

From the Independent. Degraded into Liberty.

A southern gentleman en route for Texas, brought to New York eight slaves to be shipped hence by one of our ocean going steamers. The birds of the air informed the Abolitionists of the facts, and it was not long before a writ was served upon the whole chateaugang, and they were hauled up before Judge Paine, to show cause why they should not be doomed to Freedom.

From these bright anticipations they have been ruthlessly snatched, and plunged into freedom utterly unprepared! Are there no tears in Castle Garden? Ought not the Union Committee to spend something for a trifle of emper? Eight innocent fellow-creatures changed into fellow-beings? No kind master have they now. The tender relation is sundered. Our bereaved master and mistress must depart slaveless and alone.

But if slavery is the highway of Christianity to the Anglo-African, (and it must be unless scores of ministers have professed falsely,) if they become degraded by liberty, a poor, miserable, lazy, thievish set, hanging on the skirts of life by mere sufferance, it will be only a humane endeavor to bring these miserable creatures back to their lost bliss. Could not something be done to open their eyes to the sin of liberty and the blessings of slavery? Has the South no friends in New York? Are there no teachers who will visit these poor heathen and reason the case with them; and persuade them to reject the indignity which Judge Paine has offered them, to shake Castle Garden with delight, by walking back into slavery again?

Only one woman can be found faithful in this emergency. Their former mistress alone has appealed to their conscience, and urged them to return to her! Where were the teachers, the chaplains, the converts, the lawyers, that a little time ago echoed the "Press with tentacles of slavery?" His watchmen are blind; they are all ignorant; they are all dumb dogs; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber.

In reply to Mrs. Lemmon's appeal, the deluded slave woman drew herself up, and pressing her child to her breast, said "I had rather be free!" What! not value the radiant mercies of slavery more than that? The creature is crazy. Slaves in their senses are always contented. They are mere pigs. The Uncle Toms of Virginia do nothing but look after the children, or sit in smoky nooks and smoke their stunted pipes. The Aunt Phillises are always fat, rattling, chuckling, bursting with laughter. Nobody is happy but slaves. The poor masters have all the care and burden, slaves all the glee and leisure.

But aside from these personal considerations, there is a grave danger impending, when our eminent judges do not scruple to promulgate the most infidel sentiments. For does not the Bible teach that Africans are to be cursed with perpetual bondage for Ham's sake? Here is a "Higher Law" which the judge artfully tripped over without even an allusion. He had much to say about laws of nature. But this great law which he was about to trample on was very minutely alluded to. The Bible says, Ham's posterity are to be slaves forever; Judge Paine steps in and sets right of them free! This is rebellion or worse. It is burglary on the Higher Law. Judge Paine has come out against that revolting curse on Ham which ministers and laymen have so long and often cursed over again in justification of slavery. Are we to understand, then, that Ham's curse is to bind the slaves rightfully in the South; but that northern courts can reverse it, and let men who are doomed as a divine punishment to perpetual bondage, go forth into unrestrained liberty? Here's work right in our court rooms, and among our judges, that demands instant attention. If those whom it concerns do not look sharply after their Ham's curse, our northern courts will use it up before they are aware of it! It is in vain to point us to the color of some of these eight slaves, and to say that the blood of Shem has exhaled a murch on the blood of Ham.

That's amalgamation. We hope that is not to be pleaded as favorable to the case. But we do not know what will not be pleaded in these wild and unquiet times. For our own part, we wish it distinctly understood that we wash our hands of this business. It is a dreadful state of things here in New York, where we feed upon Cotton, and have our very living in the smiles and favor of the South, to be hurrying their feelings by talking so much about liberty, and all that. A few more slaves set free, and the South will get angry again; and then New York will be in a world of trouble, and another call will call together another Castle Garden full of anxious merchants all full of love to the South; and we shall have more sermons, and more newspaper articles; and nobody can tell what will happen the next time.

In part the South is at fault. It has sent north the wrong kind of negroes. Those who have run away, or been judicially sentenced to freedom, or been bought, all these

have forced liberty. Now won't the South send some of another sort—some of those model slaves that love bondage, and wouldn't take liberty if they could get it? With a few specimen copies of such, we believe that we could do southern institutions great good in the North.

From the Nat. A. S. Standard. Who Killed Cock Robin?

Why was General Scott defeated? This is a question that one hears mooted everywhere in conversation and discussed in all sorts of newspapers. The problem is solved in different ways by different observers, according to the point of view from which they look at it. Some think that the country was afraid of trusting its integrity to one who was not swifter than Telegraphic lightning in accepting the Compromise. Other some think it was because of his very Compromising celerity that he lost the support of the only part of the country where he had any strength. Some affirm that it was putting his trust in Seward that has brought his calamity upon him; while other some again aver that Sewardism was no element in the business, but the Democrats were tired of Galphism, and Bonapartism, and Collingism, and Lawism, and Lobosism, and were determined on making a clean sweep of the whole political board.—These latter are the nearest right. Not that we would accuse the Democrats of any insuperable antipathy to any of these *isms* in the abstract; but they would, naturally, prefer that they should qualify proper nouns of the Democratic declension. Jealousy of public plunder in the wrong hands had, no doubt, a large share in the catastrophe of the bungling party now accidentally in power. The leaves and the fishes, though but five of the one and two (and they small) of the other, were unquestionably guilty of a share of this result, but not of the whole—for what are they among so many?

The cause of the Whig disappointment must be looked for behind the mere thirst for "spoils." But a small portion of the hundred of thousands of voters expected that the change would be of any pecuniary advantage to themselves. The great multitudes of men whose votes decide the issue of these political battles are swayed by motives not strictly personal.—It is on this element—this *tertium quid*—that politicians out of power must depend for help that is to bring them in, and those in power for the support that is to keep them where they are. It was on this swaying mass of mind that both parties relied for success. It was this that elected Harrison and defeated Clay, which chose Taylor and rejected Scott. The mischief was that General Scott, in his eagerness, and his friends, in their cowardice, did not manage to control it for their purpose. And why was this so? Because they forgot that for a minority candidate (as General Scott was, notwithstanding the accidental supremacy of the Whigs, just now), could become a majority one only by the conflict of Ideas. In the hope of securing Slaveholding help, they yielded the only point about which an issue could be made.—They made themselves as Democrats without their names, their watchword or their discipline, and thus suffered the battle to go by default.—They virtually abandoned the whole game in hope that the holders would hand them over the stakes, because they had thrown up their cards.

Now we apprehend that Mr. Seward's plan of the campaign was very different from this. He did not expect General Scott to be saluted Conqueror and decreed the triumph in virtue of having surrendered at discretion and submitted, nay, hastened, to pass under the yoke. He expected as hard fighting as General Scott himself had to pass through before he rode triumphantly into the Great Square of Mexico. He did not expect his hero to be carried to the skies "on flowery beds of ease." But he wished to establish a basis of operations at Baltimore by means of which he might demolish the strongholds of the enemy and finally succeed. This basis of operations we apprehend to have been the refusal of the Baltimore Convention to accept the Compromise as part of the platform. This would have made a tangible and visible distinction between the Whigs and the Democrats and would have afforded an excellent "cry" to rally the North and West, where all the hopes of the Whig-Scott party lay. Had he succeeded in doing this, he could have gone into the campaign with a show of principles and a pretence, at least, of spirit, and there would have been a genuine fight about something tangible. But having been out-general by the Slaveholders and deserted by the treacherous doughfaces of Massachusetts, in hopes of buying favors for Webster, and in hopes of the States, there was nothing left to fight about, and there was nothing to choose between except a Big General, on the one hand, and a Little one, on the other.

Mr. Seward is said to be a great political Manager, and we dare say he is. We do not think it fair to judge of his abilities in this by this present failure. The odds against which he had to contend were tremendous, and his men were raw recruits or undisciplined volunteers, mostly, and he could not establish his basis of operations. The enemy broke it broke it up and left him nothing but an aimless, guerrilla kind of warfare, which could hardly fail to end in nothing. Seeing this, he wisely withdrew from all direction of the campaign, and, no doubt, saw the end from the beginning. Could he have restrained the pro-slavery proclivity of his chief, could he have procured for him an independent nomination when he saw, as he must have done long before the Convention met, what the result must be, and have run him independently of the Convention, if it insisted on the Compromise Platform, as an Anti-Compromise candidate, he would have produced a wholesome storm of agitation, on the wings of which General Scott might possibly have ridden into power, or, at any rate, have had a creditable defeat. But it is only by repeated

failures and disappointments that men learn wisdom, politically as well as personally. Perhaps it needed this additional lesson to teach Northern politicians that their only hope, against Southern slaveholders and their "natural allies," the greedy Democracy of the North, is in a spirit of resolute resistance to their joint iniquities and not in a contest of subservency with the one, to the other.

Now whoever it was or was not, that killed Cock Robin, there is this moral to be deduced from his fate: That the same doom will await any one who seeks the same end by the same means. It may be that the decent and respectable portion of the nation is a match for the profligate and baser sort, but it will never triumph over them by rolling in the same kennel vying with them in their adaptation to dirt. The trial has never yet been fairly made. Those that pretended to "all the decency," and perhaps had more of a natural leaning that way, have never been able to attain to the faith that can alone carry them on to glory. They always had a secret misgiving that the Devil was going to be more than a match for God, at this particular election. And they have had, once or twice, a kind of delusive success which has thickened their judicial blindness. Possibly, such a hopeless overthrow as that they have received was necessary to open their eyes to their true condition. Now, there are elements in the nation which may go to the building up of a New Party, mighty to the pulling down of the present strongholds of political iniquity. An able and courageous man is needed to combine these elements into a homogeneous whole. The time is favorable. The hour is at hand. But where is the Man?—n. e.

A Chance for the Charitable.

Rev. J. W. Higginson, in a call for funds to set a family of slaves at liberty, gives the following touching story. We find it in the Worcester (Mass.) Spy:

About thirty years since, a certain man emigrated from a town in this State to Augusta, Georgia. Like many New England men, he soon became a slaveholder; like many he took for his mistress one of his slaves. He built a house for her, and visited her frequently. She was an intelligent woman, was well acquainted with his business affairs, and had a good deal of influence over him.

They had four children—three daughters and a son. He supported them, and treated them as his children; the son was educated for a gunsmith, and became quite skillful. These facts were generally known in the community where they lived, and these statements, in fact, came from that quarter. It was commonly supposed, however, by those who knew the father, that he had made a will emancipating his children and their mother, and leaving his property to them. The family declared that he intended coming North very soon, to live here with them. But he died suddenly, (like St. Clair in Uncle Tom.) No will was found.

So far, it is no uncommon series of events, under the peculiar institution. But now comes the startling point. The children and their mother became, of course, the property of the heirs of the father—four distant relatives, residing in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. The Southern neighbors were touched by the circumstances of the case, and represented them to the Northern heirs! The children were at their mercy. What said those heirs? They sold the mother and children separately, at auction, and divided the proceeds.

Let me, however, be just to them. Three of the heirs once signed a paper liberating the family. The fourth, who held his share in right of his wife, promised, by his wife's death bed, to sign the paper. His wife died, and he then refused. The other heirs yielded, made no attempt to redeem the family, and took their share of the money.

I have seen that man whose avarice thus sentenced to bondage and wretchedness the children of the individual whose property fell thus strangely into his hands. He bore the outward aspect of a man, but God had written a terrible retribution upon his shameful lips and down-cast eye. I visited him eighteen months ago, in company with that slave mother, and I never saw anything more pathetic than the way that base man cowered before the just indignation of that wronged woman. It seemed the foreshadowing of some terrible Day of Judgment, when the black race shall rise up before the Anglo-Saxon, and point the finger of eternal reproach, and say, "Thou art the man!"

Fortunately for this wretched family, they were all bought at auction by one benevolent man; he bought them in hopes that the heirs might redeem them; or rather, he bought the woman; another man paid \$1,250 for the son. Since then, by the noble efforts of the mother and daughters, (aided by one heir, who advanced \$500.) the son has been liberated, and is now in California. But that mother and those daughters are still in slavery.

An effort is at last being made for the release of these women. Of the four heirs, one is poor, and can pay nothing; another (the guiltiest) refuses to do anything; another promises \$200; the fourth died some years since, leaving \$100 in the hands of a trustee, who is now poor, and utterly unable to pay it—though it may possibly be recovered from a bondsman. The family have been allowed by their masters to accumulate \$550 towards their freedom. And there has been subscribed in the neighborhood where the father of these children originated, about \$260. This leaves \$290 to be raised in addition, before the whole sum of \$1,400 can be paid; unless (which is improbable) the above bequest be recovered.

The Vermont Legislature has passed a stringent Maine Law to be submitted to the people in March, and if approved, to go into operation in May next.

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

SALEM, OHIO, DECEMBER 4, 1852. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE meets December 5th.

Free Soil—Disunion.

The Presidential struggle is over. The result is as we anticipated;—the Democratic Party victorious, Whiggery vanquished ingloriously. To the friends of Freedom this victory and defeat are matters of little regard. Both Parties richly merited defeat, and the election of either would have answered alike the purposes of the Slave Power.

The Free Democratic Party, though its vote is considerably smaller than that of '48, has made great advancement. The vote given upon the Buffalo Platform, with Martin Van Buren as the leading candidate, can not be taken as an indication of the Anti-Slavery strength of the party four years ago, as the position then occupied was decidedly low, and the Anti-Slavery character of the candidate lower still.—The Platform of the Free Democratic Party of '52 is higher; and its candidates men who had distinguished themselves by their advocacy of freedom, instead of having as was the case with Martin Van Buren, professed to love liberty only when the Slave power refused longer to use him as the mean instrument of its usurpations.

Those who at the late election, voted the Free Democratic ticket did so because of Anti-Slavery sentiment and feeling. The case was widely different four years ago, when the only evidence given of such principle by a large portion of those who voted with the Free Soil Party, was in the act of voting;—an act, under the circumstances, that spoke shamefully little in its favor. A majority probably of the Three Hundred Thousand who went for Free Soil in '48, were in sentiment and feeling below the position of the Buffalo Resolutions; but in '52 we believe the masses of the Free Democracy are above that of the Pittsburgh Convention. If this view be correct, there must have been great progress in the party, as the moral tone of the latter, is altogether higher than that of the former.

This much we concede cheerfully to the Free Democratic Party. It has in it much of the true spirit of reform—many good and earnest abolitionists, and in its way doing efficient service to the cause of freedom. Yet there is a higher and holier position than that in which it stands, a truer philosophy of reform than that by which its policy is directed. The American and Western Anti-Slavery Societies, if we mistake not, occupy that position and are governed in their operations by that philosophy.

We know that many voting Abolitionists censure those who consider it their duty to stay away from the polls. Considerable effort was put forth in this region, and probably elsewhere, —honestly, we have no doubt—to induce Disunionists to vote for Hale and Julian. With what success these efforts have met, we are not able to say;—though it is probable that but few of those who have been actively engaged in promulgating the distinctive features of our movement, will be found to have so far departed from the course that fidelity to their principles required, as to become willing partners in a Government which is the shield and support of Slavery.

We do not hope to be able to satisfy those who have no higher ideas of Anti-Slavery progress, than is seen in the scramble of politicians for office, of the correctness, or efficiency of our cause; but before those whose hearts are imbued with the spirit of Freedom, and who yet think we violate an important duty in standing aloof from the Free Democratic movement,—we are willing to vindicate our conduct and justify our position.

All agree that the public sentiment of the nation must be changed—that the conscience of the masses must be reached and aroused to activity, before the cause of Freedom can be essentially advanced, politically or otherwise.—To get hold upon the consciences and hearts of the people we must occupy a true moral position, and be governed by the highest expediency. In this true moral consistency we maintain the Free Democracy are wanting, and that ours is the only consistent course.

We know our claim to true consistency and higher principle, is disputed by many of our Free Democratic friends. We do not complain of their censures, for we have felt it our duty to condemn, and censure them. But how stands the case? They asked us to join them upon the Buffalo Platform, and that too, many of them, on the ground that they were in advance of us! Yet the Buffalo resolutions were not opposed to Slavery in the States, but merely to Slavery extension, and the usurpation of the Slave power. They admitted—nay declared—that the Party adopting them believed Slavery to be constitutional in the States, and disclaimed all disposition to interfere with the inhuman system where it existed by state law. Yet with a platform so bad as this, and a candidate still worse, they called upon us to join them, and seemed to think us behind the age almost when we refused them, and denounced their position! We earnestly pursued our course however, despite their protestations and prayers, condemning all compromise with Slavery, all union with Slaveholders.

In the Pittsburgh Convention, a higher Platform of principles was erected. The party hesitated not to speak out directly in condemnation of Slavery. It declared Slavery to be a "Sin against God, and a crime against man which no law or usage can make right—that liberty is the right of all men, a right of which none can be deprived by valid legislation, except for crime." The party refused to pledge itself—directly at least—that it would do nothing against the existence of Slavery in the States, and in every respect took higher grounds than the Convention of '48. Its candidates

were men whose principles had been tried, and whose adherence to them in future, no one doubted. And again, with better candidates and a higher platform, they called upon us to join them, declaring that whatever might have been true of the party four years ago, they had now attained a position to which we could have no reasonable objection, so little did it differ from our own.

By raising their platform then, they brought it nearer to the level of ours! How could this be, if they before occupied a higher position? We stand where we did four years ago, they have progressed and have come nearer to us.—They must then have been behind us in '48,—must be behind us yet, or at least, not so far in advance of us as they then were in the rear.

But the position of the Free Democracy cannot be in advance of ours, because it is lower than many of the most enlightened members of the party approve, and the objections which such make to it, are so far as they go, precisely the same as are made by us. The Pittsburgh Resolutions declare that the "whole question of Slavery and the extradition of Fugitive slaves, should be left to the States"; That Slavery is "Sectional" while freedom is "National." No more Slave States, no Slave territory—no nationalized Slavery, and no national legislation for the extradition of Fugitive Slaves in their language. Why such declarations? Is Slavery less an outrage, against man and a sin against God, by being confined to the States? Is the accused system the less horrible for being "sectional"? No more Slave States! why not say, no slave States. Is slavery more endurable where "two hundred years of legislation have sanctioned and almost sanctified it"? No national legislation for sending men into bondage! Is it worse for the nation to hunt men for slavery, than to make it the duty of the States to lend themselves to such infamy?

Why, we ask, did not the Pittsburgh convention adopt the resolutions contained in the minority report presented by Gerrit Smith? This would have pledged the Party, to go against Slavery every where as against other forms of piracy and murder, to go not merely against new Slave States, but all Slave States, and against all legislation for sending men and women back into Slavery. This was the position of Gerrit Smith; this is our position, and the adoption of such sentiments would have been in accordance with the views of many of the best men in the Free Democratic Party.

In refusing to take this position, the Free Democracy stopped short of us, and we cannot go back to them, though it be true, as some of them say they have since '48, come half way to meet us. Why should we join them, when even their own highest conceptions of right are against them;—their trust and best men the least satisfied with their position?

Once more we ask why did not the Pittsburgh convention take the ground advocated by Gerrit Smith? He argued that not only the Fugitive Slave bill, but all enactments State or National, "Sectional" or general, should be held as forms of lawless piracy; that they should be all trampled upon, and that the vilest of all criminals, the slaveholder should be treated just as though no attempt had been made to sanction his iniquity by the forms of law. Did the convention deny the truth of this position, morally? Such as did so, have never been converted to anti-slavery. He who would claim for the perpetrator of the crime of enslaving and intruding a fellow man, any leniency, any countenance, any toleration, any communion, that he would not also accord to the same extent to the pirate and the murderer, needs to go to work, to learn what he has never yet been taught,—his simplest duty to his enslaved countrymen. The people assembled in the Pittsburgh convention, felt all this. Why did they not say it? We know well enough the reason. They know it. Though they agreed with Gerrit Smith as to what moral duty required, they did not agree with him, that the constitution of the United States—the platform of the nation, would sustain such principles, and action in accordance with them.

The Free Democratic Party repudiated the Fugitive Slave law, because it believed it to be unconstitutional! It opposes the admission of new Slave States, because the constitution allows such opposition. But the party refuses to go against the old slave States,—or slavery in them because it believes the constitution forbids such action.

Now we submit in candor—and we ask every voting abolitionist to answer for himself—the question, whether it is not his duty as a moral agent to labor not merely to prevent Slavery extension, but for the abolition of Slavery itself, in every way that can be morally used to put down any other form of crime and outrage.—If Slavery extension be indeed so bad, it is because of the intrinsic wickedness of slavery itself. It is the inherent enormity of the system that makes its spread a pestilence and a return to its horrors worse than death to the flying slave. We ask them, in the name of all that is consistent, how a true abolitionist can pledge himself against attacking slavery as it now exists, for the poor privilege of laboring politically against its extension?

We claim that here is the deep moral delinquency of the Free Democracy, as it was of the Free Soil Party, and here their short sighted and superficial philosophy of reform. They consent passively if not actively to the continued existence of Slavery, crushing as it does its millions of victims, over a territory larger than was ever before cursed with so terrible a form of crime; and justify themselves by the consideration that this act, gives them strength to oppose the hateful system some where else, and at some future time! And with such concessions on their lips, their actions corresponding with them, they come to us who publicly declare and act out our opposition to slavery every where and at all time without concession or compromise, and ask us to come up and join them?

We concede to the Free Democracy that they too feel opposed to slavery every where and we too feel g'dly labor for its overthrow, were it not that their hands are tied. But who tied them? None but themselves. They cling to their allegiance with a constitution which they admit prevents them from such action. So far from being an excuse, their connection with the government, voluntary as it is, but adds to their condemnation. It is bad enough to stand by inactive, and see a fellow being subjected to the worst of all outrages—the sum of all iniquities, but it is worse to go systematically to work and pledge ones self constantly to such passive encouragement of crime and outrage.

We know that Free Soilers attempt to justify themselves, by saying that in acting under the constitution they incur no responsibility—that they are not required actively to do any wicked act. We are tired of this argument if such it can be called. The government of this nation is, or ought to be a government of "the people of the United States," formed to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare. This is the only ground upon which a true man can give it his allegiance; the constitution itself opens with the declaration that the Government is to be such. Is this declaration a falsehood, or is it truth? We care not now to settle this question.—The three millions of Slaves held in this country are either a part of "the people" or they are not. This much at least is true: the individual who enters into, or would voluntarily support such a government, with a knowledge that millions of men and women exist in the heart of the nation, held as chattels by their fellows who are, to form no part of the sovereign people—to have no defense from the government and whose protection, welfare, rights and interests are to remain wholly unprotected—has he an assent who does this becomes thereby a conniver at, and a partaker in crime and outrage. It is useless to attempt a defence of such a connection. Any argument offered in defence of an alliance so wholly, is but a defence of piracy and murder.

If on the other hand the United States Government, is a Government of the whole people, requiring the protection and defence of all against wrong and outrage, what becomes of the position of the individual or party who without even a self imposed obligation to do so, refuses to act against slavery in the States? Alike in either view of the case the Free Democracy stand in a position utterly incapable of defence.

Now we believe with Gerrit Smith that no enactment whether constitutional or not—that no law whether "sectional" or "national," however clothed with legal verbiage or sanctioned by ancient usage can impose the slightest obligation upon any human being, to uphold, or sanction or countenance the enslavement of men in States or Territories, old or new; and we believe with the Free Democracy, that in the United States Constitution an attempt is made to impose upon its supporters an obligation to sustain, or at least submit to the crime of slaveholding. Of course the Constitution though it attempts it, cannot impose any such obligation as a duty, any more than any other pledge to support or tolerate piracy, makes such support or toleration a duty.

But while we believe this, we think it criminal to pledge ourselves to sanction or tolerate in state or nation lawless piracy. If the Constitution of the United States is what we and the Free Democratic Party believe it to be, to give it our allegiance, is to make this pledge. We can no more do this, than we could sustain the platform of the Whig or Democratic Party. Nor could the Free Democracy, if consistent with their own highest declarations. The Whig and Democratic Platforms pledge the parties to sustain the Fugitive Slave Law and tolerate without opposition the extension of slavery. The Constitution—the Platform of the nation, and demands of its supporters toleration without opposition, to slavery in the States. Hale and Julian are pledged to sustain this national platform, just as much as Scott and Pierce were pledged to those of their respective parties.—And there is no consistent argument, that can justify those who sustain the former candidates, without also sanctioning, in some measure, the act of voting for the latter, the difference, so far as any exists, being, not in the character of the action, but in the extent of the wrong done. The Free Democratic platform is as bad as the Constitution which allows Slavery in the States. The Whig and Democratic Platforms are worse than the Constitution, as they tolerate the system, not only in the States, but in some cases beyond their limits. Certainly the latter are more infamous, but is the former high enough for the true friends of the slave to stand upon? We think not. We believe that the "sober second thought," of many who have given their vote for Hale and Julian, will accord with our view of the matter.

But it is claimed that under the Constitution the extension of Slavery may at least be prevented, and the system itself crippled and discouraged, if not abolished—hence the Free Democracy refuse to repudiate the Constitution. The instrument furnishes them with the means of preventing evil in one direction, though it requires them to sustain the same or greater evil in another. So the party makes a compromise with Slavery. Gives one hand to slavery in Carolina, that with the other it may prevent its introduction, if it can, in New Mexico, Utah and California. Thus principle is sacrificed, and the moral influence of the party proportionately weakened. Now as no important advantage can be gained, politically even over slavery, until the conscience of the nation is more fully reached, and as an uncompromising and constant opposition to slavery, which shall repudiate as far as possible all compromise with the hateful system, is undeniably the best means of arousing this national conscience, we must be permitted to think the Free Democratic Party as much behind as in