

Saint Mary's Beacon

VOL IX LEONARDTOWN, MD., THURSDAY MORNING, AUGUST 8, 1872 NO. 41

ST. MARY'S BEACON

IS PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY J. F. KING & JAMES S. DOWNS.

Terms of Subscription.—\$2.00 per annum in advance. Single copies 5 cents. No subscription will be received for a shorter period than six months and no paper will be discontinued until all arrears are paid except at the option of the publisher.

Advertisements.—25 cents per square for the first insertion, and 10 cents for every subsequent insertion. Eight lines of type constitute a square. If the number of insertions is not marked on the advertisement, it will be published until notified, and charged accordingly. A liberal deduction made to those who advertise by the year.

Communications of a personal character will be charged at the same rates as advertisements; obituaries over ten lines in length will be charged at the rate of 50 cents per square. All communications for publication must be accompanied with the real name of the author, or no attention will be paid to them. The real name of the author will be published unless denied, but we cannot consent to insert communications unless we know the writer.

DORSEY'S TOBACCO COMPOUND.

PREPARED EXPRESSLY FOR THE TOBACCO CROP.

IT SPEAKS FOR ITSELF.

Read the Certificates of Planters in Md.

Price \$60 per Ton.

FOR SALE BY A NEEDHAM & SONS,

142 Light Street Wharf, BALTIMORE.

Plant Point, Calvert Co., Feb. 27, '72.

Gents.—I used the Compound last season on my tobacco. I take pleasure in stating that I consider it a valuable fertilizer. I used it at the rate of 200 lbs. to the acre, notwithstanding the excessive drought it produced a fine crop. I can without hesitation recommend this fertilizer to planters as a No. 1 article. I also used it on my Peach Trees and it acted like a charm.

Yours Truly, B O HANCE.

Calvert Co., Md., March 9, '72.

Gents.—I tried "Dorsey's Tobacco Compound" last year along side of Peruvian Guano. It made no difference in either, except that the Compound made no ground leaves, while the Peruvian did.

Yours Truly, JNO E FARR.

Calvert Co., Md., March 16, '72.

Gents.—In reply to your inquiry I will say that the Compound was used by me several years ago and it acted like a charm. The Compound started the tobacco more quickly, and was far ahead of the other fertilizers. The leaves were thicker and larger and bearing well.

Yours Truly, F J STONE.

Calvert County, Md., Feb 20, '72.

Gents.—I used on my tobacco your Compound by the side of other No. 1 fertilizers; the preference was clearly in favor of the Compound and so declared by all that saw the tobacco where the Compound was used being very leafy.

Yours Truly, J W PETERSON.

Port Republic, Calvert Co., Md., Feb 22, '72.

Gents.—I have used "Dorsey's Tobacco Compound" on my tobacco crop. It acted finely. I shall make more of it than from any fertilizer I have ever used.

Respectfully, RICHARD BLUNT.

Cove Point, Calvert Co., Md., Feb 23, '72.

Gents.—I have used "Dorsey's Tobacco Compound," it acted extremely well although the season was very dry. I have been using Peruvian Guano, but the Compound seemed to act as well as it.

Yours Respectfully, JAS E BLUNT.

St Leonard's, Calvert Co., Feb 26, '72.

Gents.—I used "Dorsey's Tobacco Compound" on tobacco last year at rate 250 lbs. per acre on land that had been in tobacco three successive years, and made the finest crop in quantity and quality that I ever raised.

Yours Respectfully, J B TURNER.

Port Republic, Md., Feb 21, 1872.

Gents.—In reply to your inquiries in reference to the action of "Dorsey's Tobacco Compound" on my last year's crop of tobacco, I will say that I used it on my tobacco with the most astonishing results, and conclude that the Compound is fully equal to Peruvian Guano pound for pound.

Yours Truly, STERLING SMITH.

Port Republic, Calvert Co., Md., Feb 21, '72.

Gents.—I have used a great variety of fertilizers during past years, but I have made a heavier crop of tobacco from the use of "Dorsey's Tobacco Compound" than I ever raised on any other kind of land. I used it at the rate of 150 to 200 lbs. per acre broadcast.

Yours Respectfully, A M TALBOTT.

St. Leonard's, Md., Feb 1, 1872.

Gents.—In answer to your inquiry, I will say that I have used the "Dorsey Tobacco Compound" alongside of two first-class fertilizers; it was much superior to both. It is the most reliable fertilizer I have ever used, and consider it equal to Peruvian Guano.

Yours, &c, J. BLACKBURN.

May 23rd, 1872—3rd.

Lorenz & Ritter's

CELEBRATED

Star Tobacco Fertilizer.

Given Satisfaction wherever used.

DEPOT: 15 CAMDEN STREET, BALTIMORE, Md.

March 28, 1872—1y.

POLITICAL.

The following correspondence between prominent colored men and Hon. Charles Sumner is furnished for publication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 11, 1872.

Sir: We, the undersigned, citizens of color, regarding you as the purest and best friend of our race, admiring your consistent course in the United States Senate and elsewhere as the special advocate of our rights, and believing that your counsel at this critical juncture in the period of our citizenship would be free from personal feeling and partisan prejudice, have ventured to request your opinion as to what action the colored voters of the nation should take in the Presidential election now pending.

The choice of our people is now narrowed down to General Grant or Horace Greeley. Your long acquaintance with both, and your observation, have enabled you to arrive at a correct conclusion as to which of the candidates, judging from their antecedents as well as their present position, will, if elected, enforce the requirements of the Constitution and the rights respecting our civil and political rights with the most heartiest sympathy and the greatest vigor. We hope and trust you will favor us with such a reply as will serve to enlighten our minds upon this subject, and impel our people to go forward in the right direction. Our confidence in your judgment is so firm that in our opinion thousands of the intelligent colored voters of the country will be guided in their action by your statement and advice. Hoping to receive a reply soon, we have the honor to be, with respect, your obedient servants, A. T. Augusta, M. D., David Fisher, John H. Smith, Edward Cruser, William H. A. Warren, William P. Wilson, R. W. Tomkins, John H. Brown, Henry Lacy, W. H. Bell, J. L. N. Bowen, M. D., Jacob Dewriter, Samuel Proctor, J. J. Ketchum, Charles N. Thomas, William H. Shorter, Henry Hill, Furman J. Shad I, George D. Johnson, Chris A. Ejectwood, Charles F. Bruce, David Fisher, Jr., David King, William Polkney.

Hon. Charles Sumner.

SUMNER'S REPLY.

WASHINGTON, July 29, 1872.

Gentlemen and Fellow-Citizens: If I have delayed answering your communication of July 11, which was duly placed in my hands by your committee, it is not because the proper course for you seemed doubtful, but because I wished to reflect upon it and be able by the information which time might supply. Since then I have carefully considered the inquiries you have addressed me and listened to much on both sides. But my best judgment now is in harmony with my early conclusion. I am touched by the appeal you make.

It is true that I am the friend of your race, and I am glad to be assured that in your opinion I have held a consistent course in the Senate and elsewhere as the special advocate of your rights. That courage by the blessing of God, I mean to hold so long as life lasts. I know your infinite wrongs and feel for them as my own.

You only do me simple justice when you add a belief that my counsel at this critical juncture of your citizenship would be free from personal feelings and partisan prejudice. In answering your inquiries I can have no feeling except for your good, which I most anxiously seek, nor can any prejudice of any kind be allowed to interfere. The occasion is too solemn. Especially is there no room for personal feeling or for partisan prejudice. No man or party can expect power except for the general welfare. Therefore, they must be brought to the standard of truth, that they may be seen in life and act.

You are right in saying that the choice for the Presidency is now "narrowed down" to President Grant and Horace Greeley. One of these is to be taken, and assuming my acquaintance with both and my observation of their lives, you invite my judgment between them, asking me especially which of the two, judging from their antecedents, as well as present position, would enforce the Constitution and the laws, securing your civil and political rights, with the most heartiest sympathy and the greatest vigor. Here I remark that, in this inquiry, you naturally put your rights in the foreground. So do I. Believing most sincerely that the best interests of the whole country are associated with the completest recognition of your rights, so that the two races shall live together in unbroken harmony. I also remark that you call attention to two things, the "antecedents" of the two candidates, and, secondly, their "present position." You wish to know from those which give assurance of the most heartiest sympathy and greatest vigor in the maintenance of your rights. In other words, which, judging from the past, will be your truest friend. The communication with which you have honored me is not alone. Colored fellow-citizens in other parts of the country, I may say nearly every State of the Union, have made a similar request, and some complain that I have thus far kept silent. I am not inessential to this appeal. But if my opinion is given it must be candidly, according to my conscience. In this spirit I answer your inquiries, beginning with the antecedents of the two candidates.

THE ANTECEDENTS OF THE CANDIDATES.

Horace Greeley was born to poverty and educated himself in a printing office. President Grant, fortunate in early patronage, became a cadet at West Point and was educated at the public expense.

One started with nothing but industry and a character, and the other with a military commission. One was trained as a civilian, the other as a soldier. Horace Greeley stood forth as a reformer and abolitionist. President Grant enlisted as a pro-slavery Democrat, and at the election of James Buchanan fortified by his vote all the pro-slavery forces, including the Dred Scott decision.

Horace Greeley from early life was earnest and constant against slavery, full of sympathy with the colored race, and always foremost in the great battle for their rights.

President Grant, except as a soldier, summoned by the terrible accident of war, never did anything against slavery, nor has he at any time shown any sympathy with the colored race.

Horace Greeley earnestly decided that colored citizens should vote, and ably championed impartial suffrage, but President Grant was upon the other side.

Beyond these contrasts which are marked, it cannot be forgotten that Horace Greeley is a person of large heart and large understanding, trained to the support of common rights, always beneficent with the poor, always ready for any good cause, and never deterred by opposition or reproach as when for long years he befriended your people. Add to these qualities, conspicuous in his life, untiring industry, which leaves no moment without its fruit, abundant political knowledge, acquaintance with history, the invincible grasp of statesmanship, an amiable nature, magnanimous soul, and above all an honesty which no suspicion has touched; and you have a brief portrait of the antecedents of Horace Greeley.

GRANT'S RECORD.

Few of these things appear in the President. His great success in war, and the honor he has won cannot change the record of his conduct toward your people, especially in contrast with the life-time fidelity of his competitor, while there are unhappy "antecedents" showing that in the prosecution of his plans he cared nothing for the colored race.

The story is painful, but it must be told. I refer to the outrage he perpetrated upon Hayti, with its eight hundred thousand blacks engaged in the great experiment of self-government. Here is a most instructive "antecedent," revealing beyond question his true nature, and the whole is attested by documentary evidence concerning the idea of annexing Dominica, which is the Spanish part of the island; and, shrinking at nothing, he began by seizing the war powers of the government, in flagrant violation of the Constitution, and then, at great expenditure of money, sent several armed ships of the navy, including monitors, to maintain the usurper Baez in power, that through him he might obtain the coveted prize. Not content with this audacious dictatorship, he proceeded to strike at the independence of the black Republic by open menace of war, and all without the sanction of Congress, to which is committed the war-making power. Sailing into the harbor of Port-au-Prince with an armed and powerful monitor, the Dictator, properly named for this service; and the frigate Severn as consort, and other monitors in their train, the Admiral, acting under instructions from Washington, proceeded to the Executive Mansion, accompanied by officers of his squadron, and then pointing to the great war ships in sight from the windows, said his menace of war, threatening to sink or capture Haytian ships. The President was black, not white.

The Admiral would have done no such thing to any white ruler, nor would our country have tolerated such a menace from any government in the world. Here was indignity, not only of the black Republic, with its population of eight hundred thousand, but to the African race, everywhere, and especially in our own country. Nor did it end here. For months the navy of the United States was hovering on the coast, keeping that insulted people in constant anxiety, while President Grant was to them like a hawk sailing in the air, and ready to swoop upon his prey.

This heartless, cruel proceeding found a victim among our white fellow-citizens. An excellent merchant of Connecticut, praised by all who knew him, was plunged into prison by Baez, where he was injured because it was feared he would write against the treaty of annexation, and this captivity was prolonged with the connivance of two agents of the President, and his part of the military "Ring" immediately about him. That such an outrage should be unpunished shows the little regard of the President for human rights, whether white or black. I confess my trials as I was compelled to witness these things. Always a supporter of the administration, and sincerely desiring to labor with it, I had never uttered a word with regard to it except in kindness. My early opposition to the treaty of annexation was reserved, so that for some time my opinions were unknown. It was only when I saw the breach of all law, honor and divine, that I was aroused, and then began the anger of the President and of his "Rings," military and Senatorial.

Devoted to the African race, I felt for them, besides being humbled, that the great Republic, acting through its President, could set such an example where the National Constitution, international law and humanity were all sacrificed. Especially was I aroused when I saw the indignity to the colored race which was accomplished by trampling upon a fundamental principle of international law, declaring the equality of nations, as one Declaration of Independence declares, the equality of men. This terrible transaction, which nobody can defend, is among the antecedents of President Grant, from which you can judge how much the colored race can rely upon his "antecedents."

of office-holders, drilled to obey the word of command. The speeches making him a "Ring," Horace Greeley finds footing to his support large numbers of Republicans unwilling to continue the existing course, and, as allies with them, a reliance in this regard movement.

Democrats in joining Horace Greeley have changed simply to President Grant, except when he joined the Republicans, changed that he was rewarded at once with high office. The change is open. Adopting the Republican platform which places the equal rights of all under the safeguard of irrevocable guarantees, and, at the same time, accepting the nomination of a lifetime Abolitionist, which represents prominently the sentiment of duty to the colored race, they have set the corporate seal to the sacred covenant. They may continue Democrats in name, but they are in reality Republicans, by the same title that those who sustain Republican principles are Republicans, or rather they are Democrats, according to the original significance of that word, dedicated to the rights of the people.

It is idle to say that Horace Greeley and the Republicans that nominated him are not one Republican because Democrats unite with them in support of cherished principles and the candidate who represents them. Conversions are always welcome, and not the less so because the change is a multitude rather than an individual. A political party cannot if it would, and should not if it could, shut the door against converts, whether counted by the score, the hundred or the thousand, and so we find that the supporters of President Grant announce with partisan triumph the adoption of a single Democratic politician or a single Democratic newspaper. In equal reason and with higher pride may the supporters of Horace Greeley announce the adherence of the Democratic party, which, turning from the things that are behind, presses on to those that are before. It is also idle to say that the election of Horace Greeley as President, with Grant Brown as Vice-President, both unchangeable Republicans, will be the return of the Democratic party to power. On the contrary, it will be the inauguration of Republican principles under the safeguard of a Republican President and Republican Vice-President.

With Democrats as avowed supporters in the organization of his administration and in the conduct of affairs, Horace Greeley will naturally lean upon those who present the great promise made of equal rights and reconciliation at Cincinnati. If Democrats are taken it will be as Republicans in heart, recognizing the associate terms of the settlement as an irreversible finality. The likelihood of political falsehood reaches its extreme point when it is asserted that under Horace Greeley the freedmen will be re-enslaved, or that colored people will in any way suffer in their equal rights. On the contrary, they have in his election not only the promises of the platform, but also the splendid example for a full generation, during which he has never wavered in the assertions of their rights. To suppose that Horace Greeley, when placed where he can do them the most good, will depart from the rule of his honest life, is an insult to reason. It is none the less idle to suppose that Democrats supporting Horace Greeley expect or desire that he should depart from those principles which are the glory of his character.

They have accepted the Cincinnati platform with its two-fold promises, and intend in good faith to maintain it. Democrats cannot turn back who, at the Convention adopting this platform, sang Greeley songs to the tune of "Old John Brown, his soul is marching on." Seeking especially the establishment of character, of national government, they will expect their President to be always true to himself. Therefore, I put aside the partisan allegation that Horace Greeley has gone to the Democrats, or that he will be controlled by Democrats.

Each is without foundation or reason, according to my judgment. They are attempts to avoid what you recognize as the true issue, being the question between the two candidates, or perhaps they may be considered as measures to divert the mind. Nobody who votes for Horace Greeley will go to the Democrats, nor do I believe that when elected, Horace Greeley will be under any influence except that enlightened conscience which will keep him ever true to the principles he represents.

WHY COLORED MEN SHOULD VOTE FOR GREELEY.

Gentlemen, in thus answering your two inquiries, I have shown you, as colored fellow-citizens, and also all who would uphold your rights and save the colored race from indignity, should refuse to sanction the re-election of the President and put your trust in Horace Greeley.

GRANT BROWN.

I ought to add that with him will be associated as Vice-President, Grant Brown, whom I have known for years a most devoted Abolitionist. The two together will carry into the national government an unswerving devotion to your rights, not to be disturbed by partisan dictation or sectional prejudice. Besides all this, which may fully guide you in determining between the two candidates, it is my duty to remind you that, as citizens of the United States and part of the country, your welfare is indissolubly associated with that of the whole country. Where all are prosperous, you will be gainers. Therefore, while justly careful of your own rights, you cannot be indifferent to the blessings of good government. It is for you to consider whether the time has not come for something better than the sword, and whether a character like Horace

of office-holders, drilled to obey the word of command. The speeches making him a "Ring," Horace Greeley finds footing to his support large numbers of Republicans unwilling to continue the existing course, and, as allies with them, a reliance in this regard movement.

Democrats in joining Horace Greeley have changed simply to President Grant, except when he joined the Republicans, changed that he was rewarded at once with high office. The change is open. Adopting the Republican platform which places the equal rights of all under the safeguard of irrevocable guarantees, and, at the same time, accepting the nomination of a lifetime Abolitionist, which represents prominently the sentiment of duty to the colored race, they have set the corporate seal to the sacred covenant. They may continue Democrats in name, but they are in reality Republicans, by the same title that those who sustain Republican principles are Republicans, or rather they are Democrats, according to the original significance of that word, dedicated to the rights of the people.

It is idle to say that Horace Greeley and the Republicans that nominated him are not one Republican because Democrats unite with them in support of cherished principles and the candidate who represents them. Conversions are always welcome, and not the less so because the change is a multitude rather than an individual. A political party cannot if it would, and should not if it could, shut the door against converts, whether counted by the score, the hundred or the thousand, and so we find that the supporters of President Grant announce with partisan triumph the adoption of a single Democratic politician or a single Democratic newspaper. In equal reason and with higher pride may the supporters of Horace Greeley announce the adherence of the Democratic party, which, turning from the things that are behind, presses on to those that are before. It is also idle to say that the election of Horace Greeley as President, with Grant Brown as Vice-President, both unchangeable Republicans, will be the return of the Democratic party to power. On the contrary, it will be the inauguration of Republican principles under the safeguard of a Republican President and Republican Vice-President.

With Democrats as avowed supporters in the organization of his administration and in the conduct of affairs, Horace Greeley will naturally lean upon those who present the great promise made of equal rights and reconciliation at Cincinnati. If Democrats are taken it will be as Republicans in heart, recognizing the associate terms of the settlement as an irreversible finality. The likelihood of political falsehood reaches its extreme point when it is asserted that under Horace Greeley the freedmen will be re-enslaved, or that colored people will in any way suffer in their equal rights. On the contrary, they have in his election not only the promises of the platform, but also the splendid example for a full generation, during which he has never wavered in the assertions of their rights. To suppose that Horace Greeley, when placed where he can do them the most good, will depart from the rule of his honest life, is an insult to reason. It is none the less idle to suppose that Democrats supporting Horace Greeley expect or desire that he should depart from those principles which are the glory of his character.

They have accepted the Cincinnati platform with its two-fold promises, and intend in good faith to maintain it. Democrats cannot turn back who, at the Convention adopting this platform, sang Greeley songs to the tune of "Old John Brown, his soul is marching on." Seeking especially the establishment of character, of national government, they will expect their President to be always true to himself. Therefore, I put aside the partisan allegation that Horace Greeley has gone to the Democrats, or that he will be controlled by Democrats.

Each is without foundation or reason, according to my judgment. They are attempts to avoid what you recognize as the true issue, being the question between the two candidates, or perhaps they may be considered as measures to divert the mind. Nobody who votes for Horace Greeley will go to the Democrats, nor do I believe that when elected, Horace Greeley will be under any influence except that enlightened conscience which will keep him ever true to the principles he represents.

WHY COLORED MEN SHOULD VOTE FOR GREELEY.

Gentlemen, in thus answering your two inquiries, I have shown you, as colored fellow-citizens, and also all who would uphold your rights and save the colored race from indignity, should refuse to sanction the re-election of the President and put your trust in Horace Greeley.

GRANT BROWN.

I ought to add that with him will be associated as Vice-President, Grant Brown, whom I have known for years a most devoted Abolitionist. The two together will carry into the national government an unswerving devotion to your rights, not to be disturbed by partisan dictation or sectional prejudice. Besides all this, which may fully guide you in determining between the two candidates, it is my duty to remind you that, as citizens of the United States and part of the country, your welfare is indissolubly associated with that of the whole country. Where all are prosperous, you will be gainers. Therefore, while justly careful of your own rights, you cannot be indifferent to the blessings of good government. It is for you to consider whether the time has not come for something better than the sword, and whether a character like Horace

of office-holders, drilled to obey the word of command. The speeches making him a "Ring," Horace Greeley finds footing to his support large numbers of Republicans unwilling to continue the existing course, and, as allies with them, a reliance in this regard movement.

Democrats in joining Horace Greeley have changed simply to President Grant, except when he joined the Republicans, changed that he was rewarded at once with high office. The change is open. Adopting the Republican platform which places the equal rights of all under the safeguard of irrevocable guarantees, and, at the same time, accepting the nomination of a lifetime Abolitionist, which represents prominently the sentiment of duty to the colored race, they have set the corporate seal to the sacred covenant. They may continue Democrats in name, but they are in reality Republicans, by the same title that those who sustain Republican principles are Republicans, or rather they are Democrats, according to the original significance of that word, dedicated to the rights of the people.

It is idle to say that Horace Greeley and the Republicans that nominated him are not one Republican because Democrats unite with them in support of cherished principles and the candidate who represents them. Conversions are always welcome, and not the less so because the change is a multitude rather than an individual. A political party cannot if it would, and should not if it could, shut the door against converts, whether counted by the score, the hundred or the thousand, and so we find that the supporters of President Grant announce with partisan triumph the adoption of a single Democratic politician or a single Democratic newspaper. In equal reason and with higher pride may the supporters of Horace Greeley announce the adherence of the Democratic party, which, turning from the things that are behind, presses on to those that are before. It is also idle to say that the election of Horace Greeley as President, with Grant Brown as Vice-President, both unchangeable Republicans, will be the return of the Democratic party to power. On the contrary, it will be the inauguration of Republican principles under the safeguard of a Republican President and Republican Vice-President.

With Democrats as avowed supporters in the organization of his administration and in the conduct of affairs, Horace Greeley will naturally lean upon those who present the great promise made of equal rights and reconciliation at Cincinnati. If Democrats are taken it will be as Republicans in heart, recognizing the associate terms of the settlement as an irreversible finality. The likelihood of political falsehood reaches its extreme point when it is asserted that under Horace Greeley the freedmen will be re-enslaved, or that colored people will in any way suffer in their equal rights. On the contrary, they have in his election not only the promises of the platform, but also the splendid example for a full generation, during which he has never wavered in the assertions of their rights. To suppose that Horace Greeley, when placed where he can do them the most good, will depart from the rule of his honest life, is an insult to reason. It is none the less idle to suppose that Democrats supporting Horace Greeley expect or desire that he should depart from those principles which are the glory of his character.

They have accepted the Cincinnati platform with its two-fold promises, and intend in good faith to maintain it. Democrats cannot turn back who, at the Convention adopting this platform, sang Greeley songs to the tune of "Old John Brown, his soul is marching on." Seeking especially the establishment of character, of national government, they will expect their President to be always true to himself. Therefore, I put aside the partisan allegation that Horace Greeley has gone to the Democrats, or that he will be controlled by Democrats.

Each is without foundation or reason, according to my judgment. They are attempts to avoid what you recognize as the true issue, being the question between the two candidates, or perhaps they may be considered as measures to divert the mind. Nobody who votes for Horace Greeley will go to the Democrats, nor do I believe that when elected, Horace Greeley will be under any influence except that enlightened conscience which will keep him ever true to the principles he represents.

WHY COLORED MEN SHOULD VOTE FOR GREELEY.

Gentlemen, in thus answering your two inquiries, I have shown you, as colored fellow-citizens, and also all who would uphold your rights and save the colored race from indignity, should refuse to sanction the re-election of the President and put your trust in Horace Greeley.

GRANT BROWN.

I ought to add that with him will be associated as Vice-President, Grant Brown, whom I have known for years a most devoted Abolitionist. The two together will carry into the national government an unswerving devotion to your rights, not to be disturbed by partisan dictation or sectional prejudice. Besides all this, which may fully guide you in determining between the two candidates, it is my duty to remind you that, as citizens of the United States and part of the country, your welfare is indissolubly associated with that of the whole country. Where all are prosperous, you will be gainers. Therefore, while justly careful of your own rights, you cannot be indifferent to the blessings of good government. It is for you to consider whether the time has not come for something better than the sword, and whether a character like Horace

of office-holders, drilled to obey the word of command. The speeches making him a "Ring," Horace Greeley finds footing to his support large numbers of Republicans unwilling to continue the existing course, and, as allies with them, a reliance in this regard movement.

Democrats in joining Horace Greeley have changed simply to President Grant, except when he joined the Republicans, changed that he was rewarded at once with high office. The change is open. Adopting the Republican platform which places the equal rights of all under the safeguard of irrevocable guarantees, and, at the same time, accepting the nomination of a lifetime Abolitionist, which represents prominently the sentiment of duty to the colored race, they have set the corporate seal to the sacred covenant. They may continue Democrats in name, but they are in reality Republicans, by the same title that those who sustain Republican principles are Republicans, or rather they are Democrats, according to the original significance of that word, dedicated to the rights of the people.

It is idle to say that Horace Greeley and the Republicans that nominated him are not one Republican because Democrats unite with them in support of cherished principles and the candidate who represents them. Conversions are always welcome, and not the less so because the change is a multitude rather than an individual. A political party cannot if it would, and should not if it could, shut the door against converts, whether counted by the score, the hundred or the thousand, and so we find that the supporters of President Grant announce with partisan triumph the adoption of a single Democratic politician or a single Democratic newspaper. In equal reason and with higher pride may the supporters of Horace Greeley announce the adherence of the Democratic party, which, turning from the things that are behind, presses on to those that are before. It is also idle to say that the election of Horace Greeley as President, with Grant Brown as Vice-President, both unchangeable Republicans, will be the return of the Democratic party to power. On the contrary, it will be the inauguration of Republican principles under the safeguard of a Republican President and Republican Vice-President.

With Democrats as avowed supporters in the organization of his administration and in the conduct of affairs, Horace Greeley will naturally lean upon those who present the great promise made of equal rights and reconciliation at Cincinnati. If Democrats are taken it will be as Republicans in heart, recognizing the associate terms of the settlement as an irreversible finality. The likelihood of political falsehood reaches its extreme point when it is asserted that under Horace Greeley the freedmen will be re-enslaved, or that colored people will in any way suffer in their equal rights. On the contrary, they have in his election not only the promises of the platform, but also the splendid example for a full generation, during which he has never wavered in the assertions of their rights. To suppose that Horace Greeley, when placed where he can do them the most good, will depart from the rule of his honest life, is an insult to reason. It is none the less idle to suppose that Democrats supporting Horace Greeley expect or desire that he should depart from those principles which are the glory of his character.

They have accepted the Cincinnati platform with its two-fold promises, and intend in good faith to maintain it. Democrats cannot turn back who, at the Convention adopting this platform, sang Greeley songs to the tune of "Old John Brown, his soul is marching on." Seeking especially the establishment of character, of national government, they will expect their President to be always true to himself. Therefore, I put aside the partisan allegation that Horace Greeley has gone to the Democrats, or that he will be controlled by Democrats.

Each is without foundation or reason, according to my judgment. They are attempts to avoid what you recognize as the true issue, being the question between the two candidates, or perhaps they may be considered as measures to divert the mind. Nobody who votes for Horace Greeley will go to the Democrats, nor do I believe that when elected, Horace Greeley will be under any influence except that enlightened conscience which will keep him ever true to the principles he represents.

WHY COLORED MEN SHOULD VOTE FOR GREELEY.

Gentlemen, in thus answering your two inquiries, I have shown you, as colored fellow-citizens, and also all who would uphold your rights and save the colored race from indignity, should refuse to sanction the re-election of the President and put your trust in Horace Greeley.

GRANT BROWN.

I ought to add that with him will be associated as Vice-President, Grant Brown, whom I have known for years a most devoted Abolitionist. The two together will carry into the national government an unswerving devotion to your rights, not to be disturbed by partisan dictation or sectional prejudice. Besides all this, which may fully guide you in determining between the two candidates, it is my duty to remind you that, as citizens of the United States and part of the country, your welfare is indissolubly associated with that of the whole country. Where all are prosperous, you will be gainers. Therefore, while justly careful of your own rights, you cannot be indifferent to the blessings of good government. It is for you to consider whether the time has not come for something better than the sword, and whether a character like Horace

of office-holders, drilled to obey the word of command. The speeches making him a "Ring," Horace Greeley finds footing to his support large numbers of Republicans unwilling to continue the existing course, and, as allies with them, a reliance in this regard movement.

Democrats in joining Horace Greeley have changed simply to President Grant, except when he joined the Republicans, changed that he was rewarded at once with high office. The change is open. Adopting the Republican platform which places the equal rights of all under the safeguard of irrevocable guarantees, and, at the same time, accepting the nomination of a lifetime Abolitionist, which represents prominently the sentiment of duty to the colored race, they have set the corporate seal to the sacred covenant. They may continue Democrats in name, but they are in reality Republicans, by the same title that those who sustain Republican principles are Republicans, or rather they are Democrats, according to the original significance of that word, dedicated to the rights of the people.

It is idle to say that Horace Greeley and the Republicans that nominated him are not one Republican because Democrats unite with them in support of cherished principles and the candidate who represents them. Conversions are always welcome, and not the less so because the change is a multitude rather than an individual. A political party cannot if it would, and should not if it could, shut the door against converts, whether counted by the score, the hundred or the thousand, and so we find that the supporters of President Grant announce with partisan triumph the adoption of a single Democratic politician or a single Democratic newspaper. In equal reason and with higher pride may the supporters of Horace Greeley announce the adherence of the Democratic party, which, turning from the things that are behind, presses on to those that are before. It is also idle to say that the election of Horace Greeley as President, with Grant Brown as Vice-President, both unchangeable Republicans, will be the return of the Democratic party to power. On the contrary, it will be the inauguration of Republican principles under the safeguard of a Republican President and Republican Vice-President.

With Democrats as avowed supporters in the organization of his administration and in the conduct of affairs, Horace Greeley will naturally lean upon those who present the great promise made of equal rights and reconciliation at Cincinnati. If Democrats are taken it will be as Republicans in heart, recognizing the associate terms of the settlement as an irreversible finality. The likelihood of political falsehood reaches its extreme point when it is asserted that under Horace Greeley the freedmen will be re-enslaved, or that colored people will in any way suffer in their equal rights. On the contrary, they have in his election not only the promises of the platform, but also the splendid example for a full generation, during which he has never wavered in the assertions of their rights. To suppose that Horace Greeley, when placed where he can do them the most good, will depart from the rule of his honest life, is an insult to reason. It is none the less idle to suppose that Democrats supporting Hor