force of old habit? We had not been there—we must hurry that way, by all means. As we went, we inquired of people most likely to have seen him.

"Yes"—it was a police officer who spoke—"yes, he was in that groggery there, took a drink of brandy, and rested a while. He seemed very tired, and walked slow and feebly. It is not fifteen minutes since he left—went that way."

Off we started again, made almost certain now that we were on the right track. "I will go with you," said the policeman, catching some of our excitement. We went now still faster. We would catch him, for there was a long, steep hill to be surmounted ere he could reach his goal—a steep hill that would sadly try his weary feet and wasting breath. On through the keen wind, our feet crunching the crisp snow—on—for somehow, though we spoke not of it, each felt that it was for life and death matters that we hurried. Save by us, the streets were deserted. The lamp-light flickered upon the snow—not a form to be seen. Yes, yonder, on the hill, moves a shadow, growing slowly longer from yon lamp—a shadow of a bent form, wearily plodding along. Yes, it must be him. Hasten!

"Nay, rather go slower, and do not let him see you; the excitement may be dangerous, and he may escape us, too."

True, policeman, your experience is of use to us two trembling, unstrung ones, dreading some calamity that we dare not define in our thoughts, even. Let us follow slowly, warily, you poor forlorn one, with heavy feet heavily toiling up the hill. See, now he is at the top, and pauses, turns. "Into this doorway. Let him not see you." He pauses—turns—what means he? See, he waves his right arm in the air, once, twice, thrice—waves it towards the east, waves in a slow and solemn manner, as we wave an eternal farewell to our dear ones, our loved ones. Oh, how portentously waved that arm; oh, how fearfully did that waved arm agree with our excited thoughts; oh, how terribly, afterwards, did that waved arm enter into my dreams, gloomily making air-circles about me, till sleep became a burden!

And now he moves on over the hill, and we, sighing a long sigh of relief, follow after. Not far has he to go now; an hundred yards further, and he will reach the place of his old misery. Let us hasten; we know not what his despair may bring about; deeds are quick as thought, often—not often needs death a second bidding. Follow, oh follow! And we rush on with desperate speed, with wild thoughts that choke us, fill us with creeping dread. We are at the top of the hill, and yonder is the old house, so battered—*his* house—his goal—will it be his likewise to us, under more frightful associations? Alas! we have not long to wait for the answer. Where is he? In the doorway of the house sits a silent, motionless form—a form bent over, with head resting upon knees. Even now, while we pause a moment, the head is raised, and the hand, and we fancy we note a shudder run through the frame; and again, in the lamp-light, the head falls heavily upon the knees, and the hand drops upon the snow heavily, not replacing the fallen hat which exposes those gray hairs to the bitter night. Hurry—there is need of us. *He* has need of us. But perhaps—perhaps his hour of need is past. Hurry! We are here! The lamp sheds its light upon him. A-well! One does one thing, another some other thing; but I—what do *I* do? Great God! what do *I* do? A slip of paper has fallen from the relaxed hand—a narrow slip of paper; I have seen many, very many, like it; God preserve me from seeing another as I saw that! Nothing do I, save clutch up that slip of paper, and bear it to the light; I knew it—many such had I sold; but, oh, why was it—why, oh Thou Inscrutable One, was it, that of all the numbers it is possible to combine, from one to seventy-five—of all the possible relations in which man's ingenuity has devised to place seventy-five numbers—why, oh why was it, that from that ticket there flashed out those three numbers, those fatal numbers—numbers which, God help me, I knew too well—numbers SEVENTEEN, NINETEEN, SIXTY THREE! I turned with seared brain; there was no need to cry out, to summon quick aid with voices whose tremor must appal—no need for us there, at all. I knew it, and silently they pointed it out to me, showing me where had fallen the shadow of the black wing of the Impartial.

* * * * * *

It mattered not to me that next day the jury of inquest doubted what verdict they should render; that it was questionable to them whether they should pronounce for death from exposure, or death from exhaustion, or death from excitement, or death from liquor, or death "from visitation of God." It mattered not to me that the doctors talked learnedly of the effects of so and so upon a constitution in such and such conditions; that they recited in technical formulæ the various conclusions which might be arrived at in regard to this death, based upon such diagnosis as they had been enabled by the autopsy to make. It mattered not to me that shuddering children, peeping about, and standing on tip-toe; that women, gossiping the while, and relating stories of him that lay there, should discuss how he died—should argue and quarrel, being worsted, in deference of this or that mode of extinguishment which they thought had come upon him. All these things mattered not at all to me, for, in my heart of hearts, I knew full well that the true verdict should be—

"DIED OF THE LOTTERY!"

Baltimore Co., Md., 1858.

The St. Joseph's, Mo., *Gazette* gives the following conflicting accounts from men who have visited the region of the alleged gold discoveries in Kansas:

"We had a conversation on Saturday with Joseph Richard, a trader in the region of the South Platte. He informs us that one of his associates, a Mr. Hyatt, well known in this city, visited the mines, and found them rich. Mr. Hyatt thought they would pay $50 per day, properly worked. Mr. Richard says gold is found on all the streams from Cherry Creek to Pole Creek; that the dirt pans out from six to ten cents per panfull. Peter Richard, brother of our informant, recently exhibited a quantity of the dust in this city, which bore an exact resemblance to that of California. We also had a conversation with a teamster just in from Bridger, who informed us that he heard of the mines on his route in, and was shown a specimen said to be from them, which weighed $12 60. He could give no further information.

"William G. Fee, well known in this city, called at our office on Saturday evening. He left Fort Laramie on the 24th of July, and Cherry Creek, the alleged seat of the gold mines, on the 17th. He was seven days in travelling from Cherry Creek to the fort, a distance of two hundred miles. He saw no gold whatever, and believes there is none there. Nor did he see any miners. He says a number of traders were moving into that region. He saw no rush to the mines, and thinks the bubble will be bursted as soon as reliable information is obtained."

The Lawrence correspondent of the Boston *Journal* writes on the 3d:

"As you have perhaps learned by some of the river papers, the latest news from the gold mines in western Kansas is of the most encouraging character. A gentleman who arrived in St. Joseph, from Laramie Peak, a day or two since, reports that the miners there are realizing from ten to twenty dollars per day; and a party of old mountaineers recently arrived in Kansas city, bringing with them specimens of gold of a very fine quality, which they had found in abundance among the head-waters of the Arkansas. They procured the necessary tools and outfit for miners, and immediately returned. There is a good deal of excitement in Kansas city, and a party is nearly organized to leave for the 'diggings.'"

In England, lately, a suit for breach of promise of marriage was brought by a fisherman's beautiful daughter against a captain in the English army, fixing damages at $50,000. The love letters of the gallant captain were so numerous that they were printed for the accommodation of counsel, making in all a volume of 198 pages. The matter was finally compromised by the payment of the injured lady of the sum $10,000, with the promise that the volume of letters should be burnt.

Madeline Smith is said to be making a pleasure tour in America. She is the young lady who, a year ago, was accused of poisoning her lover in Glasgow.

Mr. Giddings is engaged in writing the "History of the Anti-Slavery Fight in Congress," and his retirement will enable him to finish the work in due time.

TO ADVERTISERS.—Business men will find it greatly to their advantage to advertise in the *Era*.

Messrs. Pettingill & Co., S. B. Niles, and Joy, Coe, & Co., are our authorized advertising agents for Boston, New York, and Philadelphia.

Mr. L. T. Park, of Mount Union, Ohio, will receive and forward subscriptions for the *Era*, at club rates.

☞ Mr. Wheeler is the accredited agent for the *Era*, in Cincinnati, Ohio.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1858.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—SHALL IT LIVE OR DIE?

On returning to our post, we regret that there should be any occasion for asking the question prefixed as a title to this article.

Some twenty-five years ago, a few of us began to insist that the one real Question of American Politics was that of Slavery, in its Political Relations. We contended that, under the pressure of circumstances and considerations growing out of that system, and aided by a unity and stability of purpose springing from a great common Interest, the slaveholders, as a Class, had obtained the control of the Federal Government and Federal Politics, and were insidiously sectionalizing them, making them subservient to the growth of Slavery and the aggrandizement of their Power. They did not disregard the other interests of the country, but dealt with them always in subordination to the necessities of the slave system. The division of the People generally into two large Parties, on questions of Trade and Finance, afforded them an opportunity, by securing the machinery of party organizations, to control to a great extent the voters of the whole country. The People, engrossed by conflicts in regard to Banks and Tariffs, paid no attention to the peculiar policy of the Slaveholders. They had no exceptional interest to watch over, no one institution, like that of Slavery, to give unity and specific purpose to their counsels. In a National Convention, should the Slaveholding managers noiselessly exclude from place or influence a free-State man, who had offended them or awakened their suspicions; or, should a caucus in the Senate or House so arrange the Committees, without bruiting the matter, as to shut out from them all danger to the "peculiar institution," nobody noticed it, it aroused no excitement, it passed without comment. In this silent and insidious way, it came to pass that, while the People were agitated by the questions of a United States Bank and Protection, the Slaveholders obtained the mastery of the Federal Executive, of Congress, of the Whig and Democratic Parties, and of the general policy of the country. The People thought of nothing but settling the questions at issue between Democracy and Whigism; the Slaveholders were of course interested in these questions, but far more deeply concerned in the one exceptional Interest, which, demanding extraordinary care and effort for its prosperity, gave unity, stability, and force, to their action.

It was only when the agitation of the Anti-Slavery Reformers twenty-five years ago had succeeded in provoking discussion in Congress, that the existence of the Slave Power, and its firm grasp upon the Government and the People, began to be understood. We all know, and ought well to remember, what contempt and invective were poured upon the heads of members who ventured to utter an anti-Slavery sentiment—by what violent methods the Slaveholders sought to crush the right of petition and freedom of debate. Official power and party influence were everywhere directed towards the suppression of the agitation and the ostracism of the agitators. The Whig and Democratic Parties vied with each other in their zeal to conform themselves to the will of the Slaveholders. They had been formed to settle questions of Trade and Finance, without the slightest reference to this, to them, new Question of Slavery. They knew not how to deal with it; their aim was to avoid it, thrust it out of the way, so as to preserve party unity. Need we recount the numerous devices, the disreputable dodges and compromises they resorted to, as the conflict went on, the Public Mind became more excited, and Public Opinion gradually grew less concerned about old Questions, as it tended more towards the new?

The Bank question was settled. The Tariff question was disposed of, so far as mere Party action could dispose of it, or will ever be able to dispose of it. The real Question of American Politics—that of Slavery and the Slave Power—was now rising to confront them. Events following one another in rapid succession, revealed it in its true proportions. First, the annexation of Texas, then, the war on Mexico, for the purpose of acquiring territory to be appropriated by Slavery, then, the Wilmot Proviso controversy, brought to light the existence of a Power whose operations, although so long carried on under disguise, had not been the less real and effective.

Old Questions had indeed passed away, but not the old Parties. Unwilling to surrender political power, or the hope of it, they attempted to keep up discussions that had become useless, issues that had ceased to be vital, and thus shut out the new and all-important Question. They did not dare to grapple with it, to ascertain its dimensions, to determine its relations, to attempt to settle it upon Constitutional Principles. They had no principles, no policy in relation to it. They dreaded the awakening of antagonistic sentiments, disorganization, the alienation of Slaveholders. First, they attempted to thrust the Question aside; then, to compromise it, anxious to maintain their "nationality," as they styled it, and to retain the alliance of the Slaveholders. This anxiety was reciprocated. It was important to the views of the Slave Power that the two Parties should avoid disruption on this Question—that they should keep the People amused with subordinate or unreal issues. If the Question could be thrust aside or ignored, as in the case of Texas, it would be well; Slavery would have gained its end, without endangering the organization of the two Parties through which the Slaveholding Class controlled the voters of the free States. If it could be compromised, as in the year 1850, by the defeat of the Wilmot Proviso policy, all the new Territories would at least be open to Slavery, and the old Parties, still safe, might be used thereafter for ulterior purposes.

So the Whig and Democratic Parties contrived to live until 1850—and then, in 1852, their National Conventions, ratifying the Compromise of 1850, went into the Presidential election on that basis. Both had criminally surrendered a Principle, acted on from the beginning by the Government, in regard to Slavery; both had acquiesced in the continued domination of the Slave Power; both had managed to preserve the odor of "nationality," and both now proclaimed that the Question of Slavery was finally settled.

The Democratic Party succeeded; there was a lull in the political world; the old Parties seemed to dream of long life, to be diversified by pleasantly exciting struggles for the spoils. We, who told them that the settlement was delusive, that Slavery had gained vantage ground, from which to make new aggressions at its own convenient time, and that they [illegible] paired their power of resistance [illegible] sectional and fanatical.

The year 1854 dispelled their [illegible]. The repeal of the Missouri Compromise, under the pretext of applying the Principle of the Compromise of 1850, to the only Territory remaining consecrated to Freedom, but remote from audience to the Slave Power, which asserted the constitutional Right of Slavery to enter the Territory of the Union, and possess it too, anticipating future acquisitions which, combined with the southern border, required the establishment of Principle that would enable it to convert to its uses, showed that we were right, and proved to a majority of the People what they had learned many years sooner, that the Slaveholders constitute a distinct, dominant class, that their peculiar interest and necessities impel them to constant aggression, that the Whig and Democratic Parties had degenerated into the mere instruments of their usurpations, and that the pretension of "nationality" set up by these Parties is simply a stupid, cowardly, Pro-Slavery fanaticism. They had been prating of great National Questions, Harmony and Union, while acting in absolute subjection to a Power which had been steadily laboring to nationalize Slavery, making subservience its interests the [illegible] nationality and the price of Party unity.

But, we cannot linger.

The Whig Party was dissolved. The Democratic Party stood notorious, without disguise, the agent of Slavery. Many of its leaders and adherents of the former in the South joined the Democracy, now a confirmed pro-Slavery organization. Others of that Party, in both sections, enlisted under the banner of Know-Nothingism, which also drew recruits from the Democratic ranks. But in the general chaos opposed to the Republican Party, comprising the great body of those Whigs and Democrats in the Free States who, indignant and shocked at this last act of the Slave Power, resolved to come back on the Principles and Policy adopted by our Fathers in the treatment of the question of Slavery, to oppose the system everywhere outside of the States, and to rescue the Federal Government and Federal policy from the control of the Slaveholding Oligarchy. The changes were rapid. The majority of the People were with the Republicans. States fell under their power in a brief period, there was scarcely a State without a Republican Governor or Republican Legislature. In the Congress following the repeal of the Compromise, every strong enough to elect their candidate for Speaker; strong enough to baffle all efforts for imposing a Pro-Slavery Constitution on Kansas; in 1856, powerful enough to carry the electoral votes of eleven Free States, and a majority of the voters of the non-slaveholding States; and to-day, they are represented in the United States by twenty-seven Senators, soon to be increased by elections in other States.

There are now but two live parties—the Democratic Slavery organization, with its Cincinnati Platform, Dred Scott Decision, and James Buchanan; and the Republican Party, with its Philadelphia platform, its Constitutional Principles, as illustrated by the Ordinance of 1787, and the man who shall be its Presidential candidate in '60. The latter because the Question at issue between them is a real one, a momentous one, and must be settled. They exist, not as a result of accident or temporary policy, but from necessity. Representatives of Anti-Slavery Ideas, the necessary agents of Anti-Slavery workers. The Kansas Question was but an incident in the struggle between them. That question has been substantially settled in favor of Freedom, but the Party and Power which sought to reduce Free Territory to Slave, retain in possession of the Federal Government, and are more flagrantly than ever pledged to maintain and carry out Principles dangerous to Liberty, necessary to the Slave-Despotism.

The Republican Party aims to take the Administration of the Federal Government out of the hands of the Slaveholding Oligarchy, and make it the agent of the People.

The Slavery Democracy seek to perpetuate the power of the Oligarchy.

The Republican Party recognizes the policy of the Fathers of the Republic, which prevented the whole of the territory belonging to the Union, Freedom and Free Labor, exclusively occupied, proceeding on the assumption that Freedom was National and the Rule, Slavery the Exception.

The Slavery Democracy regard as their example and policy, and its action tending to Nationalize Slavery, and Sectionalize Liberty.

The Republican Party affirms that Slavery cannot exist without positive law, that the Federal Constitution recognizes and treats slaves as *persons*, not as property; that it does not create, or make provision for the creation of, Slavery, anywhere; that it does not enable the Slaveholder to carry his slaves into any Territory of the United States, and hold them there in bondage; that Congress has no authority from it to pass any such enabling Laws; that Congress has a right to prohibit Slavery in the Territories; that it is the duty of the Federal Government to preserve the Territories sacred to free men and free labor; that a Territorial Legislature has the right to exclude Slavery during the Territorial condition, as the People may think when they come to form a State—and these Principles it maintains in opposition to the *dicta* of the Pro-Slavery Judges of the Supreme Court.

The Slavery Democracy denies these Principles, and accepts the *dicta* of the Pro-Slavery Judges of the Supreme Court as its Platform: that is, it holds that Slavery does not require for its existence the force of positive law; that the Federal Constitution recognizes slaves as *property*, not persons; that it does enable the Slaveholder to carry his slaves with him into any Territory of the Union, and hold them there in bondage; that Congress has no right to pass any law impairing this alleged right, but is bound to protect it; that it is the duty of the Federal Government to keep the Territories open to Slavery; that the Territorial Legislature has no right, during a Territorial condition, to interdict Slavery, or pass any law impairing the right of holding slaves in the Territory, but is bound to protect it.

The issues are distinctly made, and by two Parties—the SLAVERY DEMOCRACY and the REPUBLICAN. These Parties stand to the two great Parties of the Country; a third organization, that of the Know Nothings, or American, having carried only a single State at the last Presidential election, and having been steadily declining ever since. The issues between these two great Parties are vital and practical; they go to the root of the Constitution, and involve the destiny of the Union. They must be settled—yea, or nay. If either of the two Parties can be seduced to lay down its arms, to compromise, or forswear its Principles, the decision will be against its Principle and Policy. We know that the Slavery Democracy will do neither. It has place, power, pride and the inexorable resolve, founded on the necessities of the Slaveholding Oligarchy. *Will the Republicans yield?*

This is the Question of Questions. To this point has the rapid survey we have taken, been tending. *Shall the Republicans forswear, compromise, abate, or hold back any of their Principles*—the *Principles* we have stated—for the sake of forming coalitions promising temporary and local successes, or for the purpose of disarming Prejudice, or winning over Conservatism, deemed dangerous and embarrassing? Let the man who has hitherto harbored such an idea, seriously consider the views we have presented, and then answer the question.

We anticipate the answer of all our readers. The battle must be fought to the end, as it has been begun and waged, openly, fairly, squarely, for Principles. The issues we have stated must be and will be settled, before others can engross the Public mind. Should the Republicans prove false to their convictions, surrender one Principle to the Douglas Democracy, and another to the Fillmore Know Nothings, as they are called upon by certain influential Republican Papers to do, the conflict will be by that very act decided against them. Success could not change the result. Let them go into a contest, agreeing, for the sake of a coalition with Fillmore Americans, to ignore the real issues between them and the Slavery Democracy, voting for men and with men who acquiesce in the Dred Scott *dicta*, and in Squatter Sovereignty as defined by Douglas, and let them carry the day—What will they gain? *Precisely the repudiation of their Principles, and the ratification of the Principles of their adversaries.* The only change will be, not of policy, but of agents. Jacob Broom is just as much opposed to Republicanism, as Thomas Florence. Daniel Ullman is no more to our taste as a co-worker, than Daniel Dickinson.

In one State, Republicans are called upon to commit themselves to the dogma of Squatter Sovereignty, as explained by Mr. Douglas. In another, they are solicited to hold back, and let the People's Party step into the field: it will manage the matter adroitly, by condemning the past action of the Administration in Kansas, by charging the Administration with tremendous extravagance, by insisting upon retrenchment, reform, and protection to home industry, and thus present a "National platform on which the good men of all sections may rally."

In another State, they are asked to combine with the American Party. True, that Party tried to defeat them in the Presidential election, boasted of its success, and rejoiced in the triumph of James Buchanan: but James has disappointed them—they do not like the way he has managed the Kansas business—he has stirred up sectional strife—he has really gone too far for Slavery—they are anxious to put him down, and therefore willing to unite with those whose success, which they prevented, would have spared the country the Kansas infamy. Very well—let them unite. The Republicans are in the field, with Principles as old as the Constitution, the only Party which has strength enough to enter the lists against the Slavery and Buchanan Democracy. Let every American, Conservative Whig, and Democrat, who voted for Buchanan or Fillmore, and now deplore the action of the Administration they helped to instal, vote with the only Party which stands fairly and powerfully arrayed against all the Principles of this Administration. This is the dictate of common sense. But no: a very different sort of union is proposed. By some kind of contrivance—New York is famous for contrivance and clap-trap and man-trap—a co-operative movement is proposed, in which the Republicans are to adopt two favorite measures of the Know-Nothings, and forbear any assertion of their own principles, merely affirming their devotion to the Non-Extension of Slavery—a very definite idea—and the Know Nothings are to be permitted to declare all their peculiar principles, only cordially endorsing the novel idea, of devotion to the Non-Extension of Slavery! Then, the two Parties are to divide the tickets, go into the election, whip the Democracy, take possession of the reins of Government, and do what? Nothing, but share the spoils; for, holding in truth, Principles in regard to Slavery in its political relations, utterly irreconcilable, they never could unite upon a policy satisfactory to the demands of either.

See the incongruous materials that were attempted to be harmonized. After the scheme had failed, the American Convention at Syracuse presented its solemn views on the Slavery Question, as follows:

"1. That while we recognise the power of Congress over the Territories of the United States, we deny its right to establish Slavery within the Territories, to extend Slavery thereto, or to declare its existence therein, against the voice and will of the people.

"2. That to the citizens of the United States residing in the Territories belongs the power of framing their Constitution of a State; and that whenever it is republican in its form, and in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, it must be admitted into the Union upon an equality with all the other States.

"3. That the attempt of the National Administration to force the Lecompton Constitution upon the people of Kansas, against their repeated and earnest protests, and the attempt to discriminate between the population of a slaveholding and a non-slaveholding State, by seeking to admit a State with Slavery with a less population than a State without Slavery, was anti republican in principle, dangerous to the peace and harmony of the country, and at variance with the whole spirit of our American Government and People.

"4. That we rejoice in the successful rebuke of this attempted wrong and outrage by the people of Kansas, acting on their own solemn responsibility, and free from all interference from any other quarter.

"5. That to the Members of Congress who nobly sustained this principle of free Government, against the opposition of the dominant party, North and South, East and West, is due an expression of the thanks and obligations of all the true men in the land, who believe that patriotism is higher than party, and that justice between States and citizens should control the legislation of the country.

"6. That especially to our countrymen in Congress, John J. Crittenden of Kentucky, John Bell of Tennessee, Humphrey Marshall of Kentucky, Henry Winter Davis and all his noble American compeers in Maryland, and to all of that gallant band of South Americans in Congress, who stood by the integrity of the Union and the rights of the people of Kansas to make their own laws, we tender our cordial sympathy and our heartfelt respect."

The first resolve simply embodies statements which nobody in Congress or out of it, North or South, has ever dreamed of contesting. It looks quite Anti-Slavery, but has no practical meaning. Why did the Convention dodge the question of the power of Congress to prohibit or protect Slavery in the Territories?

The second resolve contains nothing deserving of comment.

The third tells a truth, which Mr. Douglas, Governor Wise, and other Democratic and Southern statesmen have told in language still more vigorous.

Fourth, ditto.

Fifth and sixth contain no statement of principles.

Here, then, in the resolves of this Convention, it makes not a single issue on Principle with the Slavery Democracy, utters not a sentiment which can be construed into opposition to the growth of Slavery or the Slave Power.

Read now the resolutions of the Republican Convention, after the "Non-Extension" nonsense had been disposed of.

"*Resolved*, That the Republican party was called into being by an imminent public danger and an urgent public necessity—the danger of the subjection of our vast National Territory to Human Slavery—and the necessity of resisting and the arresting that calamity.

"*Resolved*, That the surrender of those Territories to Slavery would be at once a national crime, a national disaster, and national shame; and that every American, whether in the North or in the South, who lives or whose posterity must live by any other industry than that of enslaved, benighted, and imbruted human chattels; every one who does not regard those who live by honest muscular exertions, as necessarily the 'mud-sills of society,' has a deep personal interest in the triumph of our cause.

"*Resolved*, That our attitude of activity, positive, resolute resistance to Slavery Extension, is that of our Revolutionary Fathers, and the founders of this Republic—that our doctrine and practice of legislative prohibition of Slavery in the Federal Territories was first propounded by Thomas Jefferson, and heartily approved by George Washington, along with a great majority of the distinguished Patriots and Statesmen of the South as well as the North, and that New York, now happily a Free State, cannot without dishonor take lower ground in opposition to the spread of our great national cancer, than she deliberately assumed and unflinchingly maintained throughout her forty years of independent existence as a slave State.

"*Resolved*, That in thus proclaiming our determined and unalterable repugnance to the extention of Slavery, we disclaim all unkind feeling or ungenerous purpose toward our brethren of the South. We disclaim all intent or wish to war upon or harm them; we insist that the have no right to regard as invidious or hostile our persistence in a policy which their fathers first traced out for our fathers and themselves; and we hold that the true interest and enduring honor of every portion of the Confederacy require the consecration of every remaining acre of National Territory to the uses of free labor and free men.

"*Resolved*, That the dicta propounded by the Supreme Court of the Republic in the Dred Scott decision making every square mile of the Federal territory *prima facie* slave territory, by increasing the facility with which such extension may be effected, deepens the obligation resting upon us to resist the extension of Slavery; and despite such dicta of the Supreme Court, we affirm the power and duty of Congress to exclude Slavery from the Territories of the United States.

"*Resolved*, That we point with pride to the history and present attitude of Kansas, as evidence that Northern resistance to Slavery extension, even though struggling against the full power and determined exertions of the Federal Executive, Judiciary, Senate, and for the most part, of the House also, is not ineffectual nor fruitless, but certain, if earnestly and steadfastly maintained, to be crowned with a beneficent and far-reaching triumph.

"*Resolved*, That to the heroic and devoted pioneers of Kansas we tender assurances of our admiration of their courage and fidelity, our profound sympathy for their most unmerited trials and sufferings, and our congratulations on their triumph so nobly and now so nearly achieved in the face of unprecedented embarrassments, perils, and sacrifices; and we hold up their example to the imitation of their and our brethren, who are going forth to people Arizona and the vast uncultivated regions which once lay in the away of our Union.

"*Resolved*, That the attempt of the present Federal Administration to force Kansas into the Union under a slave Constitution, never authorized by her people, but indignantly repudiated as a usurpation and as a fraud, is but the natural climax of a long series of wrongs and iniquities, instigated by the same spirit, and emanating from the same source; and while rejoicing over its defeat, we realize that the blow was none the less felonious, because the enemy and address with which it was parried and its purpose baffled.

"*Resolved*, That we demand the prompt admission of Kansas as a free State, upon the application about to be made by her people, and we protest against any respect or deference to the invidious conditions of admission imposed on her alone by the English bill, as unjust to itself and insulting to every free State in the Union."

There is mind and heart in these resolutions. They show a clear appreciation of great principles, and a hearty devotion to a noble purpose. They state living issues without disguise or abatement. They confront the Slavery Democracy fairly, openly, fully. Men who vote for candidates on these resolutions will know precisely what they are doing, and if they succeed, their chosen agents will know precisely how to act.

Such a course ought to have been pursued in New York, and every other State, from the beginning. To hesitate, to vacillate, to palter, to invite coalition, was to betray weakness, raise up adversaries, revive other organizations, which would have dwindled under the pressure of a prompt, decided, an uncompromising party action by the Republicans. It was not necessary to be supercilious, unconciliatory, partisan in temper: but they had the field, the issues were defined, they had proclaimed their principles, they embraced the great majority of the voters opposed to the course of the Slavery Democracy. Why did they not, in every case, avoid all trading, all bargaining, and, confiding in their principles and position, carry their appeal directly home to the People, and let other organizations stand or fall on their merits.

Let us rejoice that in a majority of the States they have pursued this manly course, and, as the result show, with success. In a very few they have adopted a different policy, but it will fail. The Republican Party is the Party of Freedom or it is nothing at all. Strip it of this attribute, as its chief characteristic, adulterate it with Know Nothingism, make it a Conservative, or a Tariff, or an Old Whig, or a "Squatter Sovereignty" Party, and from that hour it dies to the root.

Mr. Dewart, of Penn., who distinguished himself in Congress last winter by being against the Lecompton bill up to the day of a vote upon it, and then wheeling into Administration line, has been renominated for Congress by his partisans.

NEW ATLANTIC STEAMSHIP LINE.

Mr. Lever a Manchester, England, merchant, has started a new ocean line of steamers.

"The scheme of the corporation embraces these details:

"The purchase or construction of ten first-class steamers, to ply between Galway, Boston, Quebec, and New York.

"The establishment of auxiliary coastwise lines for Ireland and England, with a line possibly for France, as feeders to the transatlantic vessels.

"The institution of two thousand booking-offices, in the United States, Canada, and Great Britain, where passages may be secured, and letters of credit be procured or cashed.

"The erection of a pier or breakwater at Galway, rendering that harbor equal to any on the Atlantic coast.

"In carrying out these plans, it is understood that the *Prince Albert*, the *Pacific*, the *Propeller*, and the *Lady Eglinton*, are to be removed from the main to the auxiliary department, giving place to the finest and largest vessels that money can obtain in the interval. It is highly probable the Collins steamers will be secured. All the unemployed first-class steam shipping of England will be overhauled, and any attaining the high standard of the Company will be put in requisition. Altogether, the enterprise assumes the largest proportions, throwing all previous operations of the sort into the shade and, if the thunder be not all in the prologue, it may handsomely merit its title of the 'Great North Atlantic Line.'"

Already several passages have been made by this line, and the time from Halifax to Galway is only a week. The price of passage is $90, and a railway ticket is furnished the passenger to any part of Great Britian. The trips already made have been successful, both in the passenger and freight traffic; and when new and first-class steamers are put upon the line, it will without doubt attract its full share of the public patronage. Should it fully succeed, it will make Galway a first-class city, and favorably affect Ireland.

THE DUDLEY OBSERVATORY.

The Dudley Observatory and the Scientific Council. Statement of the Trustees. Albany. 1858. Pp. 179

This pamphlet, concerning the claim set up by Messrs. Bache, Peirce, Gould, and Henry, to the control of the Dudley Observatory in Albany, is full of interest, to men of science especially. The facts are briefly these: In 1851, the idea of an Observatory at Albany was projected by eminent citizens, who wrote to Professor Mitchell, of Cincinnati, for his advice and co-operation. Prof. Mitchell replied, that all that was necessary to lay the groundwork of immediate action and consequent success was to collect the sum of twenty five thousand dollars. In August following, Professor Mitchell made a selection of the site now occupied by the Observatory; and such was the enthusiasm of the good people of Albany, that in March, 1852, they had raised that sum, and the Legislature of New York passed an act "to incorporate the Dudley Observatory of the city of Albany," constituting certain citizens Trustees, with power to hold property and to make such by-laws as might be required, and "to appoint such officers and servants as they deem necessary."

The plan of the Observatory building was made at Cincinnati, under the direction of Prof. Mitchell, who was then regarded by the Trustees as their future Director. In 1855, the enterprise was checked by the inability of Prof. Mitchell to remove to Albany. At this point of time, Prof. Bache makes his appearance in this pamphlet, not directly, but through Prof. Peirce, of Harvard University, who is one of the many beneficiaries of the Coast Survey. Through this gentleman, Professor Bache made known the wants of the Coast Survey of an Observatory at Albany, and proposed to the Trustees, that if the people of Albany would purchase a heliometer, the United States would supply a transit instrument and a corps of observers, free of expense to the Trustees. Anxious to make the University useful to the cause of science, the proposition was accepted, and Mrs. Dudley, who has since made a donation of $50,000, subscribed $6,000 for a heliometer, which was increased by her to $14,000, in order that the instrument might be the very best that could be procured in the workshops of Europe. Thus far, Prof. Bache's plan had been successful. The next step to be taken was the creation of an advisory council. This proposition was made through Prof. Peirce, who, with a modesty peculiar to these gentlemen, sent a list to the Trustees, viz: Bache, *Peirce*, Gould, and Commander Davis, all attached to and pensioners of the Coast Survey appropriation. Prof. Gould objected to Commander Davis, and the name of Prof. Henry was substituted. "Thus," say the Trustees, "originated the famous Scientific Council."

Prof. Gould was detailed by Prof. Bache to the duty of the Dudley Observatory, and was sent to Europe to obtain instruments; and such are the surprising improvements claimed to be made by him, that the Olcott Meridian Circle is said, in the "Defence" made by the Scientific Council, "to be an offspring of his genius." Prof. Brunnow, the eminent astronomer and director of the Ann Arbor Observatory, who saw this instrument in the shop of the maker, speaking of it, says "It is essentially the same instrument as the one at Ann Arbor;" one made by the same maker.

When the Scientific Council speak of Mr. Gould's improvements of this meridian circle being such as to make it "the offspring of his own genius," they speak by the vision of faith, and not by sight; for though this and other instruments from Europe, manufactured for this Observatory, were received in April, 1857, no entreaties on the part of the Trustees have induced these gentlemen to cause them to be mounted on piers erected at great cost to receive them, and they now lie at the Observatory in the boxes in which they were imported. This conduct on the part of the Director, Prof. Gould, compelled the belief that he was incompetent to use these instruments, or that there was a purpose not developed to keep this Observatory in the condition of uselessness to which it had been so long condemned by the Scientific Council.

On the 9th January last, the Board of Directors decided on removing Prof. Gould; and their vote was communicated to the Scientific Council, who at once assembled in Albany. This Council made no claims of control then, but, with many promises of amendment, and after earnest entreaties and even tears of one for whom they had long cherished a profound respect, the Trustees, a majority of them, reluctantly, and with many misgivings, consented to reinstate Prof. Gould, hoping the lesson he had received would teach him courtesy and wisdom. But so unbearable and rude was the conduct of this person, that the Trustees felt themselves compelled to dismiss him from their service, as a man with whom they could hold no intercourse, and in whose capacity and integrity they had no longer any confidence. This was early in June last.

On the 29th June, this famous scientific Council reassembled at Albany, and held their meetings at the Dudley Observatory. They came no longer as tearful suppliants, but with the imperious mien and bearing of sovereigns, whose business it is to scourge rebellious subjects into implicit obedience; and failing to terrify these noble citizens of Albany, whose wealth had created the Observatory under whose roof they were convened, they promulgated an almost Papal Bull against the trustees. The notes and resolves of these savans are all given in this pamphlet, and must be regarded as masterpieces of purest impudence. Not content with words, Prof. Bache now comes out from behind his hiding-places, and, in order to retain forcible possession of the Observatory, he has stationed six young men in aid of Doctor Gould (all alike attached to the *Coast* Survey, and paid out of the appropriation made for that service,) who is set for the defence of this "lighthouse of the skies." Nor is this all: Prof. Bache has hired a day and night watch to patrol the grounds, lest the gentlemen in-doors should be so intent on their scrutiny of the stars as to be surprised; and yet more: these scientific men are so intent on maintaining their usurpations, that they have already obtained six eminent counsel to defend them in the courts of New York, and have said that they were prepared for a bristling fight with the Trustees.

In reading this admirable pamphlet, so clear, calm, and convincing, as it is, the Trustees confess to their unhesitating confidence in the capacity of their scientific counsellors. They poured out their wealth like water at their command, and, instead of the $25,000 called for by Prof. Mitchell, they had paid away by direction of Prof. Gould, on and before the 10th August last, the sum of $66,676.83. Buildings had been erected, costly piers set up, the best of all instruments purchased and paid for, and nothing done for science. They were compelled to bring this stand-still policy to an end, and they have done so by the dismissal of Doctor Gould as director, and of these *savans* as counsellors.

It is now a question of public interest, whether Prof. Bache and his coadjutors shall hold forcible possession of this Observatory, built by contributions of the citizens of Albany, and placed by law in the hands of citizens as Trustees; and, further, whether moneys appropriated for the Coast Survey, or funds consecrated to other objects, can be disbursed to pay for a corps of observers and policemen to guard the Observatory and its buildings from being entered by the Trustees whose contributions have erected it. *

The Review.

Christian Examiner for September, 1858. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co. Editors, Rev. F. Hedge, Brookline, Mass.; Rev. E. E. Hale, Boston.

This is certainly one of the best periodicals received at our office. Its topics are generally well selected, and often discussed with more than ordinary ability, almost always in a fair and liberal spirit. It is published tri-monthly, in numbers of at least 156 octavo pages, at $4 a year.

The North British Review. August, 1858. New York: Leonard Scott & Co. For sale by Taylor & Maury, Washington, D. C.

The *North British* maintains its reputation for able discussions of Questions of Science, Politics, and Literature, controlled and determined by Religious Ideas. One of the best papers in this number is a review of the Researches on Light, Sanatory, Scientific, and Æsthetical; another is a Dissertation on Egypt and Syria in connection with Western influence.

There are several other papers on topics of great interest, which we have not had time to examine.

A Text-Book of Vegetable and Animal Physiology. By Henry Goadby, M. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. For sale by Franklin Philp, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Goadby is Professor of Vegetable and Animal Physiology and Entomology in the State Agricultural College of Michigan. He has prepared this book—a handsome octavo of 300 pages, illustrated by upwards of 450 engravings—for the use of schools, seminaries, and colleges, in this country.

Dr. Goadby, we fear, has consulted more his own tastes and his familiarity with the development of Vegetable and Animal Life than the capacities and wants of those who have yet to be instructed into its mysteries. His book will, doubtless, be serviceable to scientific teachers, as furnishing a general method for instruction, but ordinary teachers would find it as difficult to use as David did the armor of Saul. Portions of it may be read and studied with much interest and benefit by any student, but there are many parts which must confuse the beginner.

Memoir of Joseph Carter. By Miss Sedgwick. New York: Harper & Brothers. For sale by Taylor & Maury, Washington, D. C.

Miss Sedgwick as done well in presenting to the world this unpretending memoir of a philanthropist,