THE NEW NATIONAL ERA,
PUBLISHED
EVERY THURSDAY MORNING
At Washington City, D. C.
NEW NATIONAL ERA BUILDING, 418 11TH STREET.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS, Editor.
DOUGLASS BROTHERS, Publishers.

PRICES OF SUBSCRIPTIONS: Single copies, $2.50 per year; five copies for $10, payable in advance.
APPLY TO FREDERICK DOUGLASS, Jr., Lock Box 31, Washington, D. C.

NEW NATIONAL ERA.

VOL. III.—NO. 29.] WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY, JULY 25, 1872 [$2.50 a year in advance. 5 Copies for $10.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.
TRANSIENT ADVERTISING RATES:
One insertion, per square.....$1 50
Subsequent insertion.....75
The space of ten lines Brevier type constitutes an advertising square in this paper.
Any space less than ten lines is charged the rate of a full square.
All advertisements occupying less than a quarter of a column are computed by the square.
Advertisements inserted for a less time than three months are charged transient rates.

GRANT AND WILSON.

Appeal to the Women of America.

The National Women Suffrage Association.

To the Women of the United States:

Women of the United States, the hour for political action has come. For the first time in the history of our country woman has been recognized in the platform of a large and dominant party. Philadelphia has spoken and woman is no longer ignored. She is now officially recognized as part of the body politic. The fourteenth plank of its platform declares "the Republican party mindful of its obligations to the loyal women of America; it expresses gratification that wider avenues of employment have been open to women, and it farther declares that her demands for additional rights should be treated with respectful consideration." We are told that this plank does not say much, that in fact it is only a "splinter;" and our "liberal" friends warn us not to rely upon it as a promise of the ballot to woman. What it is, we know full better than others. We recognize its meagerness; we see in it the timidity of politicians; but beyond and through it all, we farther see its promise of the future. We see in it the thin edge of the entering wedge which shall break woman's slavery in pieces and make us at last a nation truly free—a nation in which the caste of sex shall fall down by the caste of color, and humanity alone shall be the criterion of all human rights. The Republican party has been the party of ideas, of progress. Under its leadership, the nation came safely through the fiery ordeal of the rebellion; under it slavery was destroyed; under it manhood suffrage was established. The women of the country have long looked to it in hope, and not in vain; for to-day we are launched by it into the political arena, and the Republican party must hereafter fight our battles for us. This great party, this progressive party, having taken the initiative step, will never go back on its record. It needed this new and vital issue to keep it in life, for Cincinnati indorsed its work up to this hour; the constitutional amendments, the payment of the bonds in gold, the civil service reform, the restoration of the States. It thanked the soldiers and sailors of the Republic, it proposed lands to actual settlers. The Republican party went up higher; it remembered all citizens. The *widows* and orphans of the soldiers and sailors were not forgotten; it acknowledged its obligation to the loyal women of the Republic, and to the demands for additional rights, of *all* women, whatever their class, color, or birth, it promised respectful consideration." Its second plank declared that "complete liberty and exact equality in the enjoyment of all civil, political, and public rights should be established and maintained throughout the Union by efficient and appropriate State and Federal legislation." These two planks are the complement of each other, and are the promise of exact and equal justice to woman. They were the work of radical woman suffrage Republicans—of Wilson, Sargent, Loring, Claflin, Hoar, Fairchild, and others. They were accepted by the candidates. Gen. Grant, in his letter, expresses his desire to see "the time when the title of 'citizen' shall carry with it all the protection and privilege to the humblest, that it does to the most exalted." His course since his elevation to the Presidency has always been favorable to increased rights for women. He has officially recognized their competency and has given them many Government positions. Senator Wilson is an old and staunch advocate of woman suffrage, and his letter in pointed terms refers to the recognition given woman by his party, and says, "to her new demands it extends the hand of grateful recognition and it commends her demands for additional rights to the calm and careful consideration of the nation." And, too, thus early in the campaign, the strongest men of the party, among whom are Forney of the Philadelphia *Press*, Gerrit Smith, Bowen of the New York *Independent*, and President White, of Cornell University, speak of this recognition as introducing a new era into politics.

While the old and tried Republican party in its platform and candidates thus gives woman assurance that her claim to equal political rights is to be respected, the other party in the field gives her no promise either in its platform or the letters of its nominees. The Liberal Republican party is a new party; it has no record; it has done no work; it is wholly untried; it ignores women, and by its silence in regard to the equal rights of one-half of the people—the most important question now in the political horizon—it proves itself unworthy of its name, unworthy of woman's confidence, and unworthy of the votes of truly liberal men. In regard to its candidates, Gratz Brown, once our friend, has practically gone back on his record. Horace Greeley, its chief nominee, has for years been our most bitter, scathing opponent. Both by tongue and pen he has heaped abuse, ridicule, and misrepresentation upon our leading women, while the whole power of the *Tribune* has been used to crush out our great reform. And now that he is a candidate for election to the highest office in the country, he still continues his bitter and hostile course toward one-half of its citizens. He presses the iron heel of his despotism upon their liberties; and, in answer to our appeals, he says he "neither desires our help nor believes us capable of giving any."

What can liberty expect from such a man? What can woman hope from such a party? Women of the Republic, you cannot in self-respect give your aid to such nominees; you cannot in self-respect work for such a party. It has repulsed you, pushed you back, said to you "go hence."

The Republican party, with Grant and Wilson as its standard-bearers, opens its doors to you. By its fourteenth plank it invites your aid and co-operation.

Shall it not have it? Women of the South will you not work for your own freedom? Women of the North will you not strive for your own enfranchisement?

"There is a tide in the affairs of men
Which taken at the flood leads on to fortune.
But we must take the current when it serves
our turn,
Or lose our ventures."

For us to-day this tide has risen; for us to-day the current serves our turn. Let us lay aside our party preferences. Let us one and all forget our many grievances of the past, let us forget the many times we have been ignored, buffeted, and spurned by politicians. Let us throw our whole influence of voice and pen into this campaign, and in making it a success for the Republican party, make it a success for ourselves.

And now an especial word to the Women Suffrage organizations of the country. Prepare to hold mass meetings in all the large cities of your States; be ready to co-operate with Republican committees; send into the election districts your best women speakers, circulate addresses and documents throughout every school district, persuade fathers, brothers, husbands, and sons to work and vote for Grant and Wilson; offer your own vote, as in many election districts women's votes have already been received and counted; in every possible way throw the whole weight of your influence on the side of the Republican party. By persistent, united action for *one* party during this Presidential canvass, the women suffragists of the nation will make themselves felt as a power by *both*.

Women speakers, do not hesitate, do not vacillate; let no party or personal consideration bias you to act against the Republican party at this momentous crisis. Remember we owe to it a debt of gratitude that it has made for us this opportunity, that it has thus launched our cause into the political arena, where it must go on and on till justice and equality to woman shall at last triumph in a true Republic; "a government of the people, for the people, by the people."

On behalf of the National Women's Suffrage Association.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY, President.
MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE,
Chair. Ex. Com.

ROCHESTER, July 19, 1872.

[From the New York Tribune, July 19, 1872.]

Charitable Judgments.

In Washington is printed the NEW NATIONAL ERA, which is edited by Mr. Frederick Douglass. This newspaper is the devoted friend and supporter of the President, and is uncommonly acrid in its opposition to Mr. Greeley. Its warfare is waged in the paste-pot and scissors style; and it proves that Mr. Greeley never was an anti-slavery man by showing from his own words that he never was anything else. This sort of thing is so easy to do that we wonder Mr. Douglass does not leave it to the third and fourth-rate clerks in the departments. All that is needed to carry on such work with great spirit is an old file of newspapers, the tailor's tool aforesaid, and a little boiled flour. It happens, however, to be a style of controversy, which, in the present peculiar state of public affairs, can be maintained by one side as well as another. If the Grant men are greedy for political reminiscences, they can be easily accommodated. Perhaps Mr. F. Douglass, who is so learned generally in the history of conversions, remembers the time when his political opinions were somewhat different from what they now are; when, like his old friend, Mr. Garrison, he thought it wicked to vote at all, and considered the Constitution of the United States to be "a covenant with Death, and an agreement with Hell." We observe that the NEW NATIONAL ERA quotes as authoritative the opinions of Gen. Benjamin F. Butler. How about Gen. Butler's record? Suppose he were nominated for the Presidency, would Mr. F. Douglass think it necessary to hunt up his old, bitter proslavery speeches? How about Gen. Grant? What is there about his record on the slavery question which makes him altogether lovely in the eyes of the NEW NATIONAL ERA? It is the same Gen. Grant who supported and voted for James Buchanan, and who boasted afterward of doing so; who sustained the policy of the President on the Kansas-Nebraska question; who said, early in the course of the rebellion, "I am a Democrat, and when I am convinced that the war is waged to prosecute the designs of the Abolitionists, I pledge my honor as a soldier, that I will carry my sword on the other side, and cast my lot with the people;" and who arrived at the opinion that "the contemplated reconstruction of the South upon the base of negro suffrage was an outrage upon all the principles of justice or statesmanship, and would eventually result in a war of races." Cut that out, Mr. Douglass, and send it down to North Carolina with the other elegant extracts!

The Grant faction, it cannot be truly denied, contains a pretty fair assortment of good old "Democrats," including that most important office-holder, Mr. George S. Boutwell, who, instead of attending to the business of the Treasury Department, is making electioneering speeches for his chief in North Carolina. If Butler and Boutwell and the rest can honestly acquiesce in the present sentiment of the country toward slavery, why may not all the delegates to the National Democratic Convention accept this plank of their platform and ours:

"*First:* We recognise the equality of all men before the law, and hold that it is the duty of Government in its dealings with the people to mete out equal and exact justice to all, of whatever nativity, race, color, or persuasion, religious or political."

Will it be believed that upon this plain, catholic, and satisfactory statement of opinion Mr. Fred. Douglass could make no fairer comment than this:

"Equal rights for black men is now considered by the Democratic party as negro supremacy, and, according to the chairman of the Baltimore Convention, (ex-Senator Doolittle,) the union of Liberal Republicans and Democrats is to break down this so-called supremacy."

What Mr. Doolittle did demand in his speech was "equal rights to ALL men, white or black." Well, is the NEW NATIONAL ERA opposed to that? Have white men no rights which black men are bound to respect? Doesn't Mr. D. want "equal and exact justice to all, of whatever nativity, race, color, or persuasion, religious or political?" It seems to us that when a Democratic Convention can be brought to demand this, it is quibbling without decency, and no more than an indulgence in "damnable innuendo" to assume that the convention cared only for the rights of white men. If there is no "negro supremacy," then there is no harm done; if there is such "supremacy," is Mr. F. Douglass to blame for maintaining it? If men cannot change their opinions and recant their errors, what kind of a "new National Era" are we likely to have?

The Greeley Bargain with the Tammany Democracy—Another Distinct Charge, and No Answer Possible.

A Challenge for Horace Greeley, Waldo Hutchins, and Horatio Seymour.

These men have failed to answer the charges of political arrangement or bargaining made concerning them, and repeated by this journal; and in order that the issue may the more plainly appear and they may have opportunity of denying, or admitting, or explaining the facts, as they shall prefer, we put those facts as we understand them in form, as follows:

1. That Horace Greeley agreed, in October, 1871, on his own behalf, to be a candidate for President of the United States, if Horatio Seymour and the Democratic leaders would support him; and held a correspondence on that subject; of which one letter was dated October 4, 1871. That Mr. Greeley formally recognized his agreement, and communicated the fact of the Democratic proposition to Reuben E. Fenton, who consented to give his assistance to the scheme.

2. That Horatio Seymour (who was regarded as himself a candidate) and some of the Democratic leaders subsequently agreed to give Mr. Greeley their support conditionally. That Horatio Seymour communicated with Waldo Hutchins on this subject, in reference especially to the Cincinnati Convention. That Horatio Seymour acknowledged the correspondence of himself and Hutchins, in a letter dated May 1, 1872, three days before the Cincinnati Convention was held.

3. That Waldo Hutchins responded, and became a delegate to that convention. That the fact of Democratic coalition was well understood by some of the delegates to the Cincinnati Convention; and that the expectation of this Democratic support aided, or secured, Mr. Greeley's nomination.

Now, we propose, if the points we make here are denied by any one of the persons named, to publish the testimony of the holder of the correspondence we have mentioned—which correspondence we have seen, in the handwriting of Horace Greeley and Horatio Seymour, including accounts of interviews with Horace Greeley, and Horatio Seymour, and others—such testimony showing, with the evidence of the letters and amply corroborative evidence, the mode in which Mr. Greeley and Mr. Seymour were brought together, and embracing much information of detail. We shall give Mr. Seymour and Mr. Greeley a witness of their own, who has been provided with his certificates of character by themselves, and whom they do not dare to discredit. Shall we have a response?—*Binghampton Republican, July* 10.

Mr. Boutwell's Speech.

Duty of Republicans—The Stake in this Contest.

Below we give a portion of the masterly speech of Secretary Boutwell.

When the war ended two great results were sought by the Republican party, not only by virtue of its own principles, but by its sense of duty as the representative of the country. First, it aimed to secure equal rights for all citizens of the United States, and secondly to restore the seceding States to their ancient and equal position in the Union. As far as forms of law can secure these results they are attained substantially; but public sentiment, North and South, can only accommodate itself gradually to the existing condition of things.

In the North the Democratic party is known as the reactionary party. A Democratic majority in the South, or in any State of the South, is accepted, not by Republicans only, but by Democrats as well, as a declaration that, in the district of country represented by that majority, neither immigrants nor capital will be safe. A Democratic vote is regarded as a protest against immigrants and capital from the North. On the other hand, a Republican vote and a Republican majority are accepted as pledges of security to person, property, and business.

And be not deceived by the statement that there yet lingers in the Republican party any hostility to you or to your interests. The restoration of the Union means the restoration of every right and the recognition of every duty. These thoughts bind and control the Republican party and its representative men, and especially are they in accord with the nature of General Grant. He shrinks from the exercise of power; he never seeks to enlarge his authority as a magistrate. Great in war, war is not to him a pastime, but a solemn duty through which he seeks peace. *Ense petit placidam sub libertate quietum*—the motto of my own State: "By the sword he seeks quiet peace under liberty."

If during this Administration the power of the National Government has been felt in this and in some other States, all candid men must now admit that occasion existed for its use, not merely for the protection of those assailed, but for the general peace of society. Combinations to commit wrong do not disappear with the victims first chosen, but at once the authors yield to other temptations, and, under the influence of lust, revenge, or avarice, become the terror of the community.

You may rely with confidence upon the indisposition of the President to use national power as a substitute for, or even as an aid to, local law; and you may count as well upon a sturdy resolution, in the discharge of duty, which characterized him in war, and which, finally, controls him in all the exigencies of civil administration. None more than the President will strive to make the Union what it ought to be—a General Government strong enough to maintain its own existence against all enemies, foreign or domestic; strong enough to protect its own citizens at home and abroad; States with power, full, complete, sovereign over all local affairs, members of a Union indissoluble and so attractive that no citizen shall hereafter consider whether his duty to his State or to his country is supreme.

We are advised to clasp hands across the bloody chasm made by the war. I protest against this advice. The doctrine it contains has been the curse of the country from the first, and it brought the South to the brink of ruin.

When the Constitution was formed, and even before the Constitution was formed, there was a chasm wide and deep between the free and slave States. Often our fathers shook hands as brothers and friends over this chasm, and said: "We will look into it no more; we will be to each other as though it were not." But all in vain. Their efforts failed. Your efforts will fail. All efforts will fail if there be only the purpose to clasp hands over a *bloody chasm*. Is there statesmanship, philanthropy, or wisdom in this advice?

Why this chasm, first deep, dark, portentious, and then bloody? Was not *slavery* the cause? And is not injustice the essential characteristic of slavery?

Often enough, and too often, have we clasped hands across the chasm, the chasm made by injustice; and now, after eighty years of experience, are we not bold enough to speak and to accept the words of truth?

If so, then let me say this chasm must be filled up. Produced by injustice, let it be cemented by justice, so that neither we nor our children can find line or seam to mark the ancient divisions between us.

Clasp hands across the bloody chasm is the old and dangerous advice of the Democratic party. Instead of destroying the causes of difference between us they attempt to conceal them. Instead of removing general evils, which are the fruitful source of public calamities, they shut their eyes to the evils and deny the danger. This is the old criminal conservatism of the Democratic party, and it is none the less criminal now that it is uttered in behalf of that party by a new voice.

This doctrine was embodied in Mr. Johnson's policy of reconstructing the States of the South without reference to the rights of the freedmen. It was embodied in the opposition of the entire Democratic party to the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, by which citizenship was defined and the rights of citizens were secured to all our people.

Provision is made for the perpetuation of the bloody chasm, over which all are invited to clasp hands, by the opposition of the Democratic party and its new allies to all legislation by Congress designed to secure equal justice to every citizen under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

The bloody chasm is recognized and sanctioned in the covert language of the Cincinnati resolutions, which commit to the States exclusively the business of protecting the citizen, in his political rights as a citizen of the United States, against lawlessness and crime.

And this advice from Cincinnati is tendered to the country in presence of two facts: First, that the amendments to the Constitution confer upon Congress requisite power for protective legislation in express terms; and, secondly, that national legislation is most needed in those States whose authorities are either unable or unwilling to give protection to the citizen.

Is the power of the National Government to be invoked for the protection of Dr. Houard, in Cuba, and denied to native-born and and constantly-resident citizens of the United States in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas? If so, then the bloody chasm cannot be filled.

Nor is it of any consequence that you accept the constitutional amendments because they are. These amendments were adopted, and are now supported, by a majority of your countrymen, because they are right; and if you are wise you will never trust your liberties and immunities to a party that denies their justness. Will the colored men of the country put the Government into the hands of those who deny the rightfulness of the amendments to the Constitution that recognize and secure the rights of citizens to all without regard to color or race?

Be not seduced by the idea that the Democrats are supporting a Republican for the Presidency. If their candidate could offer (what he cannot offer) a consistent life in the past as a pledge of his policy in the future, even this would be without value in presence of the fact that nearly all of his supporters are from the Democratic party.

Government is a machine. Its chief power is in the will of the party that elected it. The Democratic party, as you well know, will never legislate in aid of or for the protection of your rights under the constitutional amendments. Without legislation those amendments are powerless.

The Republican party offers you a President, Senate, House of Representatives courts, and, above all, a public opinion ready and anxious even to give you protection in all your rights, liberties, and immunities.

All this the Democratic party denies by its history, its declarations, and by the votes of its representative men.

But, do you say, "Is not their candidate sufficient for us?" I answer, he was not sufficient for himself, and he will not be sufficient for you. For the bauble of a nomination to the Presidency at the hands of his enemies he surrendered the treasures of a life. If he had not the manliness to preserve his own fame, do you expect that he will have the courage to protect your rights?

And now I turn to you, fellow-citizens, who by ancestry, education, experience, and capacity are destined to exert a large influence upon the fortunes of your State and upon the policy of the National Government, and I ask whether you will content yourselves with clasping hands over this bloody chasm, which may widen and deepen until it becomes an impassable barrier between us, or will you decree that it shall be filled up?

When Louis Kossuth was in this country a number of clergymen met him in Philadelphia, and welcomed him by a formal address. In their address they quoted the passage, "On earth peace—good will toward men." In his reply Kossuth said that in the original the meaning was "peace on earth to men of good will."

I pass by the question raised by Kossuth, and only say the declaration, as interpreted by him, is the rule in social, national, and international affairs. Where there is not good will there is not peace.

The election in North Carolina will be taken by the country as an explicit declaration upon this point by you. If you are, as a State, of the opinion that the rights set forth by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments are to be faithfully enforced and peacefully enjoyed because they are right and proper in the nature of things, then you are in accord with the Republican party; but if you believe that they are legal rights only, destitute of all moral foundation, to be avoided and overthrown whenever there is an opportunity, then you will properly sustain the Democratic party, and vote for its candidates.

I do not ask you to accept our ideas because they are entertained by a majority of the people of the country, and certainly not because they will inure to your advantage; but, in the nature of things, the moody chasm cannot be filled until a fixed majority of the South accept the doctrine not only that all men are equal before the law, but that all men by right are equal before the law.

The day looked for cannot long be postponed; in this State I trust it is near. Once the country accepted slavery. I am told, and I believe, that the thought of it is now banished from all minds, South as well as North. Why not, then, banish all injustice growing out of slavery? Is not this the purpose of North Carolina, and will she not declare her purpose on the 1st of August next? Your history bids me believe this. You first gave voice to the purpose of the colonies to proclaim independence; while under the power of slavery you recognized, in an unusual degree, the rights of the negro; under the old order of things you maintained a system of public instruction, and you yielded reluctantly to the assaults upon the Union. These things are known and the memory of them cherished by the people of the North. If bitterness once existed it has passed away. One act of justice only remains to be done—the country waits for the evidence that you heartily and cheerfully accord the full rights of citizens, under the Constitution of the United States, to all within your borders. Give this evidence and the bloody chasm is closed.

"A GREELEY RUMOR.—That Fred. Douglass is rapidly changing his complexion to suit the taste of the white-hatted man of Chappaqua. Who next? The cry is still they come."—*Chronicle.*

When Frederick Douglass shall change his complexion, rapidly or otherwise, to suit the taste of the white-hatted man of Chappaqua, or the taste of any other man, the *Chronicle* shall have due notice of a fact so important to science if not to party politics. It shall certainly not be required to depend upon Greeley rumor for the information. There is about as much danger of a change in the complexion of the editor of the *Chronicle* as in that of Frederick Douglass, though, unlike the *Chronicle*, I have not felt called upon to warn the public of the latter danger. But laying aside this by-play, please allow me to say that this Greeley rumor to which you have given currency in your columns, like most of the Greeley rumors, is groundless, and its circulation cannot in any way help the Republican cause.

Truly yours for the election of Ulysses S. Grant and Henry Wilson,

FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 18th.

Our estimable friend will pardon us for an allusion that was made only to show how utterly absurd are half the rumors that are daily finding currency through the columns of the Greeley papers. The intimation that it was "a Greeley rumor" indicated the value attached to it. Standing as he does in the category with Gerrit Smith, Garrison, Beecher, Phillips and other anti-slavery men who passed through the fire with garments untouched, we have no fears of his faltering now in the crisis of the final struggle.—*Chronicle.*

What the Ku-Klux Expect of Greeley.

A Greeley organ in Alabama, the Talladeya *News*, recently published the following brutal account of the murder of two Union soldiers while attempting to arrest a man who had been indicted for Ku-Kluxing: "Last Sunday two Yankee boys in blue visited the house of Mr. Maroney in Shelby county and near the county line of Shelby and Bibb, not far from the little village known as Six Mile, for the purpose of arresting him under a bill found by the Grand Jury of the United States Court, recently in session in Montgomery. Mr. Maroney was implicated in the Coosa county affair. Under this true bill found by the Grand Jury these brave soldiers of the best Government the world ever saw went with handcuffs for Mr. Maroney. He welcomed them with hospitable hands to inhospitable graves—he poured lead into one, and cold steel into the other, whereupon both of these gallant soldiers gave up the ghost, and Mr. Maroney is still as free as the air which he inhales. We gather these facts from a reliable gentleman just returned from Shelby county. We regret and condemn this occurrence, and call upon our people to remain quiet—the old white hat will make all things right.

The Unjust Judges.

It has been among the sharp "dodges" of the Fenton-Greeley faction to take up the cry of "Reform," and turn it to their own dishonest purposes. They opposed Reform when we were trying to accomplish it. Even now they are in league with that very Tammany gang which we have labored for years past to destroy. Yesterday, a great flag was suspended in the City Hall Park, with this inscription upon it: "*Tammany responds to the nomination of the Baltimore Convention.*" By orders of the "Sachems," a hundred guns were also fired as a Tammany salute to Greeley. In the *Tribune* there appeared a defense of Sheriff Brennan, who is daily defrauding the city, as we have conclusively proved; and a boast that the "Blossom Club" (Tweed's) anxiously awaited the nomination of Greeley. Here are evidences enough for one day that the Greeley men are identical with the Tammany gang—that they are working hand in hand—and, no doubt, it is considered by the combined forces an exceedingly "smart" thing to take the Reform weapon out of the hands of Reformers and turn it against them.—*N. Y. Times.*

Discovering the Discoverer.

The Herald's Livingstone Expedition—Letters from Stanley—The Doctor's Own Story.

Yesterday's (Monday's) New York *Herald* contained six columns of matter devoted to the *Herald's* search after Livingstone. The first two columns are merely expansions of that portion of Stanley's narrative already given, with the details of the fight, the bombast about the American flag being left out. Such names as Malagarizi, Ruga Ruga, and Nzogera, strongly suggestive of Malaga raisins, ruta baga, and nogoheresir, are profusely scattered through the narrative. Following is a condensation of Livingstone's narrative as given by Stanley; there is a good deal of *Herald* spread-eagle and self-gratulation which for the reader's sake, is omitted.

DR. LIVINGSTONE'S OWN STORY TOLD TO STANLEY.

Dr. Livingstone's expedition left Zanzibar in March, 1866. On the 7th of April he left the seacoast with an expedition consisting of thirty men. The expedition traveled up the left bank of the Rovuma river, a route teeming with difficulties. The Doctor having great trouble with his Sepoys, sent them back to the seacoast. After suffering considerable from hunger during the transit of a wide extent of unoccupied country after leaving the Rovuma river, the Doctor and his party arrived in the country of a Mhiyow chief on the 18th of July, 1866. Desertion of faithless men, in the meanwhile, had greatly thinned his party. Early in August, 1866, Dr. Livingstone and what remained of his expedition, arrived at Mponda's, a chief of a tribe of Wahiyow, living near the Nyassa Lake.

From Mponda's the Doctor proceeded to the heel of the Nyassa, to the village of a Babisa chief. When he turned his face westward the Johanna escort heartlessly deserted him. Hence the fabrication of the Livingstone murder tale to hide the fact of the desertion and to obtain their wages. Livingstone's party was very small now. He was obliged to seek aid from the natives. He engaged them as carriers, and as they had never been tampered with or betrayed by the slave traders he managed exceedingly well. From this country, which he left in the beginning of December, 1866, he entered on a northern course and traversed the country of the Babisa, Bobemba, Banlungu, Barungu, besides the country of Londa, where lives the famous King Cazembe, who received him kindly and showed every disposition to assist him.

From the beginning of 1867 to the middle of March, 1869, he says he was mostly engaged in correcting the errors of Portuguese travelers.

These tedious travels have established, first, that the Chambezi is a totally distinct river from the Portuguese Zambezi; second, that the Chambezi, starting from about latitude 11 south, is none other than the headquarters of the Nile itself, thus giving the wonderful river a length of over 2,000 miles of direct latitude. By this map the southern part of the Tanganyika resembles the southern part of Italy in configuration. The extremity of the Tanganyika south reaches to 8 deg. 42 sec. south latitude, thus giving the lake a length of 323 geographical miles.

From the Tanganyika he crossed Maremgus and came in sight of Lake Moero. Tracing this lake, which is about sixty miles in length, to its southern extremity, he found a river entering it from that direction. Following the Luapula north, as this river was called, he found it issued from the great Lake of Bangweolo, which is as large in superficial area as the Tanganyika. The most important feeder of this lake is the Chambesi.

He returned to Ujiji, and, after resting, then he thought of exploring the head of the Tanganyika and ascertaining whether this lake had any connection, or whether the river Rusizi was an influent or an affluent; but the avarice of the Wajiji's, which would have deprived him of most of his cloth, prevented him. At the end of June, 1869, he set off by way of Ugubha for his last series of explorations. Fifteen days' march brought him to Manyema, a virgin country, but lately known to Arabs even. On the threshold of great discoveries he was laid up six months from ulcers in the feet. When he recovered he set off northerly, and came to a broad lacustine river called Lualaba, which flowed northward, westward, and in some places southward in a most confusing way. The river was from one to three miles broad. Following it northerly he discovered Lake Kamolondo, in latitude six degrees thirty minutes south. He traced the river southward to Lake Moero, where he saw it issue out of this lake through an enormous and deep chasm in the mountains. Satisfied that this Lualaba was the Chambesi which entered Bangweolo, or the Luapula which entered Moero, he retraced his steps northward to Lake Kamolendo. He came to a river flowing from the west called the Locki, or Lomami, which issued from a large lake called Chebungo, situated to the south-southwest from Kamolondo. To this Lake Chebungo Dr. Livingstone gave the name Lake Lincoln, after President Abraham Lincoln. Still working his way north, bit by bit, against several and varied difficulties, along the Lualaba's crooked course as far as latitude four south, he heard of another large lake situated to the north, in the same central line of drainage as the four other lakes; but here he was compelled to turn back to Ujiji. Against this compulsion his iron will and indomitable energy fought in vain; his men had mutinied and absolutely refused to budge a step, and to Ujiji he was obliged to return, a baffled, sick and weary and destitute man.

TWO PROBLEMS REMAINING TO BE SOLVED.

According to Livingstone two things yet remain before the Nile sources can be said to be discovered. First, he has heard of the existence of four fountains, two of which give birth to a river flowing north, which is the Lualaba, and two to a river flowing south into inner Ethiopia, which is the Zambezi, thus verifying the statement which the Secretary of the Goddess Minerva at Sais made to Herodotus over two thousand years ago. He has heard of them repeatedly, and has been several times with a fortnight's march from them, but something always interposed to prevent him from going to see them. These fountains require to be seen. Second, to trace the Lualaba from where he was obliged to leave off to where it debouches into some other waters. He has followed this river from eleven degrees south to four degrees north—that is, through seven degrees of latitude or four hundred and twenty geographical miles. It only wanted one hundred and eighty miles more—this is the length of the undiscovered link—and the Nile, which had baffled oracles and sages, kings and emperors, had been revealed throughout its length.

Belmont's Successor.

BALTIMORE, July 10.—At a meeting of the National Democratic (?) Committee this afternoon, all the members being present except from the States of Delaware and Florida, the Hon. Augustus Schell, of New York, was elected permanent chairman, and the Hon. F. O. Prince, of Massachusetts, was re-elected permanent secretary and treasurer. The following gentlemen were elected members of the Executive Committee: Theodore F. Randolph, New Jersey; Cyrus H. McCormick, of Illinois; Wm. A. Moore, of Michigan; Isaac E. Eaton, of Kansas; Frederick O. Prince, of Massachusetts; John G. Thompson, of Ohio; James P. Barr, of Pennsylvania; Wm. H. Barnum, of Connecticut; M. W. Ransom, of North Carolina; General W. T. Bate, of Tennessee. The chairman of the National Executive Committee was made a member *ex-officio*. The resident committee at Washington are Messrs. S. J. Randall, Pennsylvania; W. W. Corcoran, Washington; Allen G. Thurman, Ohio; M. Brooks, New York, and Montgomery Blair, Maryland.

COMMUNICATIONS.

[THE NEW NATIONAL ERA does not hold itself responsible for views expressed by correspondents. Well written and interesting communications will be gladly received.]

Letter from Colorado.

DENVER, July 11, 1872.

To the Editor of the New National Era:

Now that Horace Greeley is selected as the candidate of the Democratic party for President of the United States and put squarely into the field against Gen. Grant, and as this will be the first Presidential election which the colored citizens have been called upon to take part in, and as the Hon. Cassius M. Clay has been giving, in a long letter, his advice to the negroes of Kentucky, urging them to vote for Greeley and Brown instead of Grant and Wilson, and as he (Mr. C.) has virtually thrown down the gauntlet to Frederick Douglass, of whom he calls "a half-white man, denouncing Greeley and Brown as pirates." Now, in view of the foregoing, we would propose, in order to elicit the mature judgment of the colored citizens at the polls next November, that the Hon. Cassius M. Clay and Frederick Douglass be requested to *debate* the relative merits of the Presidential candidates before the colored citizens assembled at such times and places as shall be agreed upon, with such prominent persons present as will insure equal protection to both. In making this fair and honorable proposition, we confidently believe that we reflect the sentiments of the colored people of the nation.

We would further suggest that in the proposed joint discussion the following prominent, well-known gentlemen be chosen as moderators to preside: Alex. H. Stephens, John C. Breckinridge, and Wade Hampton on the part of Mr. Clay; and Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Gerrit Smith, and Wendell Phillips on the part of Frederick Douglass, and that their speeches be published so as to be read by the entire colored people of the Republic.

Yours, for free and fair discussion,

H. O. WAGONER,
and many others.

BOWERS' HILL, VA., July 11, 1872.

To the Editor of the New National Era.

The colored citizens of this place celebrated the 96th anniversary of American Independence with much spirit. We assembled at Bowers' Hill about 10 o'clock of that day, with Mr. John C. Burrell, President, and Moses R. Goodman, Chief Marshal, and listened to an address by Rev. Eli Hall, who spoke especially with reference to the Philadelphia Convention, claiming that it was based upon the idea of the equality of all men, that it was the first convention in which colored men participated in the nomination of President and Vice President. The speaker did not forget to bear unequivocal testimony in favor of the election of Ulysses S. Grant and Henry Wilson, and he also spoke his good word for J. H. Platt, the candidate for Congress of the 2d District of Virginia.

J. N. PARKER.

A Bitter Assault on Greeleyism.

Judge Linton Stephens delivered a long and very bitter speech against the adoption of Greeley as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, at Atlanta, Ga., on Thursday evening. We quote this paragraph to show its general tenor:

"Why, I am told, if the Democratic party elects Greeley, he will be good to us. Give us something! What is he going to give us? Give us any principles? Where is the principle he is going to give? He has not even said that he is going to give us anything; but the hope is that he is going to give some of us who are willing to take it a share of the plunder. Was there ever a more proper application of the motto, 'Fear the Greeks, when they are bringing gifts?' Fear the Radicals when they are bringing gifts; and I tell you that radicals will never give you any gifts, only to persuade you away from your principles. Greeley wants you to swap your principles for a few pitiful little offices for some people; and I don't know whether some people will ever get the offices or not; and I would not care.

"Talk to me about abiding the Baltimore Convention! I will abide by it in all questions of policy, but I will not abide by that convention, nor any other convention, that bids me to depart from principle; and I want to know if these gentlemen who say stand by the Baltimore Convention whatever they do, will stand by it if they adopt the Philadelphia platform and nominate Grant? The Cincinnati platform is no better in principle than the Philadelphia platform.

"I will go for the maintenance of Democratic principles, and if I can't get a man that goes for all, I will take the one that goes for some one of the vital principles of Democracy. I will take no subordinate rights, but absolute State rights. The way to win is to hoist your colors. I don't mean any new departurists; I don't mean any Radicalized colors; but the true Democratic State rights colors, that hold reconstruction and all its triumphs to be revolutionary, unconstitutional, null, and void. We may not succeed in electing a President in this campaign, but we can put the party on this sort of a platform, and give it manly standard-bearers, who are in position to carry its colors. We may not be in condition to carry the next election; but, at all events, it will give us hope."

Senator Sumner's Position.

The Washington correspondent of the *Daily Advertiser* says that ex-Senator James A. Shields, of Missouri, has been trying to persuade Mr. Sumner to adopt the course which leading Liberals have urged upon him, namely, to speak upon issues of the hour in Boston, and then go through the West and South. After hearing various arguments which Shields presented, Mr. Sumner replied that, while he had strong sympathy with the Greeley movement, there was one thing which caused him to hesitate, and that was the probable treatment of his colored wards by the Democracy. For these he had nothing to hope at the hands of that party, and for himself he had no intention of deserting them. He could not see his way clear to co-operate actively with the party that would never accept the principles of his civil rights bill. Last winter, when he, with some of his associates, were battling the Administration, and his civil rights bill was pending, he went over to the Democratic side of the Senate Chamber and appealed to them there to vote with him so as to give him a chance to go with the new movement so that he could support it consistently, feeling that the rights of the colored race would be safe with the new party. But in spite of his appeals and his reasons no one of the Democratic Senators would vote with him. Now his only difficulty in joining actively in the effort to elect Greeley was the refusal of his Democratic friends to give him the least assurance that the rights of the colored men would be respected. Shields in reply argued that these Senators belonged to the dead past and did not represent the Democracy of the present, but Mr. Sumner ended as he began, by reasserting his doubt whether he could depend upon the new party to do justice to the negro.

Hon. Henry Lott.

The name of the Republican nominee for the "short term" in the Fourth Congressional District is, of itself, a guarantee for his election. What is meant by the "short term" is the unexpired term of the present Congress, made vacant by the death, some time since, of Mr. McCleery. The unexpired term is not a mere empty honor, as some suppose, but amounts to a good round winter's session of three months, from the first of next December to March 4, 1873, when the Congress to be elected this fall comes into power. On that occasion the gentleman elected in the same district with Mr. Lott for the "long term" will take the seat and occupy it for two years, or until March 4, 1875.

Mr. Lott was born in the State of Ohio, in 1833, and is consequently thirty-nine years of age, although he appears to be at least ten years younger than he is. Like almost all our prominent colored leaders, he is a self-made man. Born of poor and humble parents, the fates were against him, and all he is he owes to his own untiring energy, which never gave way before the frequent blasts of adversity that would have swept down weaker men. Doomed to weary toil throughout his youth in order to sustain himself and the family, no opportunity to obtain an education presented itself to his hopes. But with a determination to make his way in the world, which extorted the admiration of all who knew him, he devoted his days to labor and his nights to study, often burning the midnight oil when he should have been resting for his next day's toil.

In this way he educated himself. When he became of age he resolved to seek out in the South the circumscribed future that was then allotted to a colored man, and landed in Louisiana in the year 1854. The loftiest position in life to which a man of Mr. Lott's complexion could aspire in the dark days of slavery was to be a barber. That was the zenith of all the glory that the world opened to him, the *ultima thule* of his attainable aspirations. Mr. Lott, accordingly, became a good and successful barber, and often poured wisdom into the ears of his customers as he shaved their chins. Locating at Alexandria, in Rapides parish, he industriously followed this business, with short intermissions, up to the era of reconstruction.

Appointed a commissioner of election at the time delegates to the Constitutional Convention were chosen in 1867, Mr. Lott then began public life as an ardent and leading Republican. On the 17th of