

of the attacks of Indians on a wagon-train. Our artist, writing from near Council Grove, Kansas, says the sketch of the fight at Sheridan was made immediately after its conclusion, he having been a participant in the fight. He adds:

On the morning of the 16th September firing was heard in the direction of the Buttes about a mile and a half from Sheridan. The alarm was immediately given and every one turned out, no man waiting for his neighbor. It was found that part of a Mexican bull-train which had been cut off the preceding night had been attacked a second time. Two men were already dead and one scalped. The party from the town arrived in time to save the scalp of the second one; both, however, were much mutilated. Nearly all the cattle were either killed or wounded. After a short skirmish the Indians retreated without loss. Being mounted they escaped pursuit. During the night they returned and carried off some of the meat of the cattle which had been killed.

THE LOST CAUSE.

When at the last the war was done,
They owned that lost for which they fought;
But is the blood and treasure naught
By which the victory was won?

If so, then those ensanguined years
Brought in their crimsoned wake no gain,
But only sharpened thrusts of pain,
And grief let loose in scalding tears.

If so, because the sword was drawn
We fought, and not for Right assailed;
As well the traitor had not quailed,
Nor victory brought at last the Dawn.

See, now, the banners that they fly
Are those that Treason's gory hand
Uplifted; and across the land
Rings still the same old battle-cry.

And shall the Lost Cause be regained?
Shall Wrong, defeated in the fight,
Be yet triumphant over Right
Though countless fields with blood were stained?

Oh, true and tried of heart and hand!
Man of the loyal people's choice,
In you and in your soldiers' voice
Abides the Future of the land.

HARPER'S WEEKLY.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1868.

THE CAMILLA RIOT.

IT is not easy to ascertain accurately the facts in any case of violence in the late rebel States. Usually, however, when it is a conflict between rebels and Union men of any color, the fair presumption is against the former. The Union men, knowing that the feeling of the old master-class is against them, are not likely to provoke disturbance, while the history of their conduct before and during and since the war relieves them, generally, of the suspicion of instigating trouble. Again, there is not a reflecting man in the country who is familiar with the facts, who supposes that if the colored population in the Southern States were treated with fairness it would be troublesome or vindictive. While there is certainly not a man of common manhood who supposes that any class of men will allow itself to be thrust back into a cruel bondage, from which it has just been delivered, without a struggle. If, therefore, we hear of riots and bloodshed arising from the condition of society in the Southern States, we may be very sure that the final cause is the unjust attempt of one part of the population politically and socially to subjugate another.

A fortnight ago Colonel PIERCE, Republican candidate for Congress in the second district of Georgia, and Captain MURPHY, one of the Republican candidates for Elector, went with a party of political friends to hold a meeting at Camilla. They were met at some distance from the town by the Sheriff and some of the citizens, who requested them to retire, as the people of Camilla wished to hear no Radical speaking. The party declined, and moving on, entered the town, where they were presently attacked. Both PIERCE and MURPHY were wounded, and many of their friends were killed. The Sheriff says that he asked them only to lay aside their weapons. But it does not appear that they were unusually armed, while the attack shows the townspeople to have been fully armed. This request, therefore, was, that a party of unarmed Republicans, many of whom were colored, would take the risk of holding a meeting in a rebel town and among armed rebels. Now it may be the fate of Union men to be summarily shot in Georgia for the crime of holding political meetings. But it is really extravagant to ask them to submit to slaughter without even a form of remonstrance.

The question upon reading this statement is, whether it was probable that the intention of the party was, as the Associated Press dispatch avers, "to overawe" the citizens of Camilla? Had not Colonel PIERCE and Captain MURPHY a right to hold a political meeting anywhere in their district? If some of their friends were armed, has there ever been a political meeting in exciting times in that part of the country where a large part of those present were not armed? Has the conduct of their opponents been such as to show the Republicans that it is not necessary to defend themselves? Have not WADE HAMPTON and his associates every where

invited the Democrats to organize against colored Union men and starve them if they will not support SEYMOUR? Has not the Georgia Legislature expelled the colored members? Are not colored men thrust from the jury box? Are not the black codes the living witnesses of the feeling of their political opponents?

Governor BULLOCK has done what he can to protect loyal men in Georgia, but the Democratic majority left in the Legislature by the expulsion of Union men has thwarted his efforts. These are the fruits of the green tree. If SEYMOUR and BLAIR should be elected, what a fearful tragedy must not every where follow in the Southern States! If while SEYMOUR is a candidate merely there is such confusion, must not his election produce chaos in that distempered section? General SCHOFIELD has ordered General MEADE to return and to keep the peace in Georgia. He will investigate the facts of the Camilla riot. But we imagine they are already substantially known and understood. Once more, we say, let all sensible men decide whether the election of SEYMOUR and BLAIR is the road to peace.

THE SPANISH REVOLUTION.

INSURRECTION in Spain is as inevitable as discontent in Ireland. The necessity of modern government is justice; and whatever be the true theory of suffrage, whether it be a right or a trust, experience shows that in states where the suffrage is most general, justice is surest. The most disturbed political communities in our Union are those in which aristocratic government has prevailed; the most peaceful and progressive, those in which there is the highest general welfare, are those which have been most truly popular. Universal suffrage is certainly not a panacea for the ills of human society. But it seems to be the precedent condition of hopeful progress. Intelligence is indispensably necessary to good government; but political power is the great incentive to education. Where every body votes it is the interest of every man that his neighbor should be intelligent. On the other hand, an unintelligent community will not select enlightened governors; but if the governors appoint themselves, all experience again shows that they will abuse their power.

This is the result of aristocratic rule every where. We see its consequences in the present revolution in Spain, and in the Camilla riot, and in Fenianism. Its most appalling modern illustration was our late war. England is engaged in a peaceful contest with this spirit; and the revolution in England moves so rapidly that the Tory Prime Minister can hold his place only by outdaring the Liberals. He makes his stand in this election, indeed, upon maintaining the ecclesiastical situation in Ireland. But he would be instantly shorn of his strength if his previous conduct were not an assurance of rapid change in the Irish policy. If DISRAELI should be sustained in the election he would be obliged to present some reform policy for Ireland. The most intelligent of the English Liberals believe that the great changes in that country will be peacefully accomplished. But there is no Englishman so dull as to believe that those changes can be averted. And as long as DISRAELI acts as he has hitherto acted, he is in no sense a Tory minister. He receives his policy from Parliament, renouncing his own if Parliament dissents. This changes the form but not the essence of the British Government, for it still leaves Parliament supreme.

The politics of Spain during the reign of the present Queen, who came to the throne in 1833, is a contest mainly between a more or less despotic party. NARVAEZ was the chief of what may be called the Tories or Absolutists, and O'DONNELL of the Whigs or Liberals. The Tory party has generally been dominant, and the true Liberals, or third party, looking to a popular government, has been dormant, except when it tried a revolution, which was generally summarily repressed. The Tory and Whig leaders are now dead, and a Liberal revolution has broken out under the most favorable auspices. GONZALEZ BRAVO, the Chief Minister, has resigned, and CONCHA, a moderate Liberal, has succeeded him. But the revolutionists, of whom General PRIM is the most noted leader, have declared for the overthrow of the monarchy and for ESPARTERO, formerly Regent, and a Liberal. He is now seventy-six years old, but his name is a popular cry, and connects the revolution with the previous régime.

Before the French Revolution of 1848 the Duke DE MONTPEISIER, a son of King LOUIS PHILIPPE of France, married Queen ISABELLA's sister. This event was the occasion of the Spanish marriage question, which was considered to be very important. But after LOUIS PHILIPPE left Paris and history under a large umbrella it was not thought to be so important. The Duke is now understood to have arrived in Spain to wait upon Providence. But the revolution is not likely to be satisfied with exchanging one daughter of FERDINAND VII. for another with a French husband. If it succeeds it will doubtless appeal to a popular vote, and we shall see a Constituent Assembly in Spain. Nor is any power in Europe likely to interfere,

and undertake a crusade against revolutionary Spain as the Great Powers did against revolutionary France at the end of the last century. If ISABELLA abdicates no BURKE will sigh for the vanished age of chivalry, nor fear that the foundations of human society are crumbling because a corrupt tyranny is overthrown. But, whether this movement succeeds or not, the revolution in Spain is permanent. It will continue until the government is harmonized with the welfare of the people.

GENERAL DIX FOR GENERAL GRANT.

THE letter of General DIX strongly advocating the election of General GRANT, and stating his reasons for opposing Mr. SEYMOUR, is not only very good in itself, but it is very significant. The SEYMOUR papers sneer at it as the snarl of a disappointed man. But that does not touch the point. Granting it to be so, for the argument, what then? Why is he disappointed? Certainly General DIX's career as a Democrat is much more conspicuous and brilliant than Mr. SEYMOUR'S. He has been Senator in Congress, Secretary of the Treasury, and Minister to France. He is a gentleman of capacity, of scholarly accomplishment, of very great experience in public affairs, of unspotted reputation, and of national distinction. It is said that he is disappointed because he was not nominated by the Democrats for the Presidency. Very well, being a much more eminent and able man than Mr. SEYMOUR, and universally known to his party, why was he not nominated?

For precisely the same reason that he was not confirmed as Minister to France twenty years ago, when his party controlled the Senate and the policy of the Government. Because he was not a tool of the aristocratic slave power; because he had been opposed to the annexation of Texas for the benefit of that power; and because he had said that slavery should be confined to its domain by a cordon of free States, and forced, like the scorpion girt with fire, to sting itself to death. General DIX, although a Democrat, had shown some emotion of humanity, some sense of justice, some regard for national honor. But from the moment that this appeared his "Democracy" was not sound. "Sound Democracy" was unswerving subservience to the slave-holding aristocracy. FRANKLIN PIERCE'S was the true article; so was HORATIO SEYMOUR'S. They sneezed when Senator BUTLER of South Carolina took snuff.

When the slaveholders rose in rebellion against the Government, "sound Democracy" was shown in the letter of PIERCE to JEFFERSON DAVIS and the speeches of SEYMOUR, denouncing the war and discrediting the Government. But General DIX surrendered all hope of preferment by the Democratic party when he wrote, "If any man haul down the American flag, shoot him on the spot!" What was WADE HAMPTON doing but that very thing? What was HORATIO SEYMOUR doing but encouraging him? And when both were baffled, and WADE HAMPTON returned to the command of the Democratic party, of course he rewards SEYMOUR, and General DIX has as much chance of the nomination as CHARLES SUMNER.

If, then, General DIX be a disappointed man, it is because he has not understood his party. What right had he to suppose, from any thing the Democratic party has ever said or done, that hostility to slavery and distinguished service for the Government against the rebellion were claims upon its favor? Who were the managers of that party during the war? Who was the President of its National Convention in 1864, and what did that Convention declare? Who controlled its late Convention? VALLANDIGHAM directed its financial policy, and WADE HAMPTON its policy of reconstruction. It nominated HORATIO SEYMOUR, who declared that the success of the Government would be as revolutionary as that of the rebellion, and FRANK BLAIR, who called aloud for the President to overthrow by force the governments of the Southern States. "Sound Democracy" served slavery alive, and it serves it dead. It passes black codes, organizes the Ku-Klux Klan, and threatens laborers with starvation who do not support it. It is the enemy of equal rights, of free government, and of progress. Its chosen representatives are SEYMOUR, VALLANDIGHAM, HAMPTON, and HOWELL COBB. Is General DIX disappointed that these persons did not nominate him, or that his party insists upon being chained to a corpse?

WATER STREET.

THE late performances at the dance-house of JOHN ALLEN in Water Street have not seemed to us so promising as to many ardent souls, because Satan is an extremely long-headed adversary, and because bears have a habit of feigning death when they have by no means succumbed. It does not seem to us a very hopeful way of improving a man to make him notorious for wickedness, and then an object of sensational attention. If a missionary should go into Water Street—and we wish that the sense of duty called missionaries there rather than to Burmah and Siam oftener than it does

—and fining a man whose house was the haunt of every horrible vice, should labor with him manfully, show him the infamy of his life, and win him from it, a good work would be done. But missionaries are apt to be very amiable men with very little experience of mankind, and are, consequently, unable always to discover when they are fooled.

The public is greedy for religious sensations. A revival like that of ten years ago excites the community, and it is useless to speculate upon its advantages or harmful results. The difficulty with all such things is the case with which a certain physical condition is mistaken for a spiritual emotion, and in general the fatal facility both of intentional and unintentional deception. JOHN ALLEN probably made game of his missionary visitors; but finding himself notorious he acted accordingly. An article upon the Wickedest Man in New York may be a good advertisement for a magazine or for a dance-house, but we can not think it a wise way to reform Water Street. The flurry of excitement which has been raised about a particular spot in that missionary region may last for a few days longer. We observe that several noted gentlemen have been there to preach and pray. Will they continue to go when the excitement has died away, and no newspaper or magazine describes the dance-house and its meetings?

If all this is the beginning of a wise moral effort to purify Water Street and the wharves, we shall be very glad of it. But if it be a mere spasm of sensation for the cloyed city, Water Street will be worse off than before.

PUSHING THE FINANCIAL QUESTION.

MR. EDWARD ATKINSON, of Boston, is "pushing" the financial question with an ability and vigor that must be rather distressing to Mr. HORATIO SEYMOUR, who urges his friends to push it in a very different direction. Mr. ATKINSON has been studying documents accessible to every body, but by no means manageable by every body—such as Reports of Secretaries of the Treasury—and has reached some very striking results.

For instance: The total revenue of the United States from April 1, 1861, to June 30, 1868, seven and a quarter years of active war or of so-called peace, was \$2,213,349,486. If we deduct from the total expenditure for that time a fair allowance for ordinary peace expenses, we have, say, \$4,000,000,000 as the actual cost of the war. But as we owed on the 30th of June, 1868, only \$2,485,000,000, it follows that we have actually raised by taxation, and paid toward the cost of the war, besides paying all our peace expenses, \$1,515,000,000. This has been paid in seven and a quarter years, and amounts to three-eighths of the entire cost of the war. And the money has been raised mainly in the loyal States, which for more than half of the time had a most efficient producing part of the population engaged in war.

Again, as a taxation of nearly \$500,000,000 has proved too great for our present condition, the taxes have been reduced to but little more than \$300,000,000 a year—and such is the reduction of our expenses that this sum is ample to pay expenses and interest, and a moderate annual payment of the principal. The normal increase of the population will so enhance the revenue that the rate per capita, which now yields \$300,000,000, will, in the next twenty years, increase the aggregate in a sum sufficient to pay all additional expenses and the entire principal of the debt within that time. The present tariff yields about \$170,000,000. The income tax yields \$30,000,000. The whiskey and tobacco, stamp and other taxes will yield more than \$100,000,000.

This is the way to push the financial question—to tell the truth about it. To show that although the rebellion of the Southern wing of the Democratic party, sustained by the opposition offered to the Government by Mr. SEYMOUR and his friends, has thrown a great debt upon the country, yet the energy and industry which conquered the rebellion will, with equal determination, easily pay the honest cost of the incalculably precious victory.

GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE.

A DEMOCRATIC paper coolly asserts that "self-government by the people" is "the policy of the Democracy." Let us see how true this is.

In ten of the States of the Union at least a third of the people, a third of the male adults, are colored. Now the Arkansas Democratic Convention last January declared for "the exclusion of negroes from an equal participation in making the laws." Self-government by the people is, therefore, not the policy of the Arkansas Democracy.

The Richmond *Enquirer*, the chief Democratic organ in Virginia, says distinctly, "none but white men must vote." The Virginia Democracy rejects the policy of self-government by the people.

The Mobile *Register*, the leading Democratic authority in Alabama, describes the "negro vote as null and void, and a sum of villainies." This is not very suggestive of government by the people.