

Now, between McClellan and Lincoln there are many points of difference—the former is a man of talents, of information, of firmness, and great military experience and ability—the latter is a supple, pliant, easy fool, a good but vulgar joker.

While McClellan has the interest of the Union only at heart, Mr. Lincoln has the fanatical object of freeing negroes for his inspiration. Between “my plan,” as Gen. Grant has conducted it, and one by Gen. McClellan, there could not have been the same success that has already attended our arms, for we lost more men fighting the science of McClellan on the Peninsula than we have in repelling the furious but ill conducted assaults of Gen. Grant this season.

Thus, whether we look at this nomination in the light of peace or war, we prefer Lincoln to McClellan. We can make better terms of peace with an anti-slavery fanatic than with an earnest Unionist. We can gain more military success in a war conducted on “my plan” than one of a real soldier like McClellan, and sooner destroy the resources and strength of our enemy where they are managed and manipulated by the light fingered gentry of Messrs. Chase and Fessenden, than when skillfully controlled by such a man as Guthrie. Our best hope is from the honest fanatics of the United States, men who believe in their hearts that slavery is “the sum of all villainies,” and who really and sincerely believe it to be their duty to separate their country from this “relic of barbarism.” Such men, when they find that their people are tired of the war, will end it by a peace that sacrifices territory to freedom, and will let the South “go,” provided she carries slavery with her. These men believe no less that the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed, than “that all men are created free and equal.” The two postulates are of like importance to an abolitionist.

Both the Abolitionist and the Democrat is our enemy—the one, because we have slaves; the other, because we are dis-