press of the South are repeating upon the people, with better success than it deserves. The old papers have dropped their names—and because we do not see the title, we delude ourselves with the idea that their existence is ended. Because we no longer read envenomed extracts from the Sentinel, and Examiner, and Dispatch, we imagine they are dead—but the truth is the newspapers of the South are unchanged, in character, in animus, in all but name. The same capitalists own them; the same proprietors manage them; the same editors write for them. It is true the published names of editor and proprietor are often new. It is true also that their columns are not filled with the same noisy but rapid denunciation of everything Northern, but this is the effect of fear.

Throughout the rebellion Richmond has been regarded as a representative of rebellion; and the Richmond press as representative of the press of the entire Confederacy. We have made some inquiry into the present condition of that press, and we venture the assertion that there is not a "sounding" newspaper among them all. There is not one of them genuinely new. Their editors may have taken the oath of allegiance. They may acquire in a state of things which they consider inevitable, and abstain from fighting anew the useless battle over the dead bodies of slavery and secession. But there is not a paper in Richmond which is thoroughly in favor of the new order, of liberty, union, and equality of rights. There is not one which heartily supports a restored nationality and free institutions.

We do not propose to leave this a general assertion. We will make it good by specifications. The principal papers in Richmond are the Whig, the Republic, the Commercial Bulletin, and the Times.

The Richmond Whig has neither changed its name nor its editor—Mr. William Ira Smith, the present proprietor, bought a half interest in it during the war, it is hinted to save himself from confiscation. Two others of the firm who owned it were colonels in the rebel army. Their names no longer appear in connection with the paper, but it is more than suspected that they still possess an interest in it. Of all papers in the rebel capital, it was perhaps (if there were any difference) the least obnoxious. It was inclined to be conservative, and secured some respect from the North by its persistent opposition to the Davis administration. But it was never suspected of real unionism, or it never could have lived in Richmond. And though it acquiesces in the restoration of the national authority, and submits to the Pierpont government, it cannot be said to give a cordial support to either. It is not regarded as their organ by the loyal men of Virginia, nor does it enjoy their confidence.

The Richmond Republic is ostensibly a new paper. It was started very soon after the evacuation of Richmond. In its prospectus it promised great things. Securing the editorial services of the former correspondent of a Northern newspaper, the loyalists hoped to find in it the expression of their views. But its proprietors control its columns and give character to its utterances. These are the proprietors respectively of the Richmond Examiner and the Richmond Dispatch. It is in reality a reincarnated form of those defunct newspapers. The Commercial Bulletin is simply Davis's old organ, the Richmond Sentinel, in a new name, but without a changed spirit. The Times is the newspaper of Richmond. It has much the largest circulation. It is, perhaps, not too much to say that it equals that of all the other papers combined; this it has acquired by its audacious secessionism. Its editor is Mr. H. R. Pollard, formerly of the Examiner, author of a Southern "History of the War," and for a time a resident of Fort Warren. So outspoken is its secessionism that it has lately been warned by the military that its course must change or its publication stop. And such, with some exceptions, is the press, not only of Richmond, but of the whole South. We are taking great pains to put loyal men in the gubernatorial chairs. But here is a power greater than that of the government, wielded almost wholly in the interest of an aristocracy as yet far from dead.

There is nothing which is so much needed in the Southern States as a loyal, liberty-loving press; yet the South cannot, will not sustain it. In a State where the Governor declares that nineteen-twentieths of the people would be disfranchised by being required to take an oath before voting, that they have not voluntarily aided the rebellion, there is no constituency strong enough now to sustain the right kind of a newspaper. In some form of other assistance must be obtained from abroad. We commend this matter to whom it may concern in New York. In no way could they render a more substantial service to the country, than in clubbing together to furnish Northern daily papers to the city of Richmond, through some authorized agent, at the simple cost of paper, printing, and transportation, where now they can only be purchased for ten cents per copy, and are rare at that. Meanwhile, we warn the public to remember that the extracts which they constantly read from the Southern press, concerning the condition of society, and especially the conduct of the negro, are prepared for our information by the same men whose atrocious calumnies of the North did more to produce the war—whose unblushing falsehoods, during its progress, did more to prolong and embitter it, than all other influences combined.

DEMOCRATIC NATIONALITY.

The issue of the war marks an epoch by the consolidation of nationality under democratic forms. The characteristic feature of modern society, since the close of the feudal period, has been a tendency toward the national polity as the normal type of government. Following the general outline of M. Guizot—that chiefest philosopher of European society—we may divide the history of European nations into three periods—"the period of confusion," consequent upon the disintegration of the Roman empire, and the invasions and counter-invasions of barbarian tribes upon the theatre of the old civilization; "the feudal period," which furnished the first, and perhaps the only possible, nucleus of organization amid the universal chaos; and "the modern period" of national growth and coherence through organic law. The strong arm and the iron will of Charlemagne first arrested the insecurity and disorder of centuries of barbarism; and though his empire perished with him, the local authorities that he had established by grants of lands to his feudal vassals, preserved the central power, and grew into petty states—each an absolute sovereignty within itself;—the feudal lord being master over all lands, property, persons, within his domain, the arbiter of peace and war, of life and death. The feudal castle thus became the light-house of civilization amid the receding floods of barbarism, the nucleus of order in the confusion of a broken empire, the crystallizing centre of society itself. Around its base, under its protection, and through its alliances of interest, of necessity, or of ambition, society gradually grew into a power under whose weight the props that had trained it fell at length as the empire had fallen before.

In England the feudal sovereignty was ground between king and commons, as an upper and a nether millstone, till it was reduced to a mallenable aristocracy. In France feudalism was absorbed in the ambitious growth of monarchy, which culminated in Louis XIV., "the supreme personification of kingly government." In him the king was the state; but with him also the absolute type of state-craft began to decline, so that, as Martin so eloquently writes, "if monarchy did not expire on the same day as the monarch, the sullen work of decomposition was never more to be arrested in its organs. We shall witness the decomposition of this vast body, until the day when veritable unity, the sovereign nation, breaks this worn-out shell to appear in its own essence, without figure and without symbol. In the future of society the type of government will be not sacerdotal, nor monarchial, nor aristocratic, but national."

The idea of nationality in its completeness embraces first a distinct and undivided people, having a community of language, of territory, of interest and institutions; and secondly, the combination, or the co-ordinate action, of all interests in their just proportion in the state,—external independence and internal coherence and equilibrium.

Though the Italians were one race, with one language, there was no proper nationality in Italy until the petty kingdoms that divided and oppressed her people were swallowed up in the united kingdom of Victor Emanuel. Turkey is not a nationality, but an agglomeration of many races ruled by the sword of one. And China, though her people, her soil, her language are one, is not a nationality in the contemplation of political philosophy, but a race ruled by a caste, and that of foreign origin. But where the polity is national, there is no one class or interest—priestly, military, literary, monetary, numerical—has control of the supreme power, or can use the state for its exclusive benefit.
the common-weal is the idea of the state both as to its essence and as to its functions.

In Europe this idea of a national polity is most nearly approached in the British Constitution; where, though the forms of royalty are still maintained, Parliament is omnipotent; and the voice of the Commons, swollen by the voice of popular assemblies outside of Parliament, makes the nation feel as a power, though the people are still limited in suffrage, and though land, office, and social consideration are largely monopolized by the nobility. In Germany the full realization of nationality is still hindered by vicious and combustible political divisions, making the states a pasture ground for petty princes; while France vibrates from the extreme of popular sovereignty to that of imperial absolutism. Nevertheless the tendency of the modern period of society with which we stand connected is toward nationalization, and against either a feudal federation or a despotic centralization.

Within this period our American Institutions took their rise; and from the first they have borne the stamp of nationality. It has been forcibly said by Dr. Lévy, that "it is a fact or movement of the greatest significance in the whole history of the human race, that this great continent was colonized by European people, at a period when, in their portion of the globe, great nations had been formed, and the national polity had finally become the nominal type of government; and it is a fact equally pregnant with momentous results, that the northern portion of this hemisphere came to be colonized chiefly by men who brought with them the seeds of self-government and a living common law, instinct with the principles of manly self-dependence and civil freedom."

Even as colonies, we began our existence as one people, having a community of interest and of destiny in the New World; we were the English nation transplanted without royalty, without aristocracy, and without a state church—more even national than the nation itself; and when common dangers arose, this sentiment of nationality drew the colonies together in one organic form—first as a political sovereignty, independent of foreign control, and next as a national unity, or a unified body politic through a national constitution displacing the confederation of States. No statesman than Hamilton and Madison has more clearly conceived the essential nationality of the American people than did President Lincoln;—nor more ably stated and defended that nationality against the self destructive dogmas of State sovereignty. This Administration has determined both the fact and the perpetuity of a nationality under democratic forms.

In his Message for 1862, he showed conclusively that "the portion of the earth's surface which is owned and inhabited by the people of the United States is adapted to be the home of one national family," and of only one; that, "physically speaking, we cannot separate; since there is no line, straight or crooked, suitable for a national boundary, upon which to divide." "Our national homestead in all its adaptations and aptitudes demands union and abhors separation."

In his first Message of 1861, he showed that historically and politically we are and must be one nation: "Much is said about the sovereignty of the States, but the word even is not in the national Constitution, nor, as is believed, in any of the State constitutions. What is sovereignty in the political sense of the word? Would it be far wrong to define it a political community without a political superior? Tested by this, no one of our States, except Texas was a sovereignty; and even Texas gave up the character on coming into the Union, by which act she acknowledged the Constitution of the United States, and the laws and treaties of the United States made in pursuance of the Constitution, to be for her the supreme law. The States have their status in the Union, and they have no other legal status. If they break from this, they can only do so against law and by revolution. The Union, and not themselves separately, procured their independence and their liberty, by conquest or purchase. The Union gave each of them whatever of independence and liberty it has. The Union is older than any of the States, and, in fact, it created them as States. Originally, some dependent colonies made the Union, and in turn the Union threw off their old dependence for them and made them States, such as they are." The territorial, political, and historical oneness of the nation is now ratified by the blood of thousands of her sons cementing the national polity as the only government possible for the American people. The prime issue in the war was between nationality one and indivisible, and the loose and changeable federation of independent States; and this involved not simply the permanence of our national Union, but the possibility of a nationality under democratic forms. Greece, with her petty state democracies, now leagued together by dangers and now divided by jealousies, never realized a nationality. The Roman republic, centralized in the capital, and governing districts and provinces by military or proconsular power—instead of a local and elected magistracy—invited military ambition and political faction to pervert its imperial unity to the uses of a central despotism. To command Rome was like commanding Paris. The principle of local self-government, the safeguard of popular liberty, secures us against a Roman centralization; but secession was an attempt to erect local self-government into State sovereignty and sectional independence—thus repeating for us Grecian disintegration, and against that we have asserted and established nationality. Said Mr. Lincoln: "Our popular government has often been called an experiment. Two points in it our people have settled: the successful establishing and the successful administering of it. One still remains: its successful maintenance against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it. It is now for them to demonstrate to the world that those who can fairly carry an election can also suppress a rebellion; that ballots are the rightful and peaceful successors of bullets, and that when ballots have fairly and constitutionally decided, there can be no successful appeal except to ballots themselves at succeeding elections. Such will be a great lesson of peace, teaching men that what they cannot take by an election, neither can they take by a war."

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the decision reached by the war, that the United States are one national sovereignty under democratic forms. Our point of danger, and, as some imagined, of weakness also, was just there. We were proof against aggression, we were proof against despotism. But were we proof against disruption? We were independent, and we were republican; but were we one—a nation, or only a league? The determination of our nationality under democratic forms that guard with sacred jealousy personal liberty and local self-government, marks an era in political philosophy and in popular government. It has settled the permanence of the national polity—that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth." It has demonstrated that our institutions of local freedom are but so many roots to feed, strengthen, and uphold our common nationality, and that a nationality thus vitalized from the myriad roots of local, distributed self-government cannot be compressed into a centralized power even under the stupendous weight of war. Sovereignty without centralization, consolidation without despotism, nationality under democratic forms, is a fact now for the first time established in the history of government. England and France looked on with amazement to see a man of the people, chosen for such a contingency, within twelve hours after the assassination of the head of the Government, stepping into the chief place of power, and speaking not of the rights and prerogatives of his office, but of his duties to the nation. At the very moment when the Emperor of France drops the sword of the usurper for the pen of the eulogist, to persuade us that "when Providence raises up such men as Cesar, Charlemagne, and Napoleon, it is to trace out to peoples the path they ought to follow," and that nations are safe and happy only when the central power is wielded by these privileged leaders, we see the principle of nationality under democratic forms asserting itself with a grandeur of military strength, a unity of political counsel, a dignity of moral power, before which even cupids of Cesar, of Charlemagne, and of Napoleon dwindle into insignificance.

THE DISFRANCHISING POWER.

It is repeated day after day, that in urging against the admission of negroes to the franchise, those who urge it are asking President Johnson to set aside the Constitution; and it is alleged that in leaving this question to the decision of the Southern whites, he is only doing what the letter of the organic law obliges him to do, and that nobody asks him to interfere in the matter except people who deny the constitu...