THE NEW YORK PRESS.

EDITORIAL OPINIONS OF THE LEADING JOURNALS UPON CURRENT TOPICS.

COMPILED EVERY DAY FOR EVENING TELEGRAPH

Shall the Voters of the North Have Equal Rights with the Voters of the South!

From the Tribune. One of the great questions to be decided at the Congressional elections this fall, is whether the voters of the North shall obtain equal rights with the voters of the South, or whether they are satisfied that the abolition of slavery shall even increase the superior rights which the voters of the Southern States have thus far enjoyed under the Constitution. The matter is so plain that, properly presented, it cannotifail to be understood by the dullest intellect.

According to the law of the 23d of May, 1850, 1 was enacted that the number of Representatives in Congress should be 233; that the representative population (which means the whole number of free persons, excluding Indians not taxed, with the addition of three-niths of all other per sons) determined by the census of that year, and thereafter, should be divided by said number 233, and that the quotient so found should be the ratio of representation for the several States. The ratio thus ascertained under the census of 1860 was 124,183, and upon this basis 233 Representatives were apportioned among the States. The number was, however, in-creased by the act of March 4, 1862, from 233 to 241, by allowing one additional Representative to each of the following States:—Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont. According to this apportionment, the Northern and Southern States had the following number of Congressmen:-

California 8	New Jersey
Connecticut 4	New York 8
Illinois14	Ordo 1
Indiana11	Organ
lows 6	Parameter 2
lows 6	Dhada Tanin,
Kansas 1	renode Island
Maine 5	Vermont
Massachusetts10	Wisconsin.
Michigan 6	
Minnesota 2	Total
New Hampshire 3	
80071118	STATES.
Alabama 6	Missouri
Denware 1	South Carolina
Florida 1	Tennessee
Georgia 7	rexns
Kentucky 9	The Virginius
Louisiana	
Maryland 5	Total
Mississippi	
N. S. C.	44.4

NORTHERN STATES

Now that slavery is abolished, the three-fifths rule has, of course, to cease, and the new apportionment has either to be made upon the voting (white) population, as the Congressional amendment provides, or upon the total popula-tion, as will be the case if the amendment is rejected and the Johnson party have a majority in the next Congress. Should the amendment not be adopted, and the 241 members, provided for by the act of 1862, divided among the States according to their total population, the South would gain nine members and the North would lose nine. The ratio of representation in this case would be 129,245, and the representation of the Northern and Southern States in Congress

would be as follows:-

NORTHER	N STATES.
California 8	New Jersey 5
	New York 29
	Onio 18
Indiana 10	
Iowa 5	
Kansas 1	Rhode Island 2
Maine 5	
Massachusetts 9	
Michigan 6	
	2016-1-1 TAW
New Hampshire 3	10040
	N STATES.
Alabama 7	
	North Carolina 8
Deia ware 1	South Carolina 5
Florida 1	Tennessee9
	Fexas 5
Kentucky 9	The Virginias12
Lou mana 6	m 4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
Maryland 5	Total94
Missi sippi, 6	

It will be seen that in this case the States of Iffinots, Indiana, Iowa, Massachusetts, and Ohio would each lose one, and the States of New York and Pennsylvania each two. On the other hand, the States of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia would each gain one. As the total voting population of the Northern States is 18,652,776, and of the Southern States 8,026,700, this would give in the Northern States one member for a voting population of 126,889, and in the Southern tates one member for a voting population of 85,496. Those, therefore, who oppose the amendment, or who, at the approaching election, vote for Congressmen of the Johnson party, thereby vote that a voting population of 126,889 in the North shall have as much power as 85,496 Southerners, the immense majority of whom are unrepentant Rebeis.

The Constitutional amendment, upon which the admission of the Southern States to Congress is made dependent, and with it the Republican party, insist that a voter in the North ern States shall count as much as in the South ern States. It, accordingly, the voting popula-tion be made the basis of representation, the ratio of representation would be 111,685, and the Northern and Southern States entitled to the following number of Congressmen:-

NORTHERN STATES.

California...... 7 New Hampshire...... 3

Connecticut, 4	New Jersey 6
Llinois	New York
Indiana	
lows 6	Oregon 1
Kansas 1	Pennsy.vania24
Maine 6	Riode Island 2
Massachusetts12	Vermon 8
Michigan 7	Wisconsin 7
Minnesota 2	
Total	
SOUTHERN STATES.	
Alabama 4	Mississippi 2
Arkansas 3	Missouri 9
Delaware 1	North Carolina 5
Florida 1	South Carolina 2
Georgia 5	Tennessee 7
Kentucky 8	Texas, 4
Louisiana 4	The Virginias 9
Maryland 5	
Total	

It will be seen that in this case Illinois, Maine Michigan, New Jersey, and Wisconsin will gain one representative each, Massachusetts two, and

Men of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, let it be well understood by every voter in your State, that the Republican Congressional ticket means equapolitical rights for the voters North and South, and that the ticket of the Democrats and the Johnson party means superior rights of Southern voters. Every man who votes the opposition ticket thereby consents to have lesser rights than a voter in the Southern States; while every supporter of the Republican ticket insists that the Union men of the North shall have at least equal rights with the late Robels. possible that the issue between two such tickets is doubtful?

Will the South Accept the Best Attain-From the Herald.

Very naturally the radical Copperhead organs and the radical niggerhead organs are acting together in opposition to the conservative Constitutional amendment, just as they aided and abetted each other before the war and during the war. We expected no less than this when we rescued the amendment from the oblivion to which it had been doomed by the radicals of both parties, and placed it clearly before the country as a vital, positive issue. It is because these radicals so bitterly oppose it that the masses of the people are becoming every day

more enthusiastic in its favor. They remember that it was passed through Congress by conservative Republican votes and in spite of the open hostility of the ultra radicals, like Mr. Than Stevens, and they know that its adoption by the South now would be another great triumph over those extremists who desire to keep the Union divided in order to further their partisan plans at the next Presidential election. For this reason the more the radicals on both sides say against the amendment, the more the

people find in it to endorse. The radical Copperhead papers denounce the Constitutional amendment as "a sham, a swintle, and a lie." The radical niggerhead papers treat it in the same temper, and declare that 'no leading Republican in Congress means to admit the ten waiting States simply on the adoption of that amendment." This is the opiof the extremists, and everybody knows that it is worth practically nothing. We ask the Southern States whether the opposition of the radicals is not one of the strongest arguments to induce them to ratify the amendment at once? They have been shown that the Constitutions amendment was adopted in Congress against the wishes of the radicals; they have seen that General Grant approves it; they have been in-formed that the delegation from the Cleveland Convention of soldiers and sailors endorsed it in their address to the President, and they have noticed that the Pittsburg Convention of sol-diers and sailors embodied it in their platform, and forced Major-General Butler to report it, in spite of his recent ill-disguised hostility to so oncific a measure.

prompt admission of Tennessee has proved to them that a State has only to ratify the amendment to be at once received into the Union. Here, then, is a plan of immediate restoration which is sanct oned by all the true riends of the south and opposed by all her enenies. Why should it not be accepted? W do the Southern States he sitate and delay? t barder to be deprived of a few representatives in Congress by denying the negroes the franchise than to be deprived of representation altogether? Is it more grievous to give votes to the negroes, if that alternative be chosen, than to keep all the white men from the ballot-box? Will the South accept the best attainable terms as condensed in this amendment, or will the blood and burning policy of Parson Brownlow be preferred by Southern statesmen?

We tell the South that the conservative peo ple of the North are a unit upon this amendment. It has been ratified by the Legislature of New Jersey, which is the only State about whose ratification there had been any doubt. In excluding leading Rebels from office, and lorever repudiating the Rebel debt, it gives just those guarantees for our future peace and security that the North inexorably demands. Its provisions in regard to the apportionment of representation affects the Northern States as well as the Southern. If we accept it, why cannot the South? The time has passed when Northern voters will submit to see the negro counted as a man or three-fifths of a man when Representatives are apportioned, but treated as a nonentity when the votes are taken. One theory or the other must be abandoned. Either the negro must not be counted, or he must vote. We should like to hear a single reasonable argument against the justice or this provision. The South ought to be willing to accept it even if it were not a condition of re-

Under the circumstances it is not only a condition, but it is the best attainable condition. It the Southern people wait for something better they will be torced to take something worse, Let them refuse this amendment, which leaves the question of negro suffrage with the States and the next move of the radicals will be to force upon them unconditional negro suffrage with the alternative of continued exclusion, or perhaps the bayonet. The South was not satisfied with the Missouri compromise. The same error must not be repeated now. In case a more radical Congress is elected this fall, the mild terms of the Constitutional amendment will be superseded by more harsh conditions, and then what can the South do but submit?

There can be no second rebellion, and we no longer care for the bombast and braggadocia that used to affright our politicians. But if the Southern States ratify this amendment their representatives will be at once admitted to their On the one side are incalculable evils; on the other a palpable advantage. The enemies of the South are those who urge the rejection of the amendment; the genuine friends of South urge the acceptance of the best attain-What will the South decide to do? Her fare is in her own hands.

The Democratic Party.

From the Times. "The Times of yesterday chants a requiem over the Democratic party, most plaintive in tone, but most sad y out of time. In the cou se of its retreat from the truly national and patriotic position which it took up after the Philade phia Convention, that journal repeats most of the meaningles-abuse of Democrats which it indulged in during the war. There is the same careless contounding of government with administration, the same foolish charge of sympathy with the Rebilion the same groundless accusation of partiality towards slavery Can the Times be in earnest in declaring the Demo-cratic party to be, or to have ever been, 'void of the spirit of progress, of reform, and of political liberty?' All gits traditions before the war areathe that spirit. All its course during the war was inspired by the passion for legitimate progress, for regulated clorm, for true and constitutional freedom. In its law-abiding position and its resolute action now, is to be found the only hope of real Union and na-tional safety. What does it avail to taunt that great party with the mistakes of those more extravagant and erring spirits' whom, as an organization, it never followed nor avowed? Will the dauger which the Times deplores, 'from the fanatical passions of extreme and reckless men' among the Republicans, be conjured away by all that stale railing against their opponents, which was exposed and derided even during the heat of the Rebellion? If the Times cannot find research and the Rebellion? find reasons or courage to meet the arguments of the radicals, it takes refuge in a saie but trival partime by raising old ghosts of Demorate mischef, for the sake of scolding them with spells as old and as empty."—World.

The "old ghosts of Democratic mischief" will not "down" for anybody's scolding. They will haunt the Democratic party and push its leaders from their stools for many a long day to come. The evil that political parties do lives after them; and the course pursued by the Democratic party, as a political organization, during the Rebellion, will no more be torgotten than was the Hartford Convention forgotten after the war of 1812. It is idle to claim that the party did not oppose the Government but only the Adminstration-that it was not aiding the Rebellion but only "regulating" the war waged against it. The people, in such emergencies, draw no nice listinctions. They see the existence of the nation at stake and the Government fighting to preserve it-those who help the Government are

its iriends—those who do not are its foes That is their record, and they must abide by it The record of the Democratic party during the war is disloyal and unpatriotic. We speak not of individuals, but the party in its organized action, Its conventions, State and Nationalthe action of its representatives—the speeches of its office-holders and candidates, the language of its orators and its presses, were all calculated and intended to embarrass and cripple the Government-not to aid, support, and strengthen it-in its life and death struggle. The Democratic party opposed the draft. It denounced the arrest and imprisonment of spies and sympa thizers with treason in the North. It made itself everywhere the champion and defender of those who, in the loyal States, sought to aid and comfort to the Rebeis in South. Vallandigham, in Ohio, was arrested, tried, and punished for dissuading soldiers from enlisting, for encouraging desertions, and for other flagrant violations of the law, perpetrated in aid of the Rebellion; and the Democratic narty of that State not only denounced his punishment as an act of tyranny, but made him the Democratic candidate for Governor— thus distinctly esponsing and indorsing his Governor Seymour, in this acts as their own. State, wrote a letter declaring, in substance, that it was more important to put down the Government for its treatment of Vallandigham, than to put down the Rebellion; and the Demo-

cratic party made him their Governor. So it

practically and substantially in aid of the Rebellion.

We are quite willing to concede that the Democratic party sees its error now, and would gladly retrieve it. It began to repent immediately after the war was closed, and tried to change its ground. The resolutions adopted at the Democratic State Convention last year were in the main sound and patriotic—such as com-manded the assent of Union men. But instead of acting with Union men, they clung to their own organization and strove resolutely to per-petuate their party power. At Philadelphia they went a step further, and while accepting a declaration of principles in substantial harmony with the action of the Union party during the war, professed a willingness to lay aside all party projects, and join, under new auspices and a new organization, with men of all parties to carry those principles into practical effect. But no sooner did the State Convention meet than the old party flag was run up, the old party leaders took command, and the old craft, with all sail set, made straight for the old Democratic port. The Convention had not a thought beyond party success and the plunder to be thus

people understand this game and intend to block it. They do not mean to replace the Democratic party in power. They will not re-ward it for its disloyalty, nor will they trust it with interests to which in the past it has proved so faithless. It is with them not a question of argument, but of confidence. They care nothing tor Democratic resolutions, speeches, profes sions, or promises-they will not trust the De-

ocratic party.

The World objects to an impeachment of the professions, spirit, and temper of the Democratic party. But in what single instance has that party made itself the champion of any great re-form? When has it favored measures for purtying society of its evils-for remedying great and flagrant wrongs-for educating, assisting, and elevating the ignorant, the poor, and the degraded? For a long series of years the Democratte party has had absolute and undisputed sway in this city: in what beneficent statutes or institutions do we find the monument of its regard for the morals, the manners, or the peace and good order of this great community? What has it done to protect society against drunkenness, profligacy, crime, vice, and misery in

Is it not notorious that every effort made by those most solicitous for the public welfare, for the suppression of vice and immorality, meets its most tormidable foe in the Democratic party The city strongled for years against that party to secure a decent police department. It was in the teeth of its most strengous host lity that we secured a commission to protect newly landed emigrants from wholesale robbery, and at the present time the Democratic party is putting forth all its energies to break down the Heatth Board and the Excise Commission, by which alone we have any hope of protecting the community against the most fearful evils, physical and moral, by which great societies are ever

We certa nly do not missfate the case when we say that the Democratic party, in its organized political action, is the inveterate foe of all moral and social progress and elevation. It seeks always to use the vices of men, not to cure them. It panders to the worst appetites and passions, because it can make them minister to its advantage. And in its political action, its impulses have been equally aften to the spirit of freedom. Its temper towards the colored race has always been narrow, illiberal, and cruel—in sympathy with their oppressors, never with these sections. never with those who have sought their ele vation and advancement In a word, the Democratic party has never sought anything higher or better than its own aggrandizement. It has never yielded to the impulses of philanthropy, which, however mistaken they may sometimes be, are always pobler than calculations of selfish advantage, as springs and motives of public

The Democratic party has fallen behind the pirit and temper of the age. It has lost the confidence of the intelligent, public-spirited, aspring loyalty of the nation. And so long as it clugs to its old organization and its old traions, it will find that this confi never be regained.

Personalities in Politics.

From the Nation. We have received from friendly sources letters, couched not always in respectfut language, representing the error and even the sinfulness of our occasional strictures on men who represent ideas which we ourselves earnestly advocate, and are champions of causes which we with them hold dear. Without going into a detailed defense of our own criticisms, which might be unsatisfactory to our correspondents, we will attempt to state the principle we have adopted for our guidance, and have tried, possibly without invariable or absolute success, to act on. In this country, where there is no standard of political opinion fixed by authority, supported by government, or made venerable by tradition, but where opinion, even on primary questions, is, by means of debate and discussion, continually a-making, it is of first moment that all political and social doctrines should be tried on their merits by rational criticism. The party press, especially in party time, cannot be expected to do this, for it is engaged in working up particular cases, in meeting special emergencies and in as-ailing or detending immediate points.

It must, therefore, sink the fundamental to some degree in the transient; must not be too nice in distinctions or over-fine in qualineations; and, having to carry an issue, must bring up at the moment ail the forces within reach, though in doing so it weaken for the time the strength of important posts. Hence it becomes the more urgent outy of the independent press to look after these prime interests, to take ideas at their essential value, to try principles by their weight in the scales of judgment, to winnow the wheat from the chaft with which party discussions cover the mental surface of the time, and to contribute something, week by week, to the sum of rational reliet on which the community must live and grow, if it is to live and grow ac cording to the law of its civilization. The office of clear, candid, comprehensive, independent criticism, as judicial as it is possible to make it, cannot be held in too high esteem. If we cannot have it, we cannot have well-grounded political convictions, but shall be torn up from the roots by every convulsion of party passion.

It is admitted that such criticism of principles cannot be carried on without some criticism of the men who represent and maintain them. Personalities are necessarily involved in our politics, for it is often extremely difficult to separate ideas from the peculiarities of the men who initiate or sustain them. Those pecuitarities are not seldom an element in the com-position of the ideas, so that we are unable to decide what a doctrine is worth till we have rendered account of the characteristics of its exponents, in so far as they are involved in the question at issue. If Mr. Wendell Phillips assumes an air of infallibility not always justified by the facts or arguments at his command no personal admiration of him should tempt a fair mind to put that feature out of view. Mr. Thaddeus Stevens allows a passionate enthu siasm to mislead his judgment in a case of vital concern, justice demands that such an elemen should be noted and allowed for.

If Mr. Charles Sumner permits his convictions to run into dogmatism, and lends the undue torce of a vehement temper to the momentum of his argument, the truth is more than Mr Sumuer; and he would be the last to desire that a respect for his character, ability, or magnificent service should blind any one to the mis coler that might follow an unnoticed flaw in his mental constitution. It Mr. Horace Greeley, in the heat of a momentous canvass, gives undue license to his extraordinary power as a partisan writer, and mixes too much polemical animus with his discussions, it is but fair that the public should understand that too, and should learn to discriminate between the arguments of the thinker and the "points" of the political

If it be urged that in this way we injure the influence of the ablest and noblest leaders, we

was everywhere. The Democratic party reply that our purpose is to estimate that influ-throughout the North, in all its party action, took ground against the Government, and dimensions. No leader should have an unduc influence through the force of his personal magnetism; no man should have an illegitumate influence through the trick of his talent; no man, on one side or the other, should enjoy an influence through his weaknesses or defects which he could not exert through his powers and virtues; and if the former conceal, displace, or counteract the latter, the public should be saved from such a mislortune by timely criticism. The men we have mentioned will always exert, through their ability, a merited and mighty influence, which the pruning-knife of criticism will, instead of impairing, help to make sound and wholesome for permanent use. Though even of such influence the educators of the people should be reasonably jealous, for just so ar as it obtains sway it interferes with the propendent investigation of opinions.

But this criticiem of personal qualifications that we advocate as necessary to the attainment of correct judgments is a very different thing from the criticism of private character that i resorted to for the compassing of party ends. That is as unjustifiable as the other is indis-pensable. The moral character of a man is rarely implicated directly, or within the scope of our observation, in his political or social opinions, and we hold it to be as unwise as it is infair, unkind, and uncharitable to confound questions of opinion with questions of purpose, miention, or motive. To say that a change of policy implies a change of heart; that the abandonment of a party on a temporary issue is equivalent to the desertion of a great moral principle; that a mistake is a fall, and a blunder an apostasy; to call a man a trattor, hypo-crite, fool, knave, abandoned villain, and whelp of sin because he does not repeat the party creed word for word, or tread in file the bee line of party tactics, or coasent to swallow the smallest grain of inference prescribed by the party physicians—is one of those outrageous absurdities which honest men cannot abide patiently; and the habit, so common as to be invariable among us, of abscribing baseness, meanness, avarice, cunning, ambition, and whatever other turpitude can be imagined—or, in default of turpitude idiocy, lunacy, softening of the brain-not to political opponents merely, but to those who are but remotely suspected of being political opponents, calls for the severest condemnation of right-minded men. No cause deserves to thrive that has recourse to personal slander and random vituperation. No cause can be intelligently advocated on those terms. A man's motives are his own. Till he chooses to declare them, we are bound to give him credit or good ones. No party monopolizes character. The purest men-John Newton, for instance, or as Casas - have committed terrible blunders, and still have remained pure men. The most selfish men have been saved from binders by their astuteness, but have been base men still. We have our own deliberate opinion of Andrew Johnson as a statesnan, administrator, politician, thinker, orator, and it is not a high one, as all our reader know. Indeed, we may say, it could not well e made lower. Still, as a man, we believe him to be honest in deeming himself a true lover of the Union, a firm defender of the Constitution, a loyal friend of republican liberty, a champion of popular rights. To call him a Judas, a Mephistopheles, a "besotted sans-culotte," helps to no explanation of his position; that is sufficiently accounted for by his temperament, birth, ducation, experience as a Tennesseean. That ne is limited, coarse, passionate, aggressive, stubborn, fanatical, all can see, and all can understand why he cannot be anything else. That s our misfertune, but it is not his sin. To say , is simply to say what his antecedents justify in saying; but it is not to asperse his motives or to blacken his character. His character may be as good as any man's under his conditions.

It we may analyze Mr. Johnson without calumniating him, and denounce his policy without dooming him to the traitor's hell, how such more easily can we do so in the case of Mr. Beecher, whose antecedents are so different, whose temperament is so much finer, whose haracter is cast in so much grander mould, whose history has been written in such lumi-non-letters, whose career has been so magnid-cent as preacher, thinker, reformer, man, whose sympathies have been so true, whose p have been so steadtast, whose words have been so outspoken, so unequivocal, so consistent, on all the great issues of the generation. We have said before, and we say again, that in our judg ment he has committed a grave mistake, most unfortunate and mischievous to himself and to the country. He is virtually giving aid and comfort to his old enemies, and is lending the immense weight of his name, we will not say of his character, to the cause which he has been fighting grandly for twenty-five Shall we declare, then, that he is a "ialse clergyman," that "he belongs to that class of ministers who suppose that in order to be a politician it is advisable to turn their backs on morals and religion," that "he is a foolish preacher who wishes to make out a case," that "he is not so shallow that he altogether forgets to be knavish. that in discussing the condition of the freed-men, he shows 'the extreme of heartlessness and baseness?" That were a poor compliment to human nature. Then history goes for nothing, and character goes for nothing; the record of a lifetime may be blotted by the misconception an hour; a foolish word is to weigh a whole career of deeds; and a splendid one, built up on earnestness, devotion, and consecrated ability, is to be blackened and ruined by a burried letter. What is the use of nasing a character if the venom of partisan de raction can spoil it in a day, if years of strengous life are not good again t the foolish inter-

It is an insult to intelligence to say that Mr. Seecher's most unfortunate position can only be explained on the theory of his personal infi-ielity to his convictions. No doubt a man of is influence has been sought by men of the President's party, whose ingenious representa-tions had a momentary effect on a mind natu-rally disposed to listen to all sides of an argument, jealous of narrowness, on its guard against us own bias, and prone to give generous interpretations to opposing views. Then, again, hir. Beecher is rather a man of impulse han a man of intellect, a poet rather than a statesman, or politican, or philosopher. His opinions no more contain his feelings than his tings contain his opinions. Such men always naulge in vagaries from the excess of their en husiasm; they are fond of straying off into side-paths, under the lead of a fancy; but the very requency of their aberrations proves that they are sure of finding the nigh road at any moment. but whether this be so or not, it is not necessaary, and if it is not necessary it is not wise, to implicate the character of a powerful man, or of a man not powerful in his political views, especially when political views are shitting their bearings as they do with us. Character is a permanent force, good for all emergencies and needful at all times. We cannot afford to play ast and loose with it; if we do, we miss it in the time of greatest need. The world will not be three months older before these very calumnuaors will wish the calumny had never been utered, will be glad to enthrone the man they slandered in the highest seats of popular regard, and will be as irrational in calling in his personal influence as in calling in his personal influence as they are now in ruling it out. Opintons pass, tactics after, issues are dropped, views dissoive; but it is of the utmost moment that wellearned personal influence should be carefully guarded and cherished: for, whatever besides may be on the wrong side, that is ever on the right. It is the supreme of folly to kill what may nelp a generation in order to secure point

is our position, then, a plain one? For the ake of impartial cruticism, in the interest of ober principles, that questions at issue may be kept well defined and clear, that doctrines may be argued on their merits, that injustice may be avoided, that personal reputation may inscathed and personal honor respected, that the right of free discussion may be maintained inviolate, and that the community may preserve reverence for its great and good men, at the same time that men learn reliance on their own judgments, we enter our protest against the prevalent introduction sonalities into politics. If our politics sonables into politics. If our politics are ever to become noble, the practice must be abandoned. Sensitive men, and the most ser

sitive men are apt to be the finest, will shrink from the struggle with bullies and bruisers, and will leave the conduct of public affairs to the mob of unprincipled schemers. Already the habitual resort to personal vituperation ope-rates as a terror to fair mindedness, as a bounty on hypocrise, as a bribe to apostasy; for none but the best can face it, and the best will not choose to face it. Every man has an interest n the politics of this country. Every good man has a sacred interest in their nobleness, and has a sacred interest in their most have poli-they who make it their profession to have poli-they who make it their profession to have poliics in their especial charge should see to it that the good men who are interested in politics have weight according to their goodness, and that good men who ar e not interested become so.

The White Feather, From the Independent

The National Committee of the Republican party have issued an address to the American eogle, "The decree of a council," said Cotton Mather, "hath no more force than there is force in the reason of it." With sorrow, we pronounce the Committee's address repugnant to the moral ense of those American citizens who are inflexibly determined not to compromise impartial suffrage. This most solemn of reasons, therefore, controuts the Committee's address with condemuation. The country is in too critical a condition, the safety of Southern lovalists is too greatly imperilled, the peace and order of the fature are too gravely threatened, to permit this address, so inadequate to the present situation, to go forth as representing, as pledging, and particularly as binding the radical party. God grant that the great party of liberty shall prove braver than its half-hearted leaders!

Fellow-countrymen, let us consider. For eighteen months the daily topic of men's talk has been the reconstruction of the Union. Unanimity of opinion does not prevail. Opposing plans divide the nation into opposing parties, and subdivide parties into opposing sec-tions. The Republican party is divided between the advocates of readmission without securing the negro's political rights, and the advocate of readmission only after the guarantee of impartial suffrage. At the first sound of the trumpet in this war of debate, we took our place under the banner of equal rights. We joined the cause not to desert it, not to betray it, not to compromise it, but to light for it till the vice

It is a sacred cause: the cause of liberty and ustice; the cause of honor, magnanimity, and enarity; the cause of peace and good-will. noblest men of the nation are its champions the noblest women are petitioners to heaven for benediction upon it. In New England and on the prairies, bereaved (amilies, who are mourning with a proud griet over slain soldiers of liberty, recoil in their heart of hearts at any ess ample fruition of the war than a settlement ust, sale, and final. That settlement must include the political equality of American citizens, without questioning God's wisdom in varying the colors of "the human face divine." Planting their feet on the one true corner-stone of reconstruction, the radical party are not to be driven from it, not to be persuaded from it,

not to be ensuared from it.

They may, or may not, be a majority of the oyal North; the question of numbers remains to be settled by trial; but, whether they prove a majority or minority, they are not made of the cowards, and they will never surrender. Seeing their opportunity, they mean to seize it; knowing their strength, they mean to exercise it; believing in their cause, they mean to win it. At this moment the sky of promise bright with a sacred light, wherein cern anew the golden emblem, "By this sign

This journal and its legion of friends-whom may God bless! -having taken this position the beginning, are resolved to maintain it to the end. Therefore, when the National Com-mittee of the Republican party unroll their offi ial scroll, asking us to consent to a compromise of principle, asking us to pledge the Republican vote of next Rovember to a reconstruction on the madequate basis of the pending amendment. asking us to leave the negro's political rights but undemanded we can only exclaim, Heaven forbid! The radical party, both North and South, regards the pendamendment as a proper measure—a measure which it advocates with pleasure and earnestness-but it regards it as no more adapted to a basis of reconstruction than would be bill, or a fishery treaty, or a neutrality law,

The mere amendment will not "reconstruct anything; it will leave things as they are. It will not alter, one whit, the present relation of the white Rebet to the black lovalist. It holds out a faint and far off temptation to entranchise the blacks, just as the Constitution of 1789 held out, through its three-ufths clause, a taint and far-off temptation to abolish slavery. Slavery was not abolished under the mild inducace of temptation, but under the strong influence of compulsion; and the negro's entranchisement will not be achieved by such temptation, but by such compulsion. Accordingly, the radica North and South, white and black, can assent to no reconstruction short of impartial suffrage.

Is Congress already committed to a less per-fect plan? Not at all. Congress is not committed for or against impartial suffrage. It has not tied its hands against the future. It is free to act as the emergency may require. It, pext winter, it shall choose to make impartial sut trage the condition of restoration, it can do so, and Christian souls will cry Amen! We know personally every prominent member of Con-gress, and we know that the leaders do not mean to admit the unadmitted States on the mere adoption of the amendment. Moreover, we know personally the leading radicals of the Republican party outside of Congress, and we know that they have no intention of making the amendment the final measure of admission To say, therefore, as the National Committee say, that on condition or adopting the amend ment, as Tennessee adopted it, "the door stands invitingly open" for the ten other States, s to make a promise to the ear to break it to the hope. There is a door, however, that does "stand invitingly open;" and whenever these States shall choose to enter through it they will be received with shouts, thanksgivings, and benedictions; it is the golden gate of impartial

Is it asked, Why then was Tennessee admitted on the basis of the amendment? In the first place, Tennossee ought not to have been admit ted on such a basis; her admission was a min-gled crime and blunder. But the apology which Congress made for her admission was that her attitude was exceptional-that her case was not to be a precedent for the ten other States. Already the admission of Tennessee without impartial suffrage proves the peril of admitting any of the other States except on this only safe condition. Her Legislature is about to remedy the aeticiency of Congress, by enacting mpartial suffrage at the next session. The l'ennesseems who asked for the admission of their State without impartial suffrage, said at Philadelphia that no remaining State of the ten could be safely admitted except with this guar-

We therefore repeat that Congress is not pledged, either by any existing offer of terms to the unreconstructed States, or by the precedent of Tennessee, to make the Constitutions amendment the basis of restoration. Even the New York Times, of Monday, September 24, icknowledges this fact. It says:—
"The adoption or rejection of the amendment

has nothing whatever to do, as the law now stands, with the admission or rejection of members from the Southern States. A bill providing or their admission on condition of its adoption was rejected by the House, and even if every Southern State should ratify the amendment to-morrow, Congress has not pledged itself in thereupon to admit their representanny way tives in Congress.

This is true. To say, therefore, with the Syra cuse Republican Convention, or with the address of the National Republican Committee, that ongress will restore the ten waiting States these States adopt the amendment, is to misre present the Issue.

Admirable is the National Committee's logic

compact and iron-bound, to prove the power of

Congress over the question of reconstruction

We joyfully assent to the argument. But, if Congress has an absolute right to dictate the basis of reconstruction, then what right has the National Committee to pledge and bind Con-gress in advance? Is Congress, after rejecting the dictation of the President, to submit to the dictation of the National Committee? In the name of the radical party, whose heart we know and who voice we speak, we repudiate the Com-mittee's pledge to the Robels as wholly unauthorized, invalid, and votd.

Look at the following passage from the Com-

"But, say some, 'this section of the pending amendment is designed to coerce the South into according suffrage to her blacks.' Not so, we reply; but only to notify her ruting caste that we will no longer bride them to keep their blacks in serfdom. An aristocracy rarely surrenders its privileges, no matter how oppressive, from abstract decorior to instite. abstract devotion to justice and right. It must have cogent, palpable reasons for so doing. We say, therefore, to South Carolina:—'If you persistently restrict all power to your 100,000 whites, we must must that these no longer balance, in Congress and the choice of President, 700,000 Northern white framers, but only 200,000. Northern white freemen, but only 300,000. you keep your blacks evermore in seridom, it must not be because we tempted you so to do, and rewarded you for so dome.'"

Can anything be more humiliating than to see

be National Committee of the Republican party thus humbly kneeling at the feet of the "arisceracy" of the South? Do we employ a National Committee for the purpose of finding arguments against "coercing" the South? Has the Republican party no higher duty to the negro than simply to "notify the ruling caste that we will no longer bribe them to keep their blacks in serfdom?" Is the Republican party keeping its solemn pledge to its four million allies by now saying to their former masters, "Ir you keep your blacks evermore in seridom, t must not be because we tempted you to do so" If the negro were a white man, instead of a black, the National Committee would never have thought of thus degrading him below the level of a Rebel.

Coercing the South, forsooth! Did we not coerce the South into abrogating the ordinances of secession? Did we not coerce the South into epud ating the Rebei debt? Did we not coerce the South into ratifying the probibitory amendment? Without coercion, would the south have done these things? No. Neither, without coercion, will the South enact impartial suffrage. Look at it! This committee tanks that, in order to achieve impartial suffrage, we ought not to coerce, but bribe, the South! history say of the victorious war party of the North, it, after executing a policy of coercion towards secession, coercion towards the Rebel debt, coercion towards the prohibitory amendment, it attempted only a policy of bribery towards the negro? Which is of greater consesence in God's sight, the repudiation of the Rebel debt or the cufranchisement of the seemes of Are millions of citizens of less conse-

puence than millions of deliars? Is money of nore worth than man? Have the National

Committee forgotten how our Lord said that

two sparrows are sold for a farthing; but that men are of more value than many sparrows? If the only issue of the tall campaign is to ect such Republicans as will make the pending amenoment the condition of restoration, why then is it needful that only Republicans and not Den ocrats should be chosen? Multitudes of Democrats would gladly be elected to Congress on a pledge to make the amendment the ulti-matum to the South. This is the New York Herald's ground. This is the ground of all those Democrats who are secretly groaning over President Johnson and his speeches. The great duty of the fall is to elect Republicans-nay, to elect the most radical of Republicans -and why? Because the nation needs, and means to have Congress staunch and immovable for equal The unanimous appeal of the Southern ights. oyalists at Philadelphia, representing the whole en unreconstructed States, speaks with a pathos

that ought to melt all hearts:—
"We declare that there can be no security for us or our children—there can be no safety for the country against the fell spirit of slavery now organized in the form of serfdom—unless the Government, by national and appropriate legislation, enforced by national authority. shall conter on every citizen in the States we sent the American birthright of impart uffrage and equality before the law. This is he one all-sufficient remedy."

Are not these words solemn, noble, and just? Do not they far outshine the tarnished procla-mation of the National Committee? Let the Republican party ask itself one thoughtful question:-Ought we to reconstruct the ten remainng States so as to protect, or so as to destroy, the lives, property, and happiness of their loyal people? But if these ten States are to be reconstructed in the interest of loyalty, instead of treasen, then let the unantmous demand of the Southern loyalists take the place of the less worthy appeal of the National Committee. If, tter our pleasant fortune of a week's sojourn at Philadelphia with the noble representatives of the ten unreconstructed States, during which se learned their purposes and gauged their cearts, we had come home only to strike hands with the policy of the National Committee-a olicy which the Southern loyalists came to the North to plead against as totally inadequate to heir needs-we should account ourselves little less than treacherous to the best tried and most suffering triends of this republic.

We say nothing in criticism of the good men sho have signed the National Committee's address. Some of these signers are enshrined in our immost heart-men whom we honor and revere. How these lovers or justice can assent such a policy of compromise is undoubtedly explained and excused to their own minds, if not to ours. Horace Greeiev gave to this address his revision and his name; but not his teart. His heart is hungry for justice, and craves more than the Committee's husk. Lieutenant-Governor Clatin, of Massachusetts, signed it; but his honored name is almost a ynomyn for equal rights. Senator Fowler, of lennessee, signed it: but we well know that offrage. It is with heaviness of spirit that we and so many clear-sighted men holding back half their thoughts in a time when the country so urgently needs to hear every voice hat can speak for impartial suffrage. Will the Republican party be injered by plain speech? No; it will be helped. But, whether helped or hindered, are we to give up to party what was meant for mankind? "Duties are ours," aid old Philip Henry, "the result is God's." The duty of the Republican party is to reject the pledge made by the National Committee. The result may be salely left to the Great Dis-poser of events, "who doeth all things well," th! ye of little faith! Never were thirsty pit-grims so willing to be led to a fountain of living waters, as the radical party of this nation are now willing to be let to the safe ground of im-partial justice. Therefore hear the voice of the Lord:— Speak to the calldren of Israel, that they go forward.

FERTILIZERS.

A M MONIATED PHOSPHATE A CONCENTRATED FERTILIZER.

This preparation contains Fure Ground Bone and the pest Fertilizing Salts known to agricultural chemistry. combined in such a manner as to develop their productive properties only when used on the sail. Price \$60 per ton. For sale at the manufacturers' depots.

No. 724 MARKET Street, Philadelphia, No. 8 BURLING SLIP, New York.

WILLIAM ELLIS & CO.

BAUGH'S RAW BONE

SUPER-PHOSPHATE OF LIME

The great Fertilizer for all crops. Quicz in its action and permanent in its effects. Established over tweive years.

Desires supplied by the cargo direct from the whars of the manuscriery, on liberal terms.

Manufactured only by BAUGH & SONS,

Office No. 10 South DELAWARE Avenu-