

New York Daily Tribune

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1863.

TO CORRESPONDENTS. No notice can be taken of anonymous communications. What ever is intended for publication must be accompanied by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for its good faith.

A Card. By request of many citizens of all parties, I shall speak in the Cooper Institute next Saturday evening, Feb. 7, at 8 o'clock, in favor of the speedy restoration of the Union, by means of organized immigration into the Rebel States. In ninety days we can make Florida the first example of reconstruction and restoration—a free and loyal State. ELI THAYER. New York, Feb. 4, 1863.

NEWS OF THE DAY.

THE WAR.

The expressive silence of the Government in regard to the alleged Rebel successes at Charleston is broken. We are assured that "there has been no interruption of the blockade, and no such assumption will be admitted by the Government." Gen. Dix, at Fortress Monroe, has Rebel news from Charleston to Tuesday, inclusive, at which time that port was thoroughly blockaded, the Union iron-clads lying inside the semi-circle of wooden vessels. The iron-clads, the Rebels say, were not there when the attack was made. An attack by the Union fleet upon the city was momentarily expected.

We have this morning a quantity of selections from very late Southern papers received late last night.

There seems to be a great deal of doubt as to the authenticity of the so-called news from Charleston. We have before us two Richmond papers of the 23d, The Whig and The Examiner. Neither of them makes the slightest allusion to the news; nothing is said about raising the blockade; nothing is said of joy in Richmond; no notice was taken of the matter in Congress on the day of its publication. We have only The Dispatch of the 24th, and that is the paper that printed the dispatches. Whether the entire Rebel world would be likely to utterly ignore the whole affair within twenty-four hours, if it was anything like what was represented, the reader may judge. It is also a significant fact that the lines were open to Charleston on the 23d, and a dispatch was sent through stating the arrival of Charleston of the British ship-of-war Chatham, which communicated with shore by boat, passing directly by the Union gunboat New Ironsides. If they could send the arrival of the Chatham, why not a more definite report of their great victory? Beauregard is not the man to keep silence when he has even a tolerable ground for boasting. The fact that the sensation dispatches were hurried through to catch the steamer for Europe is sufficiently established. That they were intended for that purpose, mainly, if not entirely, is inferable from the circumstance that they were, or are said to have been, in Richmond on Saturday night, while they were kept out of print until Monday morning.

Resolutions were offered yesterday in the New Jersey Legislature directly opposite to the recently proposed Peace Resolves. Those of yesterday declare the wickedness of the Rebellion, the latent treason of its Northern sympathizers, the loyalty of New Jersey, the necessity for waiving all differences as to party politics, and the full and unconditional support of the Government, the laws, and the flag of the country.

The Rebels have stories of the driving of our gunboats back at Fort McAllister near Savannah. The heaviest damage to us, so far as they are certain, was the shooting away of the flag-staff of an iron-clad. They say that our boats had been up as far as St. Mary's burning houses, but as soon as a cavalry company fired at them the gunboats ran away, flinging back shells like fury.

The flag-of-truce-belt New York arrived at Fortress Monroe on Wednesday noon from City Point, bringing down 73 Union prisoners from Richmond, in charge of Capt. John E. Mifford of the Third New York Infantry, who reports that more prisoners are there ready to be exchanged.

A breeze was raised in Hudson City, N. J., yesterday, by the arrest of deserters of citizens who say they have never been in the army. Some of the Private Guard have been taken up by the civil authority.

GENERAL NEWS.

In the United States Senate yesterday, a bill was introduced to aid the construction of railroads and telegraphs in Kansas. Mr. Wall offered a resolution to inquire into an "arbitrary arrest," but it was laid over. The bill in relation to Jurors in the United States Courts was passed; also the bill concerning Courts in Washington Territory; also the bill to temporarily supply vacancies in Executive Departments; also the bill to change the time of holding certain District Courts. The bill encouraging enlistments, and the enrollment and drafting of the military was taken up. The pending question to strike out the 4th section was discussed as considerable length, by Messrs. Colman, Bayard, Davis, Sherman, Donalson, Lane, Howard, McDougall, Rice and others. The motion to strike out the section was lost, and the bill was recommitted to the Military Committee. A resolution was adopted that the Senate be informed of the actual number of soldiers raised since the war began.

In the House, a bill making 27 new post routes was passed. The Senate's amendments to the Legislative Appropriation bill were taken up. That fixing mileage at 10 cents per mile was disagreed to; that cold-shouldering The National Intelligencer was passed; on the other a Conference Committee was asked for. A joint resolution to codify the Naval laws was passed; also, a bill amending the Naval Pension Act so as to give in certain \$15 per month cases \$20 per month. Some amendments were made to the Naval Appropriation bill; as to war steamers, it was provided that no contracts shall be entered into for construction, until proposals have been solicited from the principal iron shipbuilders, and made on the most favorable terms. An appropriation for the Brooklyn Navy-Yard was increased in order to accommodate three vessels now building there 428 feet in length.

In the State Assembly yesterday there was another violent and disorderly session, made so by the wrangling of certain Democratic city members. Two of them had a wordy war, each trying to expose the other—and it may be supposed that the country members were not a little amused at the pot-and-kettle colloquy. The ostensible subject before the House was the appointment of a Committee to investigate charges against the Speaker, Mr. Tompkins. A crowd were plainly told that vague generalizations would not do, if they wanted to try a man they must first indict him, in black and white—in other words, put their charges in writing, and sign them with the understanding that they be proved them to be true. No one did so, but reviled and abused everybody on the majority side. Finally, a resolution passed that when charges should be thus presented an investigation should proceed. After adjournment, some of the members from this section of the State made Albany merry with banquets and fights, head-cracking, rum-drinking, and other diversions to which they are addicted.

In the case of the woman found dead at the foot of William street, South Brooklyn, the Coroner's jury find: "That the said unknown woman came to her death by violence at the hands of some person or persons to the jury unknown; and the jury are of the opinion that the police force of this district is entirely inadequate, the distance paroled by each man being about eight miles." The city of Brooklyn has not more than one quarter the police force really needed. This abandoned region, Red Hook Point, is especially neglected, although it has whole blocks of fifty tenement houses and low groceries; hogs, dogs, goats, and human creatures worse than these by the hundred, that require restraint. There is beside the immense floating population of the Atlantic Docks—strangers mostly, here to-day and off to-morrow—who are under no more legal or moral control than the wind. The whole district is dark, dirty and dangerous.

The alleged poisoning by rye coffee is making some noise in Brooklyn. Whatever this case may amount to, it is certain that rye often contains ergot, or sprouted rye, in dangerous quantities. The looks say that in France fearful epidemics have been known to spring from the use of such stuff in flour. It is also well known as a medicine to induce abortion. If rye is used at all for coffee, it should be carefully picked over. That the large manufacturers do this is not presumed. The safest way is to burn and grind it at home; and even then, it is not probable that, of a hundred housekeepers, one-half would know the difference between true rye and ergot, chess, and other noxious grains.

At a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce yesterday, Mr. Tomsey introduced a resolution deprecating the attempt of Secession sympathizers or others to injure the credit of the United States by depreciating its notes below those of Banks. It was adopted. A communication was received from an association of Cotton manufacturers in Louisiana, acknowledging the receipt of aid from the city of New-York. And resolutions adopted urging upon the public a continuance of confidence in the Government.

The Air-Line Railway bill before Congress provides for a road to be done in two years from New-York to Washington; first-class trains to go through in eight hours; fare not to exceed 42 cents per mile; second-class freight not over 5 cents per ton per mile; Government to have priority of business at 2 cents per mile for troops, and 3 cents for freight.

A Washington correspondent, writing under date of Feb. 4, says the House Committee had a meeting last night, and the whisky tax was fully discussed. They could not come to a decision, but will probably do so to-day. Opinions varied from 30 cents to \$1.50 per gallon. They will probably compromise somewhere between these figures.

A bogus banking operation under the title of "The Free State Bank of the District of Columbia," has been exploded by the activity of Washington and St. Louis Police. The bogus bonds of the concern were left in a bundle in an irresponsible manner at the office of Mr. S. A. Mills, banker in this city.

Yesterday morning a fire took place in the building No. 169 Broadway, in this city, which spread to the roof of No. 162. The damage sustained by the occupants and the buildings amounts to \$26,000. About \$1,000 worth of property was stolen from the premises during the progress of the fire.

The Hudson County Grand Jury has presented the Hoboken and Newark Railroad, on account of the recent bridge accident. They find the signals and the force at the bridge inadequate, and recommend that all trains be compelled to come to a full stop before crossing a draw.

Our weather took a sudden turn last evening, and a driving rain set in, the temperature being quite warm. All the fine fourishes about skating on the other side of this sheet may be considered a waste of room. At the time of going to press, the storm was driving furiously.

The Supervisors held a stated meeting yesterday, and adopted the report of the Committee on Annual Taxes, with an ordinance making the annual appropriations for the support of the City for the year 1863. The total amount is \$3,624,622.33.

Gen. G. B. McClellan was repudiated yesterday by the Boston Aldermen. A resolution to extend to him the hospitalities of the city was voted down.

The business of the Stock Board was comparatively small in the morning and quotations were irregular. The changes, however, were not important generally. Governments were rather firmer. After the 4 o'clock call the market was quite buoyant, and a general advance was established. The Foreign Bill market was very dull. The supply is not large, but the demand is still smaller. Sterling is 119 1/2 for commercial, and 120 1/2 for bankers' sight. Brights remain steady, and the somewhat heavy flow of amount of copper tender rates controlled by the banks is small. Banks now keep their own notes, which are sought for at a premium, and one-fifth gold tender notes. Money is fairly easy at 6 1/2 per cent, with not much showing 7 1/2 per cent on call. Gold has been fairly active, and had an upward tendency. After selling at 150 1/2, it advanced with readiness to 151 1/2, closing at 151 1/2. Demand Notes are firm at 150, which is nearer gold than they have ever yet stood.

The admirable and patriotic resolutions passed by the Chamber of Commerce yesterday were written, we understand by Mr. A. A. Low. They are timely and to the point, and express, we have not the slightest doubt, the spirit which animates the great body of merchants of this city. Let traitors and the sympathizers with traitors take heed. This class of men may be slow to speak, but when they do speak they say what they mean.

We print on another page an article from the Revue Nationale of Paris, by Edward Laboulaye, to which we wish to direct attention, as a most able statement of reasons "why the North cannot accept of separation." M. Laboulaye is a Professor in the College of France, an Advocate in the Imperial Court of Paris, and a member of the Institute. From his position he speaks with authority, and as one of the ablest writers in France he is sure of an audience. This paper is one of the many evidences that the character of the struggle in which we are engaged is beginning to be thoroughly understood by the best minds of Europe.

It is proper to say, in reference to the distribution of the Committees by the Speaker of the Assembly, that Mr. Sherwood, the first Republican nominee for the Speakership, by withdrawing in favor of Mr. Callicott, became entitled, by Parliamentary courtesy, to be Chairman of the Ways and Means, a position which confers the leadership of the Assembly. But Mr. Sherwood's preference was for the Judiciary, and he is accordingly placed at the head of that Committee, where his influence will be felt inferior to that which he might

have exerted in the more conspicuous position that was offered him.

THE WAR AND "THE PEOPLE."

The N. Y. Times comments on our recent remarks touching the prosecution and close of the War for the Union in terms which we do not consider fair, but it cites so much of our language that we are quite willing to leave whatever is in dispute to the judgment of our respective readers. But it finally quotes us as saying "the Union will be lost by another indecisive campaign," and proceeds to comment as follows:

"We regret exceedingly that Mr. Greeley should have come to any such conclusion at this—and still more, that he should not have been able to see that it was not necessary to proclaim it. We can conceive of nothing better calculated to stimulate the Rebels to desperate resistance than such a declaration. With the prospect of a protracted war, their energies might flag and their courage fail; but with the assurance that three or four months more of successful endeavor would give them victory and independence, they will fight with all the strength that desperation and hope can give them. Mr. Greeley's reiterated proclamation of such a purpose doubles the chances of our defeat."

"We do not suppose that Mr. Greeley consciously intends to produce any such effect. But we cannot forget that at the very outset of this contest he was in favor of Disunion. He conceded the right of the Slave States to secede. He urged the impolicy as well as injustice of a war to keep them from it. He did not believe that the South was worth to the Union what it would cost to keep her in. He desired to relieve the Union from all responsibility for the sin of Slavery, and to throw it all upon the States which maintained it. And he believed the Free States would profit by their deliverance from the political control which the South had always exercised. We have seen no evidence that he has changed these views. He has yielded for the time to the best of his efforts to bring it about by foreign mediation, and an admission to his early belief, and a conviction that the time has come when they can be carried out. The effect of the policy he is now pursuing, if it prove successful, will certainly be to bring about the Disunion, which he seems to deprecate."

The above proceeds on the assumption that the antagonist parties to our present struggle are the Slaveholders' Confederacy and THE NEW-YORK TRIBUNE. This is the very error that we have resolved to dispel. If our "Conservative" and "Democratic" fellow-citizens do really regard this as their War—as the War of the Country—we are on hand for as long and strong a fight as they may desire. If, on the other hand, they choose to regard it as our War, and not theirs, we propose to make a finish of it ere it shall be many months older. And this is an issue that we have resolved they shall plainly meet. Only prove that the people of the loyal States generally regard and treat the War for the Union as theirs, and we are in for so many years more of conflict as may be necessary.

The Times is entirely unjustified in its assertion that we were ever for Disunion, because we did think it best to throw on the Cotton States the responsibility of going out or staying in. We believed that the true way to keep them in—believe now that, before the outbreak of actual war, a decided majority of the Southern People were for the Union—that terrorism first and ultimately bloodshed were requisite to make them even seem to desire Disunion. We don't believe they would have gone out but for their conviction that we would endeavor to keep them in by force; nor do we believe they would have stayed out had they chosen and been permitted peaceably to go. The Times dissents from this, as it has a perfect right to do; but it has no right to say we were ever "in favor of Disunion."

Nor has it a right to say that we "desired to relieve the Nation from all responsibility for the sin of Slavery;" for we deny that the existence of the Union ever involved such a responsibility. We in New-York are no more responsible for the existence of Slavery in Georgia than for that of interpenetration in Canada or idolatry in China. New-York and Georgia are, so far as their social institutions are concerned, entirely independent and irresponsible for each other. The Nation is not responsible for the existence of Slavery in Georgia; it is responsible for the establishment of Slavery in any Territory belonging to it—for the Annexation of Texas on purpose to strengthen the Slave Power—for all manner of Filibustering raids prosecuted through its connivance and Ostend Circulars issued in its name and by its authority. The distinction is a very broad one, and no publicist has a right to ignore it. The Nation is responsible only for its own acts and those which it authorizes or upholds—it is not responsible for the existence of Slavery in Virginia or South Carolina. And we have never deemed the fact that Georgia chooses to be a Slave State a reason for dissolving the Union.

The Times proceeds to say that "We concur with The Tribune in urging upon the Government the necessity of making vigorous, effective and successful war. (This campaign now opening ought to give us victories in every section of the South, and compel submission to our arms and laws. But, if it should fail, we do not believe the people will want to ascertain whether they are really incapable of making peace.) They will press the struggle. They will prepare for a fresh campaign and for further fights. They will not surrender the integrity of the nation and the hopes of humanity until every effort of which the nation is capable shall have been put forth for their preservation."

The whole question turns upon what is the will of "the People" in the premises. If they are generally and heartily for the War, then we believe it may be speedily and triumphantly ended. If they are preponderantly and growingly averse or indifferent to it, then it cannot. Let us bring this matter to the test of facts:

We do not believe that a majority of those who voted for Gov. Seymour in our late Election did so presuming or intending that his success would conduce to the discomfiture and overthrow of the Rebellion. Does The Times?

We do not believe that Gov. Seymour intended that his Message should conduce to the overthrow of the Rebellion, nor that he supposed it would have that effect? Does The Times?

We do not believe that a majority of those who voted for Joel Parker as Governor of New-Jersey did so purposing or expecting that his success would conduce to the downfall of Jeff. Davis & Co. Does The Times?

Ditto as to Parker's Inaugural Address. Ditto as to the late Democratic triumphs in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. What says The Times?

We understand that thousands of copies of The World are regularly distributed through the Army of the Rappahannock gratis, or at a nominal price—opulent Democrats in this City supplying the needful. We believe this distribution is calculated and intended to demor-

alize that Army, and thus aid the Rebels. What says The Times?

We last Summer spent one night of each week for a month or so at a popular watering-place near this City, where nine-tenths of the guests were what are called loyal Democrats. One of them was a Brigadier-General of Volunteers. At this place were two or more avowed Secessionists—one of them the intimate, constant associate of the Democratic Union Brigadier. No one was treated less kindly, cordially, by the great majority for avowing Secession proclivities, while an "Abolitionist" was the general aversion. (All this, mind you, before there was any Proclamation of Freedom to grumble at.) Now, we do not believe this sort of Unionism will ever put down the Rebellion.

If by "the People" The Times means what the term literally imports, then we are at variance primarily on a question of fact. If the anti-Republicans of the loyal States are really intent on saving the Union by putting down the Rebels, then we are with them for so long a fight as may be necessary. But if they are, on the contrary, disposed to let the National cause break down—if they propose to stand off and grumble, and impede, and embarrass, and disaffect—then we tell them that they shall take the full responsibility of their factious and unpatriotic course. We know that the loyal States can put down the Rebellion—we know that THE TRIBUNE alone cannot—we apprehend that the Republicans cannot, unless relieved from "a fire in the rear."

Messrs. leaders of the Democratic party! such resolves as you have set before the Legislature of New-Jersey—such a course as you are pursuing in the Legislatures of Indiana and Illinois—such demonstrations as you are making in aid of desertion and demoralization in our National armies—are hurrying the country to ruin. Will you pause in your career, and unite in an earnest, resolute, united effort to save the Republic? It is not yet too late; but who can say how soon it may be?

POCKET MORALITY—WAR FOR TRADE.

In the year 1757, Benjamin Franklin wrote to an English gentleman as follows: "I read with pleasure the account you give of the flourishing state of your commerce and manufactures, and of the plenty you have of resources to carry the nation through all its difficulties. You have one of the finest countries in the world; and if you can be cured of the folly of making war for trade, in which war more has been expended than the profits of any trade can compensate—you may make it one of the happiest." This advice, we suppose, would be quite thrown away upon a newspaper irrevocably wedded to the system here so pointedly condemned. The London Times accepts the well-known aphorism of Franklin with a qualification—it thinks that there never was a good war, if it was unprofitable, and never a bad peace, if it added to British wealth. Such a publication should be treated with all possible candor. If its principle be to have no principle, and if it would quite as severely scorn to affect a virtue as to possess one, let it, at least, aspire to the praise of a sublime consistency. If it must serve Mammon, let us be thankful that it does not pretend to serve God! If it must ignore consistency, it should have the credit of a frank advertisement of its renunciation. What it thinks upon the First of January, it thinks for the First of January, and by no means for the Second. Its avowed business is not to speak the truth, but to "Bull" this stock and to "Bear" that. This being understood, why should we be angry with it? All that can be said of it, is that it follows its instincts, and that its instincts are commercial. It does a wholesale business in a retail way. Who blames it? Who blames the Calmucks for eating raw horse-meat? Who blames the cannibal of Sumatra for eating cooked man-meat?—not because he likes it—for he is very careful to tell the traveler that he does not like it—he only devours it as a religious duty—only that he may propitiate the God of War by masticating, swallowing, and digesting the slain. He does not quarrel with the flavor of the tid-bits, from the degradation of which he anticipates such immense advantages. It is in the same bold and devoted way that this Times newspaper swallows Slavery on Monday, rejects it on Tuesday, and swallows it again on Wednesday, relishing the morsels well or ill, according to the fluctuations of the cotton market. Yesterday it pronounced Human Slavery to be a Divine Institution, and quoted St. Paul out of its borrowed Bible—to-day, it declares that it "would unfeignedly rejoice" if the Emancipation Proclamation could only be effectual! What will it say to-morrow? Exactly what it may think the interests of trade to demand. "Joey B. is sharp, Sir!"

It would ill become us, members as we are of a great commercial community, to speak disrespectfully of mercantile prudence and sagacity. We yield to no one, in our most respectful estimate of the ameliorating influences of trade in promoting the comfort and even the higher morality of men. We know enough of monetary operations to understand that they can only be successfully promoted by forethought, caution and deliberate prudence. We are ready to make all proper allowances for the instinct of self-preservation when it is shrinking from insolvency. We believe money to be a good thing, and that it is a good thing to have money. We believe that society has no member more worthy of its respect than the high-minded merchant, who, without bringing discredit upon trade by unscrupulous rapacity, increases our sources of happiness, brings capital to the assistance of civilization, and supplies that material aid without which the progress of mankind would cease. But all our respect for the honorable and enlightened trader cannot conceal from us those moral perils which environ him. Indeed, in every scheme of religion they are admitted; and the most solemn warning against absolute devotion to money-getting came from the Founder of our Faith, and has in his time been repeated in countless bodies of divinity, and uttered from ten thousand pulpits. Money can do much and buy much,

but there are some things which it cannot do and others which it cannot purchase. We may admit it to be the sinews of war—but is it the heart or the muscles? In England, we think very unfortunately, the tendency has been toward a worship of wealth, simply as such, and a contempt not perhaps for personal, but certainly for national poverty. "He's so very poor," says one person of another in an English comedy, "that you would take him for an inhabitant of Italy." This is the perfection of purse-proud complacency. De Toqueville observes that in "the eyes of England, her enemies must be rogues, and her friends great men." It is this association of arrogance and acquisitiveness which has given to England a bad Public Reputation. "When she seems," says De Toqueville, "to care for foreign nations, she cares only for herself." A man who acquires a character like this will find money powerless to purchase public respect—he may be feared, but he will also be detested—nor do we believe that there is one rule for nations and another for individuals.

Finally, in the spirit of Franklin's observation that the rapacity of England has usually cost more than it came to, we beg leave to suggest that an unjust and selfish policy is equally short-sighted. Have British economists been able to determine that the establishment of the Confederacy would promote the manufacturing interests of their country? Have they, in their calculations, recognized the intense prejudice against England which exists in the Slaveholding States? Have they estimated the chances of a certain production of the coveted staple, if the present system of slave-cultivation is to be continued? Have they considered the difficulties which they may encounter in maintaining amicable relations with the unreasonable and impetuous oligarchy which now controls, and in the event of their independence will continue to control the Revolted States? These, it seems to us, are questions which even selfishness can afford to consider.

MUTATIONS AT ALBANY.

The New-York Express of last evening has the following jubilant paragraph: FROM ALBANY TO-DAY—THE CANAL APPOINTMENTS. The appointments of Collectors and other Canal officials are all made, and the Ballots are closed out. The Union Ticket men of 1861 and the Democrats united, and have given the appointments to Weed Republicans and Democrats retreating to appoint any man having a Radical record.

Radicals and Greeleyites are pretty much "used up" in Albany this season and hence there is much "swearing." Weed, like a cat, falls on his feet, and has as much control in the Politics of the State, as ever. The story is, that the President has telegraphed for him to go to Washington, but that is doubtless given out for effect.

In the Summer and Autumn of 1861, there was a very general desire expressed by earnest supporters of the War for the Union that but one ticket should be presented and supported at our approaching State Election. The Republican State Committee formally proposed a Union Ticket to the Democratic, but was repulsed with contempt by Dean Richmond's Central Regency. They insisted on running a straight party ticket, and in their nominating State Convention showed their teeth significantly at those charged by the Constitution with the conduct of the War for the Union. A portion of the Democrats, led by Daniel S. Dickinson and Lyman Tremain, revolted at this, and united in the formation of a Union State Ticket, which swept the State by One Hundred Thousand majority, despite the adverse efforts of Dean Richmond, Horatio Seymour & Co. The "Weed Republicans" entered very coldly into the Union arrangement—in fact, did not enter fully into it at all. They nominated a Republican Canal Commissioner—Benj. F. Bruce—against Fredk A. Tallmadge, the only "conservative Whig" of The Express school placed on the Union ticket, and so divided the Union vote that Wm. W. Wright, the Regency candidate, was elected. Fernando Wood and his wing of our City Democracy supported generally the Union candidates.

The decided "Radicals" very generally supported the Union candidates throughout, including Tallmadge. The "Weed Republicans" sustained Bruce. Horatio Ballard, previously a Conservative Democrat, and Wm. B. Lewis, who had been a Whig, then an American, but had gone for Lincoln in 1860, were pinned on the Union State ticket by "Radical" support, and thus triumphantly elected.

A year has passed, and these gentlemen turn against the party which elected them, outst their own appointees from office, and fill their places with Seymour Democrats and "Weed Republicans"—(a distinction, be it noted, not of our making.) The "Radicals" are, as we are entitled to say, "cleaned out!"—the State Board having "refused to appoint any man having a Radical record." And "Weed," it is added—the gentleman who just resigned the conduct of the Republican State Paper, avowedly because he was at irreconcilable variance with his party as to the conduct of the War—like a cat, falls on his feet, and has as much control of the politics of the State as ever." We simply make a note of these things, for the benefit of the "bissing vipers," who were placed under Weed's heel by the defeat of Gen. Wadsworth. Things take such turns now and then.

SEVEN PAGES.

We print this morning the long-withheld official report of Gen. Heintzelman of the battles of the 31st May and 1st June on the Peninsula. Few battles in this war have given rise to more controversy than this. The question of the conduct of Gen. Casey's Division has remained in a measure unsettled ever since. Gen. Heintzelman's opinion is very plainly expressed. "Nothing but the great gallantry of Gen. Kearney, who had a horse shot under him while leading the 57th N. Y. into action, his officers and men, and the steadiness of most of Couch's Division, saved us from a most disastrous defeat." The divisions of Kearney and Couch had been ordered up to reinforce Casey, the condition of whose command may be judged from the statement that: "Some of the regiments fought gallantly till overpowered by numbers. After they were once broken, however, they could not be rallied. The road was filled

with fugitives (not all from this division) as far as Bottom's Bridge. Col. Starr's regiment of Gen. Holmes division had to force its way through them with the bayonet, and a guard I placed at Bottom's Bridge stopped over a thousand men." Gen. Casey's camp, it is well known, was taken, but it has been denied that it was surprised. Gen. Heintzelman says, "An officer informed me that after we had driven the enemy beyond our first intrenchments, he visited Gen. Casey's camp, and found more men bayoneted and shot inside the shelter tents than outside of them." The names of certain regiments said to have behaved well will be found in the report.

Most of the ground which was lost was carried by the first rush of the Rebels. After Kearney came up, our force did not fall back a third of a mile. Gen. Sedgwick's arrival late in the afternoon saved the day on the right.

We note with interest that on the next morning Gen. Hooker led the 5th and 6th New-Jersey forward near the railroad, and, after some firing, made a gallant charge with the bayonet, leading the two regiments himself, and drove back the Rebels nearly a mile. The ground lost on the first day was recovered on the second, and on the following morning Gen. Hooker, with a portion of his division, pushed forward on a reconnaissance to within five miles of Richmond, driving the enemy's pickets before him as he advanced. In the afternoon he fell back and occupied the position held by Casey before the battle. We lost on the first day eight pieces of artillery, and on both days, in the aggregate, 4,002 men, killed, wounded, and missing.

It is impossible to understand why a report containing facts of such interest has been so long withheld from publication. While a campaign is in progress silence may be a wise policy, but when military reasons for reticence have ceased to exist, the public has a right to know the facts. The history of the Peninsula campaign is yet a labyrinth of doubts which only official reports can clear up. They at least ought not to be suppressed with a view to shielding the blunders of any General, or even to hide the mistakes of such there were, of his officers.

MILITARY ORGANIZATION.

Foreign nations are astounded that seven millions of Southerners, burdened with the care of watching three millions of negro slaves, should have been able for nearly two entire years to hold at bay twenty millions of Northerners. There is one reason for this result demanding more consideration than it has yet received. The military system of the South, though not perfect, approaches perfection. Our military system is so imperfect and irrational that it compels us all the time to oppose raw levies to disciplined forces.

Military writers estimate that in an ordinary campaign the wear and tear of an army by death, wounds and disease, amounts to one-fourth of its whole force. Say that we have 200,000 men in arms. The annual wear and tear will therefore be 200,000 men, and to keep up the army to its present strength we must furnish annually 200,000 recruits. Upon the mode in which these 200,000 recruits are used depends the whole question of the efficiency of the army.

The Southern system is to distribute their available conscripts among the old regiments, keeping each regiment, as near as possible, up to its full number. "Our many memorable successes," says President Davis in his late Message, "are with justice ascribed in large measure to the reorganization and reinforcement of our armies under the operation of the conscription." The Northern system is to keep perpetually raising new regiments, and to allow the old veteran regiments to dwindle away to nothing, till in a year or two there will be nothing left of them but commissioned and non-commissioned officers, all drawing high salaries. To regiments of veterans we oppose on the battlefield regiments of raw recruits commanded by raw officers, and then wonder that the result is often straggling, skulking, insubordination, panic-flight, and defeat! With disciplined troops the worst Generals sometimes succeed, with raw levies, war, instead of being a game of nearly pure skill, becomes a mere game of chance; and the best General in the world can make no certain calculation as to what his men will do, or whether they will do anything at all.

Both in the English and in the French armies, and, we believe, in all European armies at the present day, a simple but most efficient system of recruiting, which was first invented by the great Napoleon, is universally adopted. Every regiment is composed of three or four battalions, one of which, called the depot battalion, remains permanently at home in some garrison town, receiving and training recruits, and forwarding them as fast as they are trained, to the war battalions which are engaged in active service. By this admirable plan the effective force of the army in the field is kept up to its full standard, and not a man is put to work at soldiering until he has learned the trade.

"Napoleon," says the historian Thiers, "paid extreme attention to the organization of the depots. He resolved to make the conscripts repair thither a year beforehand, that, during this year, instructed, trained, unured to fatigue, they might be rendered capable of replacing the old soldiers carried off by time or war. Excepting some regiments of infantry consisting of four battalions, all the others had three, two of which were war battalions destined to take the field, and one a depot battalion placed in general upon the frontier." He necessarily repeated, that on the attention paid to the depot battalions depended the quality and the duration of an army." At a subsequent period Napoleon, in his eagerness to make a greater number of his soldiers available at once in the field, reorganized the French army, so that each regiment should consist of seven war battalions and only one depot battalion. And it is a most instructive fact that from this period commenced the series of reverses experienced by his arms, which culminated eventually in his downfall, and that 1841