

NEW YORK HERALD

BROADWAY AND ANN STREET.

JAMES GORDON BENNETT, PROPRIETOR.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.—On and after January 1, 1875, the daily and weekly editions of the New York Herald will be sent free of postage.

THE DAILY HERALD, published every day in the year. Four cents per copy. Twelve dollars per year, or one dollar per month, free of postage, to subscribers.

All business or news letters and telegraphic dispatches must be addressed New York Herald.

Rejected communications will not be returned.

Letters and packages should be properly sealed.

LONDON OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK HERALD—NO. 46 FLEET STREET.

Subscriptions and advertisements will be received and forwarded on the same terms as in New York.

VOLUME XL.....NO. 158

AMUSEMENTS TO-NIGHT.

- WALLACK'S THEATRE. Broadway—THE DONOVANS, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:40 P. M.
BOVEY OPERA HOUSE. No. 201 Bowery.—VALETTI, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.
ROBINSON HALL. West Sixteenth street.—English Opera—GIROFLE-ROFFIA, at 8 P. M.
WOODS MUSEUM. Broadway, corner of Third street.—SHERIDAN & JACKSON'S GRAND VALETTE COMBINATION, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:40 P. M.
GILMORE'S SUMMER GARDEN. Late Barnum's Hippodrome.—GRAND POPULAR CONCERT, at 8 P. M.; closes at 11 P. M. Ladies and children's matinee at 2 P. M.
PARK THEATRE, BROOKLYN. Broadway, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:40 P. M.
METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART. West Fourteenth street.—Open from 10 A. M. to 5 P. M.
PARK THEATRE. Broadway.—EMERSON'S CALIFORNIA MINSTRELS, at 8 P. M.
OLYMPIC THEATRE. No. 224 Broadway.—VALETTI, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.
FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE. Twenty-eighth street and Broadway.—THE BIG BONANZA, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.
CENTRAL PARK GARDEN. THEODORE THOMAS' CONCERT, at 8 P. M.
METROPOLITAN THEATRE. No. 205 Broadway.—VALETTI, at 8 P. M.

TRIPLE SHEET.

NEW YORK, MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1875.

From our reports this morning the probabilities are that the weather to-day will be cooler and partly cloudy, with occasional local storms.

Persons going out of town for the summer can have the daily and Sunday Herald mailed to them, free of postage, for \$1 per month.

THE FRENCH ASSEMBLY has decided that M. Burgeon, the Bonapartist candidate in the Department of Nièvre, was not elected. Our Paris correspondence discusses the causes of recent political events at the capital.

THE UNKNOWN GERMAN princess, whom it was reported was to marry King Alfonso, may be congratulated on her escape. The uncertainty of the future of this royal youth, perhaps, induced her prudent parents to object to the match.

THE CORPORATION OF LONDON sends its compliments to Mr. Wickham and will be happy to see him at dinner at Guildhall next month. It is to be hoped that His Honor will be able to accept the invitation. This is an era of international courtesies.

THE COLLEGE REGATTA at Saratoga will be even more interesting this summer than it was last year, and, as will be seen by our letters from Cambridge and Providence, the Harvard and Brown universities are preparing for the contest by thorough training of the crews.

THE CARLETS have shown renewed activity this year, and, though in the winter it was reported that the rebellion was almost at an end, the cable dispatches lately indicate that they are about as strong as ever. Our letter from Bayonne gives a detailed explanation of the advantages Don Carlos has gained.

THE FRENCH RACES.—The race for the Grand Prize of Paris was won by Salvador yesterday. Our cable dispatches describe the features of this notable event, in which, as the French horses beat the English, their enthusiastic backers will consider that Waterloo is at last avenged.

LITERATURE.—A full survey of the field of literature is given by our reviews and foreign correspondents to-day. The writings of Richard Wagner upon "Art, Life and Theories" are examined; the freshest English books are criticized in our London letter; from France we have an interesting study of M. d'Haussonville's work on the prison system of that country, with the latest news of art and the drama, while in "Chats About Books" several recent American novels are analyzed.

THE FLOATING HOSPITAL is one of the most useful of the charitable institutions of New York, and last summer rendered a vast service to the city children. St. John's Guild is preparing for similar excursions on the bay and rivers this year, and has already received more than eight thousand dollars in subscriptions. But more money is needed to complete the work, and our benevolent citizens will surely make an immediate response.

THE HAZLEB FLATS are known to be the cause of disease, but to-day we narrate a case of death which the medical authorities trace directly to their poisonous effect. The decaying organic matter already there cannot be removed this summer,—indeed, it would be dangerous to disturb it during the hot season,—but it can be covered with earth, and thus the city will be protected. There is no better nor cheaper disinfectant. The Board of Health should see that this remedy is promptly applied.

Attorney General Pierpont on the Third Term.

Among the distinguished public men who have consented to let their views of President Grant's letter be known to the country there is none who is better entitled or better qualified to speak as an expounder of that enigmatical document than Judge Pierpont. The new Attorney General is honored with the personal confidence of the President in perhaps a higher degree than any other member of the Cabinet. Secretary Fish, who has so long held the chief place and has seen all his Cabinet colleagues changed while he alone remains, may be more trusted by the President as an official adviser; but the prudent reserve, which is a part of Mr. Fish's character, is not so well calculated to make him the repository of the President's personal confidences as the frank and more communicative nature of Judge Pierpont, in whose presence reticence is relaxed, on the principle that like begets like. In the interview with our representative, which we publish to-day, Mr. Pierpont spoke with his habitual frank courtesy, but even his statements do not remove the doubts excited by the President's ambiguous letter. Mr. Pierpont's language is indeed very emphatic. "President Grant," he says, "has told me his plans for the future, and I cannot consider that he has concealed anything from me. If he has a wish to be President again he must have a capability for deception such as no other man ever had before him." This might seem conclusive if human experience did not so abundantly attest the capacity of men to deceive themselves. We have forgotten that ancient exile from power it was who persuaded himself he was far happier in his rural recreations than he would be in governing a State, but to whom these tranquil pursuits seemed intolerably rapid from the moment the news reached him that he was likely to be recalled. The fabulists have delighted to satirize this weakness of human nature, as in the fable of the fox who thought the grapes were sour when he found he could not leap high enough to pluck them, and the fable of the cat who was transformed into a fine lady and presided at the tea table with all the airs of polite breeding until a mouse chanced to run across the room, when she gave a sudden spring over the rattling china to pounce upon the little intruder. If her feline ladyship had assured her tea table companions three minutes before that she had become quite indifferent to mice she would have had as little consciousness of deception as General Grant had in the assurances he gave Judge Pierpont. We therefore submit with great deference to Mr. Pierpont, whom we sincerely respect, that there is no necessary imputation on the President's sincerity in supposing that he may yet be a candidate in 1876.

The conflicting interpretations of his letter are a natural consequence of the ambiguity of its language and the contrariety of its positions. It supports both sides of the question; the negative meekly and tamely, the affirmative with vigor and zeal. President Grant defends the principle of the third term, but disclaims any personal desire to benefit by it in practice. But he cannot be ignorant that what the American people chiefly object to is the principle. Their strenuous opposition to a third term is far less a personal opposition directed against General Grant than a determination to protect our institutions from a dangerous innovation. If they could be persuaded by the arguments of the letter to yield the principle; if they could be brought to agree with the President that a third term is just as legitimate as a second or a first, the republican party would be more likely to run General Grant again than to take up a new candidate. The Pennsylvania resolution, which called forth his letter, was aimed solely against the principle of the third term, and was accompanied with another resolution strongly indorsing the administration of President Grant. The Ohio platform made the same broad discrimination, condemning the third term on principle, but praising the patriotism, wisdom and public services of the present incumbent. The republican conventions are not opposing the man, but the principle, and it is evident that no man has any chance of a third term unless opposition to the principle can be broken down. President Grant, with the eye of a strategist, directs his guns against the main fortress, which stands on the frontiers of the forbidden ground. He is too skillful a campaigner to weaken his attack on the frowning fortress which hedges his way by attempting to gain any minor point which could not be held while exposed to its guns. His arguments in support of the third term principle could not have gained a hearing if he had not taken his personal claims out of the discussion. Should he succeed in convincing the American people that a third term is as legitimate as a first (and this seems the main purpose of his letter) the republican party might then be easily persuaded that Grant is their strongest man. If he can demolish that part of the opposition to a third term which is founded on principle—the personal opposition to him as a candidate will not be very formidable in his own party. He has dexterously separated the personal question from the question of principle with as true a strategy as that which taught him that he could capture Richmond only by faking the forts which blocked his approach.

Had it been the real purpose of President Grant in writing his letter to remove doubts and silence criticism he would not have made it so clear that he favors the third term principle and left it so uncertain whether he would personally accept a third term. While he stoutly maintains that a third term is as proper as a first, he does not say unequivocally that he will not accept another nomination if it should be offered him. He merely postpones the personal question pending the question of principle which his letter is designed to influence. He says he would not accept another nomination "unless it should come under such circumstances as to make it an imperative duty." The President is willing to have it understood that he will not refuse another nomination if he can be persuaded that it is his "imperative duty" to accept it. He furnishes in this letter an easy clue to his notions of the imperative duty to accept a nomination for the Presidency. He informs us that it was in obedience to such a sense of duty that he accepted his first nomination, at

a prodigious sacrifice of personal interest and comfort. "But I was made to believe," he says, "that the public good called me to make the sacrifice." As he yielded to an imperative sense of duty in accepting his first nomination, he has furnished a criterion for judging how he would construe his duty in accepting a third. The imperative duty, in the first instance, was merely the duty of preventing the election of a democratic President, and, measured by the same standard, President Grant would take a third nomination if his supporters should again convince him that he is the only man who can beat the democrats. In plain words, General Grant is willing to run again if his party should think him its strongest candidate. The strongest republican candidate he would undoubtedly be if the country did not oppose the third election of a President on principle, quite irrespective of his personal merits. The bold attempt which General Grant has made in his letter to discredit and demolish that principle, and thus remove the chief obstacle to his nomination, is as inexplicable as it was unnecessary, if he had no other purpose than to quiet the public fears. It is more probable that the real design of the letter was to prevent the republican conventions of other States from following the example of Pennsylvania and committing themselves against the principle of the third term. If the republican party would drop the subject on the strength of his declaration it would not be precluded from nominating him again by resolutions in all the States like that adopted in Pennsylvania. The letter was intended to head off the passage of more such resolutions, and to convince the country that a third term is constitutional, and may at some time be necessary to the public safety. If the republican party could be brought to accept this doctrine the renomination of Grant would follow as a matter of course, for he is personally the strongest man in the party. And if he were once nominated this "imperative duty" of beating the democrats would overcome his reluctance in 1876 as it did in 1868.

The Tolerance of the Modern Politician.

A comparison of the views of our leading clergymen is an interesting and sometimes a profitable occupation, but it is rarely exciting. The churches at this time and in this country seem to live together comfortably and to be united by a spirit of tolerance. Now and then some Protestant divine thunders forth against the abominations of Rome, and endeavors to show that the Pope is the beast spoken of in Revelation, or some Catholic priest denounces free schools and puts out of the pale of salvation all who do not believe in his own creed; but these are exceptions to the good feeling that exists. Clergymen have ceased to beat each other with books of divinity, and polemical discussions are rarely heard in the pulpit. The tendency to preach morality and those truths of Christianity which all sects acknowledge results in a harmony which is in remarkable contrast to the religious feuds that formerly disturbed the religious world. To compare the sermons of the Roman Catholics, the Episcopalians, the Methodists, the Presbyterians, is to find not so much the differences as the resemblances of their teachings. Occasionally, however, we find very opposite views, as in Mr. Frothingham's sermon of yesterday and that of Mr. Talmage. Mr. Frothingham dealt with symbols and shadows, and said that "a single hour of duty is worth a century of exorcism, of prayer and of praise." The Brooklyn preacher, on the contrary, declared that "we want more prayer in the store, in the nursery, in the parlor, in the legislative halls; more prayer among the young, among the old." Mr. Beecher, in his sermon at Plymouth church, affirmed the certainty of punishment for sin, arguing from analogy, and defined "punishment to be but another term for effect." The same conclusion was reached by Rev. Mr. Ganse from widely different premises. His subject was the holiness of God, which he described as a torrent of destruction if it flows in the way of justice. "A holy God cannot be regardless of unholiness." Here in the case of Mr. Frothingham and Mr. Talmage is a direct issue; in the case of Mr. Beecher and Mr. Ganse we see how the same conclusion is reached by different ways. The reader may find other interesting points in the intelligent discourse of Mr. Hepworth, upon Christ as a prophet and the Bible as a book of holiness; in Mr. Martin's thoughts upon the cost of working out our salvation; Mr. Leavell's explanation of the text "What think ye of Christ?" and the other sermons reported in our columns to-day.

General Spinner.

The loss of a large sum of money while in the custody of the Treasurer of the United States casts light on the difference between the Secretary of the Treasury and General Spinner, in virtue of which the latter is about to quit the post he has worthily filled for many years. It will be remembered that the difference between these functionaries turns upon what is called patronage, in the political view of appointment to office. Mr. Bristow or some of his political friends wanted to appoint a man to a vacant place under General Spinner, and General Spinner objected and claimed the right to fill the place, upon the simple ground that he must himself choose the persons for whose honesty he is under the law officially responsible. But his claim was overruled and his resignation was accepted, and on this difference he is to give way to another. Forty-seven thousand dollars have now been stolen while legally in the Treasurer's custody. For the safety of that money he is not only financially but criminally responsible, inasmuch as if he "falls safely to keep" the moneys of the government he is guilty of embezzlement, and "shall" be punished by imprisonment for "not less than six months nor more than ten years," and shall also be fined in a sum equal to the amount "embezzled." His bond also is conditioned for the fidelity of the persons under him. Yet upon an officer thus responsible for the acts of the many persons in his department his administrative superiors claim the right to force the loose adventurers who hunt for profitable employment in the political routine of distinguished men. This is one of the many monstrosities incident to the system that contemplates offices of trust as the spoil of party warfare.

French Finance.

The case of Philippart continues to excite unusual interest in Paris. The Jay Gould of France has no lack of hired supporters in the newspapers, but his adversaries count even a larger army of mercenaries in their pay. It is not long since M. Clapier, a member of the National Assembly and President of the extra Parliamentary Committee on Railways, publicly declared that the immense power obtained by the great companies was a national misfortune, that they formed a secret league, united by the bond of common interest, and had almost the entire press at their command, purchasing its support or its silence. Some of them had a staff of from forty thousand to fifty thousand employes in their service and enjoyed so vast a patronage as to exercise a serious control over government departments. It is obviously the interest of Philippart to pose as the representative of humble interests which gigantic monopolies threaten to ruin. In a recent letter to the Journal des Debats he begins very meekly by saying that "there were once two companies—the one great, very great; the other little, very little. A kind fairy presided at the birth of the first, which it largely and lavishly dowered. An evil genius—was it, indeed, an evil genius?—spoke these words over the cradle of the second:—'Little one, thou wilt have to work hard; thou wilt have to struggle much against ill wishes. They will take every kind of shape, they will use every means in their power to injure thee; but I give thee patience, courage and energy. If, with these virtues, thou dost not triumph the fault will be thine.'" This is a strange style and strange imagery for a discussion on finance, and is probably used with deliberate art. The shrewd speculator appeals to popular sympathy, which he is perfectly aware is commonly bestowed from any other than reasonable motives. "Smilies," observed a witty writer, "are no argument; that is probably why they convince so many persons." A metaphor, in which Philippart shall appear as the lamb and Baron Alphonse de Rothschild as the wolf, may, the former rightly judges, have considerable effect upon the simple. The remainder of Philippart's apology is devoted to an indignant denial that his nails are made of cardboard and straw.

It must in fairness be conceded to Philippart that his enemies themselves are not altogether free from blame. They have not scrupled to attack his private character at the most critical periods, when the question for shareholders should have been not whether Philippart was an honest man or a rogue, but whether the projects, in furtherance of which he asked for their money, were based on sound calculations or the reverse. It is impossible for anybody, however fair may be his intentions, to carry on business properly if, at the very moment that an operation is assuming larger proportions and a corresponding increase of capital is thereby necessitated, he has to defend himself against vague insinuations which affect his reputation for probity and are yet too impalpable to be openly grappled with.

The object of these insidious assaults is, nevertheless, perfectly able to take care of himself, being, in reality, one of the most powerful men in France. During the late trial the Advocate General expressed himself with extraordinary bitterness regarding the action of the Crédit Mobilier, of which Philippart was constituted the virtual head by the vote of a meeting held on the 2d of March. "There seemed," exclaimed M. Hémart, "a disposition on the part of the directors to hurl defiance at Justice, to tell her, 'Our plans are settled and unalterable. We mean to carry them out. Whatever betide, we shall push on, with or without your injunctions, toward the goal we have in view.'" There is evidently a gloomy feeling among Frenchmen that the plutocrats of the present day are getting to be above the law. The rich contractor of the nineteenth century fills the same place in society as the Farmer-General of Customs filled in the eighteenth. The one prepared the way for the Revolution of 1789. From the other there appears to be no deterrence. But in France, where men expect the administration to remedy all ills, there is likely to be a cry for a strong ruler to keep stock jobbers in order. People forget that this class was never so powerful as under the so-called "strong" government of Louis Napoleon.

The controversy which has raged during the last two months has clearly demonstrated one important truth—namely, the endless mischief which is the result of a carelessly framed law. An act of the French Legislature, in 1855, gave the Councils General in the departments power to grant concessions of lines of local interest, while reserving to the State the right of authorizing those of general interest, but neglected to define clearly the distinction between the two categories of railways. At the same time no provision was made against the amalgamation of a number of local lines. The Councils General no sooner received their powers than they began to exercise them without any sort of discretion. Concessions were freely granted, not so much because the utility of this or that line had been proved, but because it was well to assert the principle of local self-government. "Do not," said a great French statesman to his contemporaries, "do not brutalize the machine of the constitution by too frequent usage." He knew his countrymen well. If a right or a privilege is given them they will not wait for a proper occasion to arise for its legitimate exercise. It must be put in force at once. So the savage, who is presented with a hammer and some nails, proceeds forthwith to drive all the nails into the wall of his tent for the mere pleasure of seeing them sink into the wood. Companies soon took advantage of this weakness of the Councils General. They obtained concessions in different departments and then amalgamated the lines until an extensive network had been formed. The network had attained to dimensions of national interest, and, according to the spirit of the law of 1855, should not have been created without the intervention of the State itself. Yet it had been formed by the sole vote of one provincial board after another. The central executive could never determine at what point it became its duty to interfere. It is to be feared that, as is too often the case in this country, an extreme remedy will be applied to what is unquestionably a substantial evil. Possibly the Councils

General will be completely stripped of their powers and serious damage thus be inflicted, both on commercial enterprise and on the luckless cause of local self-government in France.

What Does General Grant Mean?

This may be the best of all possible worlds, but it is certainly not without occasional drawbacks to perfect and unmitigated felicity. Here, now, is General Grant's third term letter. There are actually people and newspapers which pretend they do not understand it! "Does he mean that he does not or that he does want a third term?" they ask. This is too bad. Last winter the HERALD was at the trouble of elaborately and painfully explaining the meaning of the President's Message to Congress. When we had got done with that we certainly hoped the public would hereafter understand him; but here is another case of general misapprehension, and as the General wrote this letter plainly in obedience to the HERALD's somewhat urgent and often repeated requests we feel bound now not to leave him in the lurch.

In the first place, then, it will, we suppose, be generally granted that he means something. This much admitted, we proceed to say that it matters very little what he really means. It is quite enough that he seems to decline another term (unless—). He plainly says that he does not now suppose the exigencies of the country will require his re-election (unless—), and in this we cordially agree with him. Whether, therefore, he really, at bottom, would like to be renominated is of not the least consequence. All that the republican conventions have to do is to take it for granted that he has declined, and to act accordingly. And we advise them to come out strong for a single term for the Presidency. It is, just now, a popular notion. General Grant has conceived a good many American voters that one term is as much as we commonly need for any President. A good strong one-term resolution will please the public, and it will probably mitigate General Grant's regrets at leaving the White House in 1877; for if he does not want three terms he probably does not want anybody else to have two.

"The Protection of Character."

A correspondent of a rural journal, one of that class of useful gentlemen whose imagination we are afraid is sometimes allowed too vividly to color their facts, gives us an account of a proposed society that is to be formed in New York for "the protection of character." This society is to be supported by voluntary contributions. It is to be based upon the plan embodied in Mr. Bergh's useful, if at times eccentric, Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. A distinguished citizen, whose name is not given, is to become the President. There is to be a council of men of high character, and vigilant lawyers are to be engaged. The duty of the society will be to prosecute by indictment any journal published in New York that prints a libellous statement reflecting upon the character of a private or public citizen. As our correspondent properly shows, the license that attends the management of certain of our newspapers is only stimulated by the indifference of public and private citizens to attack. An action for libel in New York would be a burlesque upon justice. The reason is that while the means of most private citizens are limited, and while no gentleman, under any circumstances, cares to undergo the ordeal of an action at law, the resources of a newspaper are generally large, and a libel suit is looked upon as only another form of advertisement. Consequently ninety-nine out of a hundred libels are passed by with impunity because of the indifference of the person attacked to criticism, or his incapacity to measure resources with a powerful newspaper with money at its command and writers perfectly capable and willing to hold any judge or jury to a severe accountability who would attempt to do justice upon them. The duty of the society, however, will be to make every libel its own case, just as Mr. Bergh makes the wrongs of every dumb animal his own proper quarrel. The only process by which a society of this kind could reach a libeller would be by indictment before a grand jury.

We have no doubt that if a society of this kind were properly organized and its members kept it in funds it would do a great work. The honest newspapers of New York would regard nothing with more gratification than an efficient law of libel. It is as much to their interest as to those of the people that this business of wantonly assailing private and public character should be stamped out. The indifference that is felt by so many people to newspaper attacks is in itself a reflection upon the power of the press. If journalism has fallen so low in this country that a private gentleman can afford to treat with disdain a persistent and virulent attack upon him, conscious of his own innocence and integrity, conscious that the assaults make no impression whatever upon the public—that they are dismissed as the ravings of cowardice and scoundrelism—it is a severe commentary upon the independence and power of the press. Now, if we could put an end to this indiscriminate and brutal and wanton assailing of private character the result would be that when a newspaper did seriously make a charge it would be respected and believed.

A society for the protection of reputations would have a very wide scope. We do not know upon what the correspondent bases his narrative, but we think such a society is more needed in New York than even Mr. Bergh's Association for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

A Suggestion for Bunker Hill.

The Bunker Hill Centennial being the commemoration of a truly national event we hope the committee who have in charge the preparations will not forget to give it a national rather than a local character. To fail to do this would be to belittle the memory and importance of the battle whose hundredth anniversary is to be celebrated. A Baptist preacher up in Maine commendably remarked, in the course of his morning prayer, "O Lord, we would not venture to advise or instruct, but only to suggest." In the same spirit we address to the Bunker Hill Committee the respectful suggestion that they would do wisely, not only for the grandeur of their celebration, but for the advancement of that good feeling between the lately estranged sec-

tions which we trust will be brought to a general and cordial handshaking at Philadelphia next year, if they would take pains to invite a few prominent citizens from all parts of the Union, and especially from the Southern States. We should like to see Mr. Lamar of Mississippi; General John H. Morgan, of Alabama; Colonel Zachary or Mr. Moncure, of Louisiana, and a few dozen others invited to be present and one or two of the most eminent asked to speak on the great day. The North, however, has more to do for the national celebration of this event than merely to extend an invitation. There are organizations in the Southern States which have intended to visit this ancient field of glory, to renew the friendship of old times and to pledge again fraternity for the future. They should be complimented by the Bunker Hill committee with the offer of all facilities of transportation, and the welcome of the North should be made in all respects equal to the traditional hospitality of the South. They should be the guests of Massachusetts, just as under similar circumstances Massachusetts would be the guest of South Carolina or Alabama.

The Ohio Republican Convention has just declared in its platform that "these States are one, as a nation," which is quite true. To celebrate a national event like Bunker Hill we do not need to invite our cousins; and, indeed, it might be in bad taste to ask some of them. But by all means let us have as many of our brothers as can be induced to come, no matter how far away their farms lie.

The Situation in Germany.

We print this morning an interesting letter from Berlin in reference to the situation in Germany, written at a time when Paris and London were frantic over their apprehensions of a general war. As our correspondent shows, the idea that Germans would gladly lapse into the pursuits of peace when they had conquered the French, that they were really a "simple, idyllic and studious people," caring only for peace and science and tranquillity, was erroneous. The fall of France meant the rise of Germany, and not simply the confederation of States, caring only for their internal improvement and the protection of their frontiers, but as a mighty aggressive military Power, who, having overthrown France, stood ready and only anxious to combat with the rest of the world. According to our correspondent Germany is now controlled by absolutism, taking its source, not from the throne, but from the Prime Minister. Since the war there has grown up a military party, which proposes that Germany, having found union by this party, can only retain it by the sword. This party now embraces the Chancellor, Prince Bismarck, the Crown Prince and all the royal family but the Emperor, who is too old a soldier and far too old a man to care about rickling his gray hairs in a new campaign. The German military party has frequently alarmed Europe at the danger of war. It every day publishes warlike articles. It interferes with Italy and the Pope, and is constant in complaints of angry and foolish French priests who mourn over the prisoner of the Vatican and the persecutor of Vauzou. The conviction of this military party is that the last war was imperfectly finished; that unless Germany renews it now and overwhelms France she will be compelled to fight at later days under more disadvantageous circumstances. The fact that such a party exists in Germany, that it is so powerful as represented in the higher ranks of the new Empire, that so active a man as Prince Bismarck commands it, and that there is probably more than justice in the fear that France is arming for a war of revenge, gives constant value to the situation on the Continent, and makes the elaborate and instructive explanation of our correspondent an interesting chapter of the politics of the day.

THE THIRD TERM.—In addition to Attorney General Pierpont's opinion of General Grant's letter the interviews held by our correspondents with Senators Thurman and Clayton are published to-day, and that of Mr. Thurman decidedly questions that the letter is a declination of a renomination next year.

THE WESTERN CITIZENS who wrote to the HERALD from Omaha, expressing their belief that the negotiations at Washington with the Indians would fail, have been sustained in their opinion, as our Washington dispatches indicate.

PERSONAL INTELLIGENCE.

Secretary Bristow returned to Washington Saturday night. There is a French court trying the question whether a functionary charged with a process of the law is justified in seizing a soldier's two wooden legs if he can get them at a moment when they are not worn.

As a public meeting in London lately a British republican wanted to dispense with oaths, because there were none mentioned in the Bible; but Lord Hongton pointed out that on the same ground they might be deprived of citizens.

Fire was lately discovered in a berth on a steam boat in England which had originated in the heat of the sun—one of the glass "deadlights" concentrating the rays directly on the spot and acting as a burning glass. How many vessels at sea may have been fired in that way.

An important work has been published in England, which, as announced, contains "Sixty-nine engravings, either from wood or metal, twelve of which bear inscriptions representing scenes of Christian mythology, figures of patriarchs, saints, devils and other dignitaries of the Church." The stories of La Fontaine were published in 1762 in a most luxurious form, with remarkable illustrations. Latest a copy of that edition sold for 13,000. It occurred to a bookseller that the edition might be profitably reproduced and he reproduced it, only to find himself prosecuted and condemned by the authorities under the laws against indecent literature.

A member of a Paris club expressed his doubts as to the veracity of the account given of the Oxford and Cambridge boat race, declaring that it was impossible to attain that boating speed, whereupon Baron Arthur von Rothschild agreed to find a crew who would achieve the same feat as a distance and time on the Seine. The match is to come off on the Sunday following the Grand Prix de Paris.

As a gentleman, fishing near Penzance, England, gaffed a large fish, he was seized with a numbness in his arms, accompanied with an indescribable and painful sensation, which was really an electric shock. His servant man, who accompanied him, suffered in the same manner, he having assisted in securing the torpedo. The electrical apparatus in this fish was found, on examination, to consist of small membranous tubes, which occupy the space between the head, the pectoral fins and the branches. They are disposed like a honeycomb and divided by horizontal partitions into small cells, which are filled with a mucous substance, the whole arranged like a galvanic pile.