctrine, so called, is imbued with a spirit of universal meddling and dictation. Perhaps it could not be more fairly stated than in the spirited yet superficial or the light of defensive policy; its most ardent advocates are those who most seem given to asserting the utter inviolability of the United States in any sort of contest and her destined supremacy, by sheer force of proximity, example, and natural and inevitable gravity, over the whole Western hemisphere.

It is decided that the world made the United States its fulcrum among the nations, an enemy alike to the monarchical whose form of government is limited, and to the republican over which it seems to dominate in the name of protection. It is a doctrine that has no place in international law, which is a sort of unwritten compact of disinclination in which the interests of others are ignored and the parties stand to each other in their external characters as national units. Modified to its fundamental principle, it can have but one meaning and intent, namely: that the United States is hostile to all other forms of government, and must not rest until it has overthrown the last vestige of monarchy on this continent.

Such a republication of the terms of peaceful and friendly intercourse between the family of nations, such a declaration of war against all monarchical governments could only lead to a determined opposition on the part of other powers all needed and strong, if prepotent to the security of the present forms and designs of the United States.

The aspect of the doctrine under consideration is beginning to command attention, and to elicit a suggestive inquiry, in quarters where it was not familiar or popular until recently to speak out of the way with the prevailing tone of the subject. The fashioned Intelligencer, for instance, appeared to reflect in a leader the sentiments of Mr. Seward's views of foreign relations significantly from the New York Herald's Advertisement, a commercial article which takes a view of the question very similar to that heretofore taken in this paper. The gist of that article, by a "intelligent writer" styled the Intelligencer, will appear in the subsequent extracts:

National law recognizes, in the normal and natural condition of the family of nations, that they should be independent and self governing. Hence, only to the extent of their consent should other in their relations of neighborhood and their commercial and political intercourse. Thus we see that upon this principle, the Monroe doctrine, quoting from a family of nations, that "it is only when our rights are invaded, or seriously menaced, that we resent injuries, or make preparations for our defence."

Then upon President Monroe as the organ of what was then a comparatively weak American Republic, for whose integrity and even existence he feared in view of the powerful alliance of reactionary despotisms that followed the downfall of the first Napoleon. He did not propose that the United States should stand over the two Americas, become the protector of all the Spanish American States, and dictate precisely what relations of peace or war should subsist between those States and European nations, and precisely what political institutions those States should maintain within their borders. The object of President Monroe, as his policy was subsequently interpreted by President John Quincy Adams who was his Secretary of State, was to have it clearly understood that the United States stood by herself, and each Spanish American country stood for itself, within their respective territories, by their own means, from recent or colonial intrusion on the part of European powers.

It is then seen that the policy of President Monroe was eminently conservative, strictly defensive, totally destitute of menace and a disposition to intermeddle and dictate in the affairs of other countries.

On the other hand, the Monroe doctrine, so called, is imbued with a spirit of universal meddling and dictation. Perhaps it could not be more fairly stated than in the spirited yet superficial or the light of defensive policy; its most ardent advocates are those who most seem given to asserting the utter inviolability of the United States in any sort of contest and her destined supremacy, by sheer force of proximity, example, and natural and inevitable gravity, over the whole Western hemisphere.

It is decided that the world made the United States its fulcrum among the nations, an enemy alike to the monarchical whose form of government is limited, and to the republican over which it seems to dominate in the name of protection. It is a doctrine that has no place in international law, which is a sort of unwritten compact of disinclination in which the interests of others are ignored and the parties stand to each other in their external characters as national units. Modified to its fundamental principle, it can have but one meaning and intent, namely: that the United States is hostile to all other forms of government, and must not rest until it has overthrown the last vestige of monarchy on this continent.

Such a republication of the terms of peaceful and friendly intercourse between the family of nations, such a declaration of war against all monarchical governments could only lead to a determined opposition on the part of other powers all needed and strong, if prepotent to the security of the present forms and designs of the United States.

The aspect of the doctrine under consideration is beginning to command attention, and to elicit a suggestive inquiry, in quarters where it was not familiar or popular until recently to speak out of the way with the prevailing tone of the subject. The fashioned Intelligencer, for instance, appeared to reflect in a leader the sentiments of Mr. Seward's views of foreign relations significantly from the New York Herald's Advertisement, a commercial article which takes a view of the question very similar to that heretofore taken in this paper. The gist of that article, by a "intelligent writer" styled the Intelligencer, will appear in the subsequent extracts:

National law recognizes, in the normal and natural condition of the family of nations, that they should be independent and self governing. Hence, only to the extent of their consent should other in their relations of neighborhood and their commercial and political intercourse.