

THE MONTANA POST.

A Newspaper, Devoted to the Mineral, Agricultural and Commercial Interests of Montana Territory.

VOL. 3, NO. 27.

VIRGINIA CITY, MONTANA, SATURDAY, MARCH 2, 1867.

WHOLE NO. 132.

The Montana Post.

D. W. TILTON & CO., PUBLISHERS



SATURDAY, MARCH 2, 1867.

Our Agents in the different towns and mining camps of the Territory and elsewhere, will please take notice that the terms of subscription for the Post have been increased to \$3.50 per quarter, \$5.00 for six months, and \$8.00 for one year.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

The last number of the weekly Post completed the first half of Volume Three. Some of the subscriptions expired with that number. A notice is attached to the paper of each subscriber, two numbers before the expiration of their term of subscription. If not renewed, the paper is stopped. Justice to ourselves, and to prompt subscribers, alike require this rule to be strictly adhered to. In no other way can a newspaper be successfully conducted. Thanking our patrons who have already renewed their subscriptions, we solicit the attention of those who have forgotten or neglected it, to the necessity of at once renewing, and keeping their files unbroken.

COME ON, MACDUFF.

If beneath the sun there is, in a newspaper, one thing more despicable than another, it is to fill its columns with articles abounding in malicious attacks upon a person or paper who has wished them no injury, and in which there is nothing to interest the general public, justify the assault, or supply any appetite except the basest and vilest, and minister to the most degraded craving of the lowest class of humanity. The Post has for some time, received the attention of an obscure sheet in Helena, which has published extracts from a private letter written by a member of this firm to a party in Helena. They perverted articles written in good faith, by one who is true to the Union and the Union cause, in his heart of hearts, as any man in Montana. They sought a controversy which would result in no good to them, to us, or to the people of Montana; and we declined it, content to leave them with almost an entire paper full of vehement attacks, unanswered. In the *Herald* of the 21st instant, in an article, "Who steals Telegrams," there are assertions we cannot pass by. The silence that we had hoped would have the effect of causing them to reflect, and be more fraternal, has roused the fiendishness of a nature so depraved, degraded and debased, that when the smitten cheek was turned unto them they have struck again, with spiteful, satanic malignity, a treacherous, personal, and cowardly blow. This we cannot pass by unnoticed. It is a direct personal attack upon the character of a member of this firm, who stands too high in the estimation of all Union men, to be vilified and misrepresented by the miserable prevarications of a paper which envies and hates the Post and its proprietors, with a savage ferocity, that it smooths over with the nauseating slime of anaconda friendship, by saying, "Now, we wish our young friend Dittes a pleasant journey, and all that sort of thing," and expects people cannot see beneath the loathsome, sickening, familiar, (castor) oily smoothness of words, the vindictive malignity and envy that inspires it. We publish that article in full in this issue. Hitherto, we have not had an unkind feeling against that paper. We have loaned them paper upon which to print their issues, that they might fulfill their promises to their subscribers, and they retain it to this day. We have shown them every courtesy in our power, and would have been pleased to see a good Union paper, conducted upon honest principles, issued in Helena. Ben. R. Dittes, the very man they have falsified, and has, on different occasions, written to this office, asking the senior member if he had the kind of paper they used, and requesting, if he had, that he would lend it to the *Herald*. Now, we propose to settle this question, hit to hit; and in the struggle, we will use every honest endeavor to defeat our adversary; even as we would turn to crush a venomous viper. In regard to the telegrams, it is scarcely worthy of mention, except as cumulative evidence of the falsehoods contained in the *Herald*. The following certificate settles that story:

We certify on honor, that the firm of D. W. Tilton & Co. are the only parties in Montana who receive telegrams for publication. That Messrs. Tilton & Co. have not only agreed to, but have paid promptly, for all their telegraph dispatches; that, by contract, are entitled to receive the news dispatches as soon as they are received at Salt Lake or San Francisco; that they

have so received them, and a literal and correct version of the same, has invariably appeared in the Post, the issue following their reception, without alteration, abbreviation, or changing in any way, whatever, except the supplying of such omitted words as are necessarily supplied by every editor who receives news dispatches.

B. HUGHES, Operator.
JOHN A. CREGGTON,
Supt. W. U. Tel. Co.

Virginia, M. T., Feb. 25, '67.
In addition to the above, the editor, foreman and compositors of this office, will make oath that, since the telegraph line has been opened to this city, there has never been a line or record of telegrams copied from any Salt Lake city paper; that they have never, since that time set a "reprint" of a telegram, and that the story about the dispatches copied from the *Fedette* is an unqualified falsehood. The little quotation commencing, "and Mr. Chairman" we know nothing about. It is probably a profound witticism, emanating from the same source as did the story about "his aunt," which was a miserably butchered plagiarism from the *Nasby Papers*, originally attributed to Johnson, but which with commendable family pride was gotten off to show up the smartness of "a maiden aunt of the Fisk family." It will be seen, first, that the personal attack in that article is based upon a private conversation between Ben R. Dittes, and James L. Fisk. What do Union men of Montana say to the kind of honor that prompted the publishing of a private conversation? Knowing the subsequent action of the latter party, to what can they attribute the desire he manifested in engaging in conversation with Dittes, except with the malicious intent to use that conversation, private and sacred among gentlemen, as a means to injure his character? We will take the assertions one by one, and answer them directly. Captain Fisk says that Mr. Dittes "declared in loud and unqualified terms."

First, "That Radicalism could never win in this Territory."

The palpable absurdity of an assertion like this stamps it at once as manufactured, and Ben. R. Dittes did not use the words. He said, "That Radicalism could not win in this Territory now," and any sane man knows that to be a fact.

Second, "That no party advocating that doctrine could ever elect a candidate on that platform in Montana."

This is on a par with the preceding quotation, in point of absurdity. The question was in regard to the propriety of bringing out a Radical candidate, for delegate, in case the time of holding an election for that office should be changed to the spring, to which Mr. Dittes objected, using the following language: "The Radical party will be defeated if they bring out a Radical ticket at that election," and there is not a Union man in the Territory to-day but will say, "tis true, 'tis pity, and pity 'tis true."

Third, "That you came here to make money! and you'd be damned if you were going to tie yourself to any such cause or doctrine, which in your mind 'was so certain of failure.'"

In No's one and two, there was a certain likeness of wording that somewhat approaching the language used by Mr. Dittes, was like that species of falsehood which is more dangerous, because of its near approach to truth, but in this No. 3, the writer sprang free from every curb, relinquished every attempt to pervert, and from the fulness of his heart concocted an unmitigated falsehood. Here is the language used by Mr. Dittes. He said that "the proprietors of the Post were determined to publish a good newspaper, devoted to the interests of this Territory; that they were guided by no clique, faction or sect, and that it was their purpose to go straightforward in the continuance of that determination; that it had won the confidence of the people, and would maintain its record." He did say that, "he had come here to make money, but in his endeavor to make money he would not barter away his principles," and the words that "he would not tie himself to any such cause or doctrine, which was so certain of failure," were not used on the occasion. The intent of that assertion is too evident to need demonstrating, and we know, to our gratification, that it is discredited by those it was intended to influence, even before we publish this denial.

You said you 'had just been calling on General Meagher, and he authorized you to say several things, and that he was very friendly, indeed.'

Mr. Dittes did tell Capt. Fisk that he "called upon General Meagher every day during his illness," spoke very highly of "his eminent social qualities," and added, that, "although opposed in politics to me, he was very friendly, indeed." We scarcely know what words to use to convey our opinion of that rancorous, fiendish malignity, which most totally absorb the better qualities of a man who cannot accord to one opposed to him on political issues, the credit of the virtues he possesses. Gen. Meagher certainly is opposed to the Post, which, in time past, has said severe

things of him, as we promise him faithfully we will do in time to come, if his public actions require it; but "he's a man for a' that," and even Revenge would break the dagger, by the sick couch or the grave.

"And didn't you make several threats about cleaning out the radical party or ticket, if one was put in the field, at the approaching 'special' election?"

It would do our readers good to hear the denial our irate junior gives this lie. It is hearty and to the point. Does any man that ever knew Ben. R. Dittes, believe he ever said it? Not one. It needs no denial.

"Certainly you did—and when we cornered you a trifle about there being but two parties—the radical Republican and 'Conservative' party, which means simply copperhead Democracy, didn't you—after acknowledging that 'conservatism' meant just nothing at all?"

Mr. Dittes suggested that idea to Capt. Fisk, without waiting to be "cornered," by saying that "conservatism would not be an element in the coming election." That "acknowledging" is a missing suit in Ben. R. Dittes' hand, when he plays against a man of Capt. Fisk's calibre.

—"didn't you assert that you—meaning the Post—would get up a third party? Certainly you did."

No! James L. Fisk, he never said that. You know it. We know it. Such a thing was never mentioned in this office or out it, by either of the proprietors of this paper. He never said anything that approached it, in letter or intent. It is a base fabrication; an empty bubble, light as air. We do not wish to use in this paper, the only language fitting to denounce the series of perversions and falsehoods, quoted from the *Herald*. We have given the language used by Mr. Dittes. He will answer anywhere for the truthfulness of our version of the conversation, and his word is good. The last portion of the *Herald* article, shows the motives that actuated the writer. ENVY, explains it in a word. It is an old adage, that "envy confesses superiority," and, God knows, it would be little we would have to be proud of, if it consisted alone in superiority to the *Herald*. We never would have answered its imbecile taunts, or its idiotic attempts at witticism, except to vindicate the character of one it has slandered. It will be in violation of our better feelings to do so, but if this most ungentlemanly vilification of Mr. Dittes is continued, we will strip from the hideous deformity that sits enthroned within the *Herald* office, the glittering tinsel, and boasted honors he wears; if he "assumes the god," and with malicious intent, defames the character of respectable men; perverts and publishes private conversations, and mingles perversion with falsehood, that it may answer an infamous purpose, we will publish a record of his public life, so disgraceful that men will shun him like a leper, or the noxious odors of the grave.

CIVIL QUESTIONS FOR THE GAZETTE.

1. Do you believe the clause in the Declaration of Independence, holding "this truth to be self-evident, that all men are created free and equal, having certain inalienable rights, among which are, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?"
 2. Do you believe that a loyal negro is as unsafe to bestow suffrage upon as a disloyal white man?
 3. Do you believe that taxation without representation is right?
 4. If it is wrong for the white man, why is it not wrong for the black man?
 5. Are you in favor of releasing Jeff. Davis, and declaring him eligible to hold office?
 6. Is Jeff. Davis any more of a traitor than any other of the proscribed leaders?
 7. Are you in favor of the present system of apportioning representation by which South Carolina, with a white population of 291,000, is entitled to the same number of members in Congress as Connecticut, with a white population of 452,000?
 8. Do you believe the Union League is a disloyal organization? If so, please show cause for the faith that is in you.
 9. You have opposed every plan of reconstruction offered by Congress. What is your plan?
 10. Do you believe that the decisions of five members of the Supreme court, represents the infallible opinion of the American people, when the four other members of that court, the Senate and House, and a majority of 400,000 loyal voters have decided against them?
 11. If the people of the United States desire to alter or amend the Constitution, have they any right to do so, and where must the amendments emanate from?
 12. Is there anything loyal in the Republican party? Is there any disloyal element in the Democratic party?
- By answering these questions without calling us a liar, you will very much oblige the Greek editor, and no doubt, get yourself in a muddle.

AN EMPIRE IN AMERICA.

Latest advices state that the French troops have all left the city of Mexico, and Maximilian remains. The French Emperor has peculiar abilities in shaking off dependents upon his military strength after it once becomes evident that further support is likely to provoke hostilities. The armies of Italy and Mexico are recent instances of this policy. As we predicted, Max. remains to found an Imperial Government among the Aztecs, and rear a monarchy upon the shattered remnants of a score of defunct Governments. Cut loose from the authority of Napoleon, and unsupported by the French army, it will be interesting to note the policy by which this brave, but fated monarch, will endeavor to harmonize the many contending elements existing in Mexico. He has an army of 30,000 men, and proposes to remove the seat of Government to Puebla, after having levied a tax of one per cent. upon the inhabitants of the present capital. This may be judicious, but it does not evidence that fact to us. The stoniest friends of Maximilian are in the city of Mexico. His departure will be the signal for occupation by the Liberals, and again taxed and occupied by them, Maximilian will be cut off from their assistance, and his influence weakened. If, within a few short months, this newly projected government does not prove as ephemeral as any of its predecessors, past experience is no criterion for the future. The question is, does the withdrawal of the French expeditionary corps, with the action of Maximilian, release our government from further action, if it proposes to sustain the Monroe doctrine, which has become a component part of its national policy? We think not. In his annual message to Congress, sent in December 2d, 1823, James Monroe, then President of the United States, announced the settled policy of this nation in regard to the extension to any part of America, of European systems of Government. The following extract from that message show the principles laid down, and which have been tacitly admitted by foreign powers, and adopted by the American people, as cardinal principles of our foreign policy.

"In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part; nor does it comport with our policy to do so. The political system of the European powers is essentially different from that of America. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare 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.

"Our policy is not to interfere in the internal concerns of Europe, or any of the European powers. It is impossible that these powers should extend their system to any part of America without endangering our peace and happiness. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence, and maintained it, and whose independence has been acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States."

While it may be urged that the Empire proposed, is to be founded on the wishes, of at least a portion, of the Mexican people, without the assistance of foreign arms, it must not be forgotten that its inception was under the auspices of the French legions, and that an Empire is an extension of a European system of government to this continent, and an encroachment upon the Monroe doctrine in letter and spirit. Unhappy children of the sun, distracted descendants of the Montezumas, there is but one balm in Gilead to heal your wounds; but one physician there, with power to do you good, and until Uncle Samuel anoints the dividing line with the ointment of annexation, you will not likely recover from the grievous ills you have been heir to, or breathe the air of liberty, un-polluted by the fumes of "villainous saltpetre."

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

ERROR POST: Please answer the following questions and oblige your numerous friends who are not clear on this subject.

1. In the event of the simultaneous death of the President and Vice President of the United States, upon whom would the duty devolve to convene Congress?
 2. Is not the presiding officer of the United States Senate at the present time, Vice President by virtue of the position he holds?
 3. Should Congress convene and fail to declare "who shall act as President" as provided in the Constitution, on whom would the office devolve?
- Truly yours, QUEEN SABLE.
Highland Gulch, February 16, 1867.
- Ans. 1. In such event, the President pro tempore of the Senate would become Acting-President of the United States.
2. L. S. Foster, of Connecticut, is now Acting Vice President by virtue of being President pro tem. of the Senate.
3. We presume this means in the same event as is mentioned in the first question. It would first devolve on the President pro tem. of the Senate, second, upon the Speaker of the House.

CIVIL ANSWERS.

The *Gazette* of the 23d, in a very labored argument on Reconstruction, endeavors to substantiate the insinuation in the democratic "address," that Congress is endeavoring to accomplish the purposes of secessionists by their violation of the Constitution. It charges Congress with "usurping the rights and prerogatives of the President, the Supreme court and the people" with tyrannically resolving itself into perpetual session" and "presuming to impeach the President." It opposes the Constitutional amendments, because that astute organ saw in them a clause conferring suffrage on the negro in the rebellious States, and prohibiting rebels from governing the United States. It objects to the Territorial bill, because it sees the rebel States reduced to provinces, and then when the Military Government bill passed, oh! what accents of despair comes up from the death rattle in that crushing leader on "Radical Despotism." It supplicates Omnipotence or Impotence, or any other power to send a William Tell or a William Wallace or some other William or Bill, in fact, anything but a whiskey bill, to come to the relief of the unterrified and magnanimously throw himself into the breach, while they stand aside and applaud. It says that Congress has usurped the rights and prerogatives of the President. This is clearly a misprint of the *Gazette*, without a doubt. We give them credit for better understanding the situation than to suppose that they intended it should be understood in any other way than "by contraries." The usurpation on the part of President Johnson is a matter of history. He has usurped the powers of the Legislature in establishing Governments in the rebel States, in defiance of the cardinal principles of this Government, and placed them in the hands of traitors, and in this he has usurped the appointing power, and its continuance exists in his persistent efforts to enforce their recognition. This usurpation he assumed without color of law, and has absorbed to himself all the powers of the National Government. He has surrendered to rebels, property belonging to the United States, amounting in one State alone, to \$50,000,000, in defiance of all law, and against the protest of the military commanders. So far did this extend, that, as an act of self-preservation against his encroachments, Congress was necessitated to take action upon it, or permit loyal and patriotic citizens throughout the South, to be butchered by the minions of rebellion, revived into life, vigor and power, through his usurpation and appointments, and see the Government despoiled and traitors pampered. You had better abandon the cry of usurpation, Messrs editors of the *Gazette*. Our neighbors, who ask if the erection of West Virginia into a State, against the consent of the old Dominion, was Constitutional, will find that the Supreme court, of which they prate so loudly, pronounced the act Constitutional, and their decision is on the record. "Is West Virginia a State?" Yes. "Are the ten Southern States, in the opinion of the editor of the Post, States, or Provinces?" States. They have, however, no legitimate Government existing in them. When the Federal Government put down the rebellion, it found no organized Government existing therein, or any officers qualified according to the Constitution of the United States. Congress has the sole power to define the status of those States and cause to be organized Governments therein. The President, under the war power, as commander-in-chief, during the existence of martial law, inaugurated provisional governments in the South, which have no validity, save in the continued acquiescence of Congress. "Can a State commit political suicide?" The people of a State can. The *Gazette* is referred to the recent examples in the South. "If the Carolinas, Virginia and Georgia were independent States during the revolutionary war with England, can they be legally reduced to provinces now, by the declaration of one of the co-ordinate branches of the government, while the other two co-ordinate branches object?" That is a long question, but there is very little in it. In the first place, they were States only during a portion of the Revolution, and did not exist under the present Constitution during the Revolution. The war was fought partly as colonies, and afterward, under the articles of confederation. We have answered the question in another place. We deny that Congress has usurped the powers of the Supreme Court, the President, or the people, in this question of the territorial bill; or that it has resolved itself into perpetual session. Although we believe it would be for the best interest of the country if it would do so until this question is settled; and, as to its "presumption in impeaching President Johnson, we assure the *Gazette* that, if he is guilty, it is only right that he should be punished; if not guilty, the impeachment will prove it to the world, and redound to his honor and credit. In reply to their very kind invitation to "come over and help us," we thank them most sincerely. There may be "some good in Nazareth," but the prospecting we have done among the *Gazette* style of Democracy, convinces us that it will not "pan out" the Union colors, and we can't serve in their company.

VIGILANTES vs. ANTI-VIGILANTES.

A notice, of which the following is a copy, was posted in Red Mountain city, (Highland) about the 15th instant:

Notice!
We, now, as a sworn band of law-abiding citizens, do hereby solemnly swear that the first man that is hung by the Vigilantes of this place, we will retaliate five for one, unless it be done in broad daylight, so that all may know what it is for. We are all well satisfied that, in times past, you did do some glorious work, but the time has come when law should be enforced. Old fellow-members, the time is not like it was. We had good men with us; but now, there is a great change. There is not a thief comes to this country but what "rings" himself into the present committee. We know you all. You must not think you can do as you please. We are American citizens, and you shall not drive, and hang, whom you please.
(Signed) FIVE FOR ONE.

Information accompanying this notice convinces us that it is the platform of an organization, and that it means business. It demands the consideration of the Vigilantes of this Territory. They have been, in times past, the only protection for life and property that existed in our Territory; and history will accord them the honors for a thorough, fearless and conscientious discharge of arduous duties. It was composed of men intent upon but one purpose—the supremacy of Order. For this they sacrificed their time, their money, and their personal safety; braved every danger, and endured privation, exposure and peril, even to the death. They acted from pure motives, and as the Judiciary assumed power and protective strength, their aid was given to the courts, and the organization existed only as an auxiliary to them, and has, finally, become passive and inactive. The organization, however, still exists, as strong in numbers and power, as in its palmy days. It is a sleeping lion; a smothered volcano; perhaps to awake in anger or burst forth with redoubled vigor. The number of horrible crimes recently perpetrated within our borders has disturbed their repose, and a low, but portentous, rumbling has given cause for expectation. This notice, and other reliable information, indicates that there exists in different localities, secret and sworn leagues to resist the Vigilantes. The assertion, that bad men have, in its latter days of apathy, worked themselves into it, and hold position in it, may be true. Vigilantes, your reputation is at stake; your character is assailed. If you are guilty, you have but two alternatives: to die in dishonor, or to banish from your body every unclean member. The crisis is upon you. Your enemies have hurled the gauntlet in your teeth. Let not passion return the blow; but separate from the wheat the tares and cockle, that you may continue honored by the good people, and feared by the bad. Whether you are active or passive, this duty to yourselves; the principles you have maintained; the history you have made, and the order-loving, law-respecting citizens who have sustained and honored you, is alike imperative. You will be strengthened by driving out an element of weakness; and, it necessity demands that you should act again, let it be in the broad light of day, in the presence of the people; in the cause of the Right, and strong in the high character of those who are assuming to judge the limits of life, that when your final record is written up, and your character brought before the tribunal of the world, you may be honored by the verdict, *Sans peur et sans reproche*.

STERLING PRICE.—The lecturer, Geo. Alfred Townsend, from a snow-bound train at Terre Haute, writes on the back of his hat to the *Cincinnati Commercial* a gossip letter, which he spices with this "wafer of news"—as he calls it.
Last Sunday I saw in St. Louis, at the dining table of the Southern Hotel, Sterling Price, a splendid name for a soldier; almost good enough to be a *dramatis personae*. He was one of those gorgons of the rebellion, of whom we read in the East, picturing to ourselves a bearded eagle, young and unquenched, like Sheridan or Stoneman. I saw before me a poor old man, whom peace and honor had made plethoric, whom war has made bald and lean. His great shoulders bent under their dwindled height; his feet were shrunken in their gaiters, and rattled like a pair of spurs; he had lost the battle-light from his eyes, the bronze from his knuckles; his voice of command was lost so that the waiter bent to his lips to hear his choice of soups. Destitute in his disappointed age, the spectre of a dining-table, one-half the guests who looked upon him pitifully had been his soldiers in the war. Three times he swept Missouri—slew Lyon, stormed Mulligan, bearded Jeff. Davis. Now he eats like the seventh stage of man. His son sits by him—married but lately to the daughter of a Federal General Price—and they are going to give him a purse in St. Louis to make some merry rattle for his frosty days.