

SPRIT OF THE PIRATES

EDITORIAL OPINIONS OF THE LEADING JOURNALS UPON CURRENT TOPICS—COMPILED EVERY DAY FOR THE EVENING TELEGRAPH.

The Rats Gnawing.

From the N. Y. Tribune. The first instinct of the rats just before they leave the sinking ship is to get into the pantry and gorge themselves. We have such a phenomenon in Washington now. The Administration rats have figured out just five hundred and fifty-five days of feeding, excluding impeachment chances, which, to say the least, are not so bad as when Congress adjourned. If they were even sure of five hundred and fifty-five days, it would be well enough, but they are not very certain of more than a hundred. So they assail the Treasury with vindictive and hungry earnestness. Uncle Sam's oaken chest was never so persistently gnawed. They have clambered around it, over it, up the sides, across the ends, along the top, trying every bolt, stove, and lock. They have snugged at Mr. McCulloch with venomous energy. If they could drive him away the box would be easy prey; but the whacks of his cudgel are too severe, and rats have whackable backs. Grant is as bad in the War Office.

The Indian claims, the cotton claims, the soldiers' bounty claims—the claims for everything but honest work—that Grant won't settle are innumerable; and so the rats gnaw, and scratch, and bite, and snarl at the acting Secretary. Even Randall, who, with all his faults, is honest, and between whom and Jerry Black is said to be a brooding row, on account of certain claims that Randall does not "see," is being pursued by the rats.

Old Thad Stevens a Revolutionist.

From the N. Y. Herald. If any additional evidence was requisite to prove that old Thad Stevens is a revolutionist, it would be supplied by his letter published in Wednesday's Herald. In this letter he openly avows himself as a revolutionist by declaring that he and his sympathizers in Congress were all acting outside of the Constitution, which they had repudiated, "else our whole work of reconstruction," he adds, "was usurpation." Thad Stevens is, in fact, the Robespierre of the revolution through which we are passing. He has adopted the plan of the Jacobin party which Robespierre led to condemn the King and demand his death. Robespierre declined his nomination as presiding judge of the revolutionary tribunal which he caused to be organized "for the summary trial of the enemies of liberty;" and Thad Stevens, although from different motives, opposed the impeachment of President Johnson. After the execution of the King, Robespierre proposed the decree investing the revolutionary tribunal "with executive powers above the Convention." He was elected a member of what was called the Committee of General Security, an auxiliary of the Committee of Public Safety. Thad Stevens did his best to transfer the executive authority from the President of the United States to Congress, and was the soul of the Reconstruction Committee, to which the policy of Congress is due. He would fain have made that committee the ruling power of the land. Briefly, he is the American Robespierre. But he is a clever Robespierre, a witty and good-tempered Robespierre, a Robespierre that we can get along with, despite his pet theory of "a mild confiscation," far better than with such a Robespierre as either Wendell Phillips or Greeley or Sumner would make. We are glad to hear that he has recovered sufficiently from his recent illness to undertake a tour to the upper lakes. We don't want him to die for at least five years yet to come. Let him return to Congress invigorated in health, to "fight it out" on his peculiar line, and see to what result his pet theories will lead him and his colleagues of the revolutionary party. We shall see if he will yet force "the man at the other end of the avenue" to quit the White House, reopen his tailor's shop in Tennessee, and make suits of clothes for new Presidential candidates.

Grant.

From the N. Y. Tribune. Some friends of whom we respect, and a small number of insectivorous newspapers whom we do not, are very angry with the Tribune for doubting General Grant. Well, we claim the right to doubt anybody whose record is not so clear that there can be no mistake. If General Grant put himself under suspicion, the fault was his own. We certainly had no desire to do him injustice. On the contrary, we feel we deserve the credit of inducing General Grant to define his position. Our article challenging the Times was written on August 15. The General wrote his Sheridan letter on the 17th, animated, no doubt, by a desire to give the people the information that was wanted. In the agony of the war, when we criticized President Lincoln for not urging emancipation, he replied by writing a similar letter. If we remember rightly, these insectivorous creatures were horrified because we labored to make Mr. Lincoln proclaim emancipation. Mr. Lincoln and General Grant made their responses because they were actuated by a desire to answer public opinion, and showed their respect to the power of independent journalism, which, in a measure, accounts for their great success.

We like General Grant's letter about Sheridan. We honor him for having written it. We want Grant to be with us; so essentially with us that we can lean upon his strong right arm. We believe his heart is right; but he has himself to dread more than any other influence. He has been too easy with the President, too good natured, too anxious to please, and so has been betrayed into false positions, to the detriment of the general welfare. We regret that he has consented to the removal of Sickles, for there is an important principle involved in this case quite as deeply as that of Sheridan. If he has the right to object to the removal of Sickles, he has the right to object to the removal of Sheridan, and all the other District Commanders. This is no mere technical quarrel about the wording of an order. It is a conflict of fundamental principles. Congress has imposed upon the General of the Army the responsibility of seeing that the Reconstruction laws are faithfully executed in the spirit in which they were framed. General Grant cannot throw off that responsibility

upon Mr. Johnson. It is not enough for him to place himself upon Federal as an enemy of the President's policy. He has a strict duty to discharge towards the people who have confided to him his high trust. It is time for him now to be stern. He should know that the President means war, and that he cannot escape a sublime responsibility. We do not know how far the President will lead us; but with Grant vigilant, resolute, and true, he cannot lead us very far.

Public Opinion King.

From the N. Y. Church Union. Andrew Johnson abdicated the office of President of the United States the day that he telegraphed to Mayor Munros, of New Orleans, whatever stands recorded in his work of participation in the business of the murderer of the martyr Dostie. Since that time he has been busy repenting that edict of the abdication, and the American people have been equally vigilant lest he should take steps to get back again to his seat. A few days since he screamed it into the ears of a still doubtful people, who were more than half willing to receive him back—"I do hereby, by the power in me vested as the President of the United States (not remove Secretary Stanton, nor propose to remove the valorous and incorruptible Sheridan) but abdicate." This is the meaning of his proclamation and most uproariously do the people shout, "Amen."

Now the only question is, in the premises—Do the people desire this man to rule over them? Judging from the terrific "aman" which went up all over the land a few days ago, we should think even that Crazy Carlyle would have heard "The everlasting No." In short, it is getting to be a pretty well settled conviction of the American people that they do not want this man to rule over them. Certainly, of all the foolish Presidents of the United States, Mr. Johnson will rank as the prince of fools. Van Buren was dishonest, but he was composed terms. Pierce was a craven, but he kept his party in power. Buchanan was a dotard, and yet his devotion to conservatism was, doubtless, sincere and disinterested. Andrew Johnson is a naughty boy who starves himself to spite his mother. He is an old crow which believes the South when it calls him a beautiful bird and a heavenly songster, and drops his morsel of meat for the fox Seward to devour.

We do not, therefore, take fright as some do at the latest folly of this imbecile exile. We have no fears so long as wisdom seems to have been dethroned too. The people are King.

General Grant in Civil Life.

From the N. Y. Independent. General Grant (we regret to say) appears to have become a cat's-paw of the President. If, instead of winning a seat in the Cabinet, he had lost a battle in the field, although he might thereby have damaged his country more, he would have damaged his reputation less than he has now done. In view of his eminent services (which all the world applauds), and in view of his practical common sense (which he possesses in an eminent degree), the Republican party has sought, with the friendliest feelings, to find some valid excuse for his present attitude towards the President and the nation; but it still seeks in vain. Not to judge of his motives (which are unquestionably upright), he has astonished the Republican party by apparently countenancing the treacherous policy of the President at a moment when no good Republican could be found to support it.

To give the new Secretary of War the benefit of the most favorable supposition, we presume that he does not mean by his recent action to signify his approval of the President's nefarious plans. But why does he make himself accessory to these nefarious plans? A military officer is bound to obey the military orders of his military superior; but no man, whether in military or civil life, is compelled to be a Cabinet minister against his own free will. It is not through voluntary acquiescence as a soldier, but through voluntary acquiescence as a citizen, that General Grant has taken a seat on the council-board of Andrew Johnson. He would have been supreme folly in the President to order General Grant to become what the official documents style him—"Secretary of War ad interim." The President had no more right to order him to such a duty than to order him to be a Professor in Yale College, or to be the Attorney-General. If General Grant had not chosen to accept the proffered portfolio, his simple refusal of it would have put an end to the ingenious, and now successful attempt to cover the President's evil deeds with General Grant's good name. The people know that "the Secretary ad interim" was just as free to decline as to accept. They would have applauded his declination; they regret his acceptance.

Once General Grant consented to accompany the President on a tour of billingsgate from one end of the country to the other. Now he consents to accompany the President, not in a succession of foul words, but of fouler acts. The first two of these acts, the removal of Mr. Stanton and of General Sheridan, apparently reflect upon General Grant something more than the sufficient discredit which he borrows from each shares with the President. With the exception of Abraham Lincoln and General Sherman, it is well known that the two greatest friends and supporters of General Grant, and to whom therefore he ought to be bound by the closest ties of personal gratitude, have been Secretary Stanton and General Sheridan. Without the good-will and cooperation of these two men General Grant might not have become the possessor of his world-wide reputation, but have remained to this day a major-general of the army. In the campaign before Richmond, Stanton was General Grant's right arm; Sheridan was his left. If any two living men ought to be objects of General Grant's gratitude and affection, they are the two men whom he has consented to disgrace.

Of course, we gladly believe that he did not desire to strike a blow at either. On the contrary, we eagerly credit the statement that he "advised" against the suspension of the one, and "protested" against the relief of the other. But why should the first general of the army—a general bearing a reputation which, if not for his own sake, yet for the nation's, should be kept unarmished by any uncharitable or unkindly set—why should he consent to take a purely civil office against the public protest of his rightful occupant, that occupant being at the same time his benefactor and long-tried friend? And why should his first act in an office not justly his own, be the setting of a stigma upon a great soldier who helped his chief to many a victory? Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the removal of Mr. Stanton is not to be viewed simply in the light of an ordinary removal of a Cabinet minister, whose place a President desires to fill with some other man. Congress passed the Tenure of Office bill

primarily with the view of retaining Mr. Stanton in the War Office against the attempt of a treacherous President to get rid of a too loyal war minister. The President's removal of Mr. Stanton was a direct violation of this law—a defiant challenge to Congress. To this offense against Congress, and thereby against the nation, General Grant has unshakably become a party. It cannot be doubted by Mr. Stanton's successor that, if Congress had been in session a fortnight ago (as it ought to have been), Mr. Stanton's removal would not have been permitted; in which case the "Secretary ad interim" would not have enjoyed the honor of a civil office. The Republican party universally desired the retention both of Mr. Stanton and of General Sheridan. Why then has General Grant allowed himself to be used as the instrument of thwarting the will of the loyal party of the country?

Let us say again to avoid the least possible misunderstanding, that the Republican party is willing to hold General Grant altogether guiltless of any factious spirit in this matter, and altogether purged of any former sympathy with the President's policy. We happen to know that General Grant's views are now thoroughly and radically Republican. In fact, if he were now more of a conservative and less of a radical—if, for instance, he believed in the ballot only for the white man, and not for the black; if he were seeking chiefly to embarrass, rather than to promote, reconstruction on a radical basis—he might then be able to present to the country a more plausible vindication of his recent uncalculated contact with civil affairs than he can now make.

There is but one explanation of General Grant's course; and that is, not sympathy with the President, nor opposition to radical ideas, nor jealousy of Stanton or Sheridan, but simply ineptness in political affairs. General Grant comprehends a military, but not a political situation. He knows how to bear himself in a military, but not in a political emergency. As a soldier, he never (except, perhaps, in some too hilarious moment at the social board) steps down beneath the true loftiness of his rank; but we do not see how a man of moral firmness and generous sympathies could have performed General Grant's recent exploits without violently wounding his own self-respect. We believe that, if the facts were known, it would be found that he suffered a keen pang at the transfer of Sheridan. The fact that a radical officer is put in Sheridan's place, and the fact that Sheridan's radical measures still remain in force, show how thoroughly General Grant must have sympathized with Sheridan's administration in New Orleans.

Now if, before the removal either of Sheridan or Stanton, General Grant had said to the President, "Sir, I am a soldier, ready to obey all military orders which you may as Commander-in-Chief give; but will not accept from your hands a civil office, even though it be a seat in your cabinet; and, more than all, I will not be a party to the public degradation of two of my best friends!"—if General Grant had sent to the President such a message as this, couched in whatever terms of mildness and respect, the whole nation would have been kindled to enthusiasm and delight. Fortunate would it have been for his influence and fame had he pursued such a course, instead of adopting a reprehensible alternative.

His first step in civil affairs now stands forth conspicuously as a step ill-advised—a step to be regretted—a step which his best friends, if they could, would eagerly recall. These friends ought to be warned thereby against luring their great lion into a net of entanglement.

The military reputation of General Grant was not sufficient to make him President. General Grant is a shining light; but his light shines at the head of an army, not at the head of an idea. General Sherman, even at a moment when he was the people's idol, set the people suddenly against him by a maladroit negotiation. Sometimes a military and a political capability are combined in the same person; but the instances are rare. Washington was not only a soldier, but a statesman; but, before he became the hero of the war, he had taken the pains to learn statesmanship in the House of Burgesses, by the side of George Mason and Patrick Henry. General Grant, on the contrary, has lived his whole life outside the realm of political questions and of civil administration. Until the breaking out of the Rebellion, he had only one office in his life, and voted then for James Buchanan for President. Even this vote he gave idly rather than earnestly—not because he liked Buchanan, but because he disliked Fremont. General Grant was endowed by nature with many great qualities, for which his countrymen delight to do him honor; but a genius for political affairs is not one of these qualities; nor is he likely, by entering upon political life, to increase, but rather to diminish, his great reputation. Polydamas said to Hector, "All gifts thou canst not in thyself combine."

We regret to witness the signs and tokens of an obvious disposition among some officious people (perhaps acting without General Grant's complicity) to dwarf our Hector into a politician. State craft is not General Grant's forte. Nevertheless, this falling will be gladly forgotten, or never remembered, or covered down only by a multitude of other merits, if he has the prudence to atone for it by altogether withdrawing his name as a Presidential candidate.

Johnson and Grant—The Inevitable Collision.

From the N. Y. Times.

The Washington correspondents are doing battle upon the question whether a conflict has actually occurred between the President and General Grant, or not. By some it is alleged that a rupture took place between them in Cabinet Council, on Tuesday; by others it is declared that the meeting passed without difficulty, and that Mr. Johnson and the General are still good friends. The informant of the Boston Post, which shares with our neighbor the Herald the dubious honor of Mr. Johnson's confidences, furnishes a circumstantial narrative which makes clear the fact of serious differences, the determination of the President to snub the ad interim Secretary, and his purpose to push the point of difference to extremities.

Really, however, it is not necessary to look for explanations or assurances upon this head. Matters have gone too far to render doubt or misapprehension reasonable. Mr. Johnson has entered upon a course which shuts out the last chance of reconciliation, and renders all compromise impossible. Vows and protestations will serve him no longer. Pretenses of compliance with the law which he is trying to obstruct are no longer admissible. His parrot-talk about the Constitution is laughed at as sheer nonsense and hypocrisy. He stands revealed an enemy not less of Congress and its laws than of the country and its peace. Wantonly, treacherously, with no conceivable hope of success, impelled only by some malignity and an insane ambition, he has opened the quarrel which shapes and orders his fate and the duty of the governing party perfectly clear. As between the Executive and the people

represented by Congress, there will now be neither the giving nor the taking of quarters. Mr. Johnson has unsheathed the sword of a disturber and a usurper, and there can be no further parley with him.

A conflict with General Grant is then simply a question of time. The General's coolness and sagacity may enable him for a brief period to avert an open rupture, but come it must eventually, unless Mr. Johnson abandon his pretensions—and even that step would not save him—unless General Grant himself recede from the position in which Congress has placed him. Neither of these contingencies being probable, the collision which now forms a subject of gossip and speculation must be considered certain.

That this estimate of the case is not exaggerated is proved by the antagonism that exists between the claims of the President and the duties and responsibilities of the General. Admittedly, the former possesses the power of removing the District Commanders, and recognizing as obvious his purpose to retain in command only those who share his hostility to the form and spirit of the Reconstruction acts, it is plain that there his authority ends. Over all else the General-in-Chief is supreme. Being clothed by the law with the power of revising, revoking, or confirming the doings of the District Commanders, he holds in his hands the means of counteracting much of the mischief to be apprehended from the President's removals. It is possible for him to impose an absolute check upon those whom Mr. Johnson may send to execute his will, and by the firmness and vigilance of control to make these instruments of carrying out the law. All this General Grant may do. All this the law enjoins him to do. And by doing it promptly and well, he may from the outset frustrate the machinations of the President.

But to this exercise of lawful authority on the part of General Grant Mr. Johnson refuses to quietly submit. As Commander-in-Chief under the Constitution, he claims the right not only to remove and appoint, but also to instruct. On the hollowness of his claim it is scarcely necessary to speak; for even the Commander-in-Chief, albeit holding his office independently of Congress, must be governed by its laws in the exercise of his functions. Abstractions aside, however, the President has asserted his pretensions in this respect in the cases of Hancock and Casey, and we are not prepared to suppose that these expedients cannot endure. Mr. Johnson's course during the last few months has shown that he cannot appreciate moderation, and that forbearance but feeds his arrogance. The truce of to-day will prompt him to urge further demands to-morrow; and at last General Grant, obeying the dictates of duty, will be compelled to assume an attitude of open, avowed hostility. The prospect is not a pleasant one, but we shall gain nothing by ignoring its probabilities, or closing our eyes to its perils. It is some consolation to feel that, as between Mr. Johnson and the bold, bad men who surround him, and Congress, with General Grant at its side, the ultimate result is not doubtful. But this certainty of final triumph for the right does not afford compensation for the immediate injury to business, and the losses and gloom of the intervening period, which proceed from Mr. Johnson's wild and wicked proceedings.

The Three Great Forces of this Revolutionary Age.

From the N. Y. Herald. What are the leading characteristics of this age? This is a question to which many different yet appropriate answers might be given. We know only one answer which is at once distinctive and exhaustive. It is the age of the printing press, the steam engine, and the electric telegraph. We might put it in another form, and say it is an age in which all men think, some with greater, some with less intensity; some to greater, some to less purpose; in which the thoughts of thinkers are common and public property, and in which the mysterious and mighty forces of nature are yoked to the car of humanity. Men think now not in a corner, in a cell, or a cave, but in the open air of the world. Thoughts are not now buried, as they once were, for centuries; they obtain prompt and immediate and universal publicity, and the principal agents in giving effect to thought in modern times are printing, steam, and electricity. These are at once the types and the means of human progress in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

A Natural and Necessary Result of this State of Things is that Everything is at Once Conducted on a more Gigantic Scale and Brought to a more Speedy Issue.

Witness our late civil war. Witness Napoleon's Italian campaign. Witness the recent struggle in Germany. Questions which in former times required ages to ripen now rush to maturity at once; and those which it took years to settle are settled in as many days. Compared with the gigantic struggles of modern times, the wars of an earlier period degenerate into village rows; and a thirty years' war in any part of the world where modern forces are at work is no long process. These thoughts are not without a certain value as applied to the situation both in the Old World and the New. Europe, at the present moment, is evidently on the eve of a great crisis. War may be spoken of as an almost absolute certainty. We know not what a day or an hour may bring forth. This we do know: that war, when it does break out, will be on a grander scale, and will be shorter, sharper, and more decisive than anything which we have yet seen. Europe to-day is very different from Europe in the days of Wallenstein, of the Great Frederick, or even of the First Napoleon. The iron road and the puffing engine are everywhere. Everywhere, too, is seen the electric wire, tremulous with passing thought. The railway war has replaced the slow and tedious march; and what was done by the tardy messenger is now done by the swift and well-trained lightning. Europe, therefore, may have greater, but she cannot have such lasting wars.

The same forces which have revolutionized Europe are at work here. They have already placed us in the front rank of the nations, and the time is not distant when, directed by Anglo-Saxon skill, they will give us the command of the entire American continent. Mexico will come in and extend our borders to the South. Canada will come in with its Anglo-Saxon energy, and increase at once our

Old Rye Whiskies. THE LARGEST AND BEST STOCK OF FINE OLD RYE WHISKIES IN THE LAND IS NOW POSSESSED BY HENRY S. HANNIS & CO. Nos. 218 and 220 SOUTH FRONT STREET, WHO OFFER THE SAME TO THE TRADE IN LOTS ON VERY ADVANTAGEOUS TERMS.

Their Stock of Rye Whiskies, in BOND, comprises all the favorite brands extant, and runs through the various months of 1865, '66, and of this year, up to the latest date. Liberal contracts made for lots to arrive at Pennsylvania Railroad Depot, Erie-Union Line Wharf, or at Bonded Warehouses, as parties may elect.

territory and the vital forces of the Union. Spain must look out, for Cuba, already ours by electric contact, must soon be ours in fact. The West Indies and the South American States will follow; nor will there be any halting in their triumphant career until the entire continent is sheltered beneath the folds of the Star Spangled Banner. Is this mighty people, the possessors of so much power, the destined inheritors of so much fame and power—to be subjected in their onward march to the control of the negro? It must not be.

Mr. Johnson Plays Foul.

From the N. Y. Tribune. The President, not content with his late performances at the Schutzenfest, has recently expressed a desire to take a hand at base ball. Indeed, he has gone so far as to receive a deputation of New York athletes, calling themselves the "Mutual Base Ball Club, of New York," but called, at home, "Man-Eaters," and to accept at their hands a badge of membership, which he immediately pinned on to the lapel of his coat. He then proceeded to punish the young men in question for forcing themselves into his presence, by making a speech to them. He was pleased to accept of the badge, and pleased with the honor of being made a member of the club. He held the game of base-ball to be a moral recreation. The game never attached any disgrace to its members. He had played the game when a babe, and was always delighted with it. He hailed with pleasure the admitted fact that the game was now hailed as a national one. He thanked them for their kind attention. He hoped they would enjoy whatever hospitalities they might receive in Washington. Then the Club shook hands with the President, and then the Club retired. After that they went to Baltimore, and got one of the worst beatings they ever had in their lives.

Whether the game of base ball ever attaches any disgrace to those who play it depends upon how it is played. But a bad player may easily disgrace the game, and in Mr. Johnson's way of playing his National game was a very sterling illustration of it. When he took his place at the head of the field two years ago, nothing could have been more promising than the looks of affairs. All the litter caused by the players in the great game then ended was being cleared away. Bran-new bases were planted, bran-new bats and balls were provided, and the eyes of the whole world were upon this bran-new player who had bragged so tremendously about what he had done and what he meant to do. But the bran-new gentleman soon began to astonish everybody. He seemed to take as naturally to miffing as to muffing, and to enjoy wild balls as if they were wild ducks. He was continually getting between the legs of men of his own side, bringing his bat recklessly down on the heads of his friends, and making feeble attempts at twisting, that always ended in hitting the man behind him. At length, when he had played a series of the worst innings ever seen, the opposition, or Congress Club, tripped his feet from under him, and set him in a corner till he should have slept off his excitement. This made him sulky, and when he found that his hands were tied behind his back, he determined to show what he could do with his feet. Just as the game got started again, and he was promising peace, joy, and satisfaction, he slyly wriggled out of his corner, and with a bold thrust kicked the short-stop against the pitcher, and then sent him rolling first against one base and then another, until they all lay in a heap on the field. This is the situation of the game at present, and we submit that the President's friends owe it to the public, who have been standing a long time patiently longing to see the game brought to an end, to get him off the field as decently as they can. He really is in no condition to be about, much less to be playing National games where the stakes are of tremendous importance. Thus far, all his scores have been blanks, and his pitching and striking have been equally divided between impotence and spite. He may be very sure that no honest base-ball players will ever choose him on their side again.

General Grant and the Radicals.

From the N. Y. World.

The political star of General Grant, which has been in the ascendant for several months, begins to pale in the glare of radicalism, and there seems some danger of its total obscuration. The conjuncture has, therefore, been to the radicals one of great perplexity and embarrassment; and, although they begin, or think they begin, to see daylight, it may, after all, be a deceptive glimmer. The political situation, till Grant recently changed it, was this:—The conservative Republicans desired his nomination, desired it mainly because they supposed he might be run by the Democrats, and they wished to head off the Democratic party and deprive it of General Grant's prestige. The radicals, under the lead of the Tribune, have protested and resisted; not, however, in such absolute terms as to preclude all hope of their ultimate acquiescence, but insisting that their consent, if ever given, would depend upon General Grant's public and unequivocal adoption of their principles.

This was a trap artfully set and well baited. Nothing but the fear of General Grant's nomination by the Democrats could have induced the radicals to treat him even with this prospective and conditional tolerance; and if they can ruin him with the Democrats, they will fling him aside without scruple. The most dexterous method of tempting him to commit political suicide was enticing him to hoist the radical flag. This done, and the danger of his nomination by the Democrats removed, the radicals would pass to an easy and triumphant mastery of the situation. They form a majority of the Republican party in almost every Congressional District, and can elect delegates of their own stripe to the Republican National

Convention. If General Grant had maintained his former reserve, they might have felt constrained to nominate him by their fears that Democrats and conservative Republicans would take him up and elect him. But they would deride the idea of danger from his being run by the conservative Republicans alone. A split in the Republican party would do them no harm, provided the two sections of it outnumbered the Democrats. In that case the running of three candidates would merely prevent a choice by the people. The election would be thrown into the hands of Representatives—a House already elected and intensely radical. If three candidates are run with no choice by the people, the radicals would be just as triumphant with their candidate third on the list as first. They have nothing to fear from a Republican split, but everything to fear from the Democrats running a candidate who would draw off the conservative Republican vote, or a considerable portion of it. Hence their manoeuvres to entrap General Grant into declarations which would prevent his receiving any Democratic support.

General Grant has been so freely talked of in connection with the Presidency, that like every other man who had a fair prospect of gaining that high elevation, he has come to desire it. The removal of General Sheridan looked to him like putting another candidate in the field against him. With a boldness of strategy favoring more of a soldier than of a politician, he took that bull by the horns. He espoused the cause of General Sheridan with such a superabounding zeal as to make the removal of an affront to him than it was to Sheridan himself. As a mode of disposing of a rival this was prompt and adroit, but we doubt whether it was far-sighted. The radicals want neither him nor Sheridan, and will be glad to see them both put out of the way. Grant has done them a service in smothering Sheridan; they now wish him to go step further, and smother himself. The Tribune tells him plainly he must not stop yet. We quote:—

"Mr. Johnson has overruled his arguments, and reversed his orders, and has even gone so far as to direct Sheridan to go at once to the Plains, though Grant had summoned him to Washington. Now, he never once instructed General Thomas to maintain all orders he should find in force in the Fifth District; the President instructs Hancock to annul whatever he has directed. This is a hard issue, and no man who honestly honors Grant for his services in the field, who honestly desires to know him as a friend of reconstruction, will fall to rejoice that it is made. There is a gulf between the people and the President, and those whom the people trust must stand upon their side of it. No bridge is possible. No man, however great his popularity, can reconcile belief in the laws of Congress with voluntary obedience to the President's policy; and the sooner the rupture, which General Grant's friends predict, occurs—the sooner he speaks as a soldier should—the better it will be for himself and for the country."

This was on Tuesday. Again, Wednesday, speaking of General Grant's letter, the Tribune says:—

"While we heartily agree that the letter does General Grant timely and essential service, we confidently cite that letter as justifying our criticisms of General Grant's position."

"General Grant has a perfect right to be or not to be a Republican, without being 'assailed' therefor. Why, then, 'assail' him for a pretense; and of this we have not known him guilty."

Which means that, in the opinion of the Tribune, General Grant's letter to the President by no means identifies him with the Republican party. It is a warning to him that he must take sides so unequivocally as to cut him off from all possibility of receiving any Democratic votes, or he cannot have the Republican nomination. But if he takes that final and fatal step, he is "as dead as Julius Cæsar." The only reason why the Republicans ever thought of nominating him was to prevent his election by the Democrats. If he descends into the same arena with the other Republican candidates, he will be formidable to none of them. Chase's friends, Colfax's friends, Butler's friends, reinforced by Greeley, by Sumner, by Wendell Phillips, by Tilton, and hosts of others, will join hands to dispose of him before the competition becomes active between the radical chiefs. Grant, having been brought prematurely into the field, will be the easy victim of their common jealousies. For though an early candidate, it would be charged that he was a tardy Republican to the party till thirst of office tempted him to abandon his former principles. For our part, we shall be slow to believe that General Grant will march into the radical cul de sac.

FURNISHING GOODS, SHIRTS, & CO. F. HOFFMANN, JR. NO. 525 ARCH STREET, FURNISHING GOODS, (L. G. A. Hoffman, formerly W. W. Knight.) FINE SHIRTS AND WRAPPERS, HONKEY AND GLOVES, SEAL, LAMBS' WOOL, AND BEBING, J. W. SCOTT & CO., SHEET MANUFACTURERS, AND DEALERS IN MEN'S FURNISHING GOODS, NO. 514 CHESTNUT STREET, FOUR DOORS BELOW THE "CONTINENTAL," PATENT SHOULDER-SEAM, SHEET MANUFACTORY, AND GENTLEMEN'S FURNISHING STORE, PERFECT FITTING SHIRTS AND DRAWERS, MADE FOR MEASUREMENT AT VERY SHORT NOTICE. All other articles of GENTLEMEN'S DRESS GOODS in full variety. WINCHESTER & CO., No. 706 CHESTNUT STREET. JAMES E. EVANS, GUN-MAKER, SOUTH STREET, above Second, would call the attention of sportsmen to his choice selection of BURGESS' STUT AND BASS RIFLES (a new assortment), Files, and all various kinds of FINEST TACKLE in all its various branches. HAND RULING LOADING GUNS altered to HENKEL'S in the best manner, at the lowest rates.