

THE NEW REPUBLIC.

VOL. 1,

CLEVELAND, MAY 17, 1862.

NO. 5.

Success.

The word *success* is generally employed loosely, vaguely, improperly. It describes the object on which our Fellows every where are professedly intent—for which they seem to be ready to submit to almost any self-denials, and to make almost any sacrifices. For this “they compass sea and land”—welcome exhausting toil and defy dangers, however various and frightful. Those whom they reckon successful, they regard, perhaps, with envy; certainly with admiration. In the sphere of business he is, in their estimation, successful, who gets rich. His methods, whether of acquiring or expending, they do not pause to ascertain. In amassing wealth he may have inflicted deep wounds on the nature he has inherited—may have weakened or torn the bond which unites him to mankind—may have dissipated thought, chilled the affections, deranged the imagination and crippled his active powers—he may have become foolish, weak, wicked; who cares? It is enough that he has been successful!—So, where *distinction* is coveted, magnified, pursued; where in one way or another one pants and struggles to rise above his fellows. If he rises to a higher place, wears more imposing titles, wields loftier prerogatives, thousands shout his praise and pronounce him fortunate and happy. The “ways and means” which he employed, have in their thoughts a bearing slight and insignificant enough on the question of his success. He may have been in conflict with every sound principle, every generous sentiment, every lofty aim—with every thing essential, permanent and ennobling in human relations, responsibilities and prospects—may, in climbing to a high place, have sunk to a low character; no matter. He has outwitted and outrun his rivals—he has seized on the place, titles and emoluments he was eagerly and stoutly intent upon—every body talks loudly of *his success*.

And yet no such success involves self-possession—the free and effective exercise of our human powers—the development and enjoyment of the nature we have inherited. It leaves us bankrupt in every thing essential to our welfare: poor, pining, restless—the victims of wasting disappointment, bitter regret and keen remorse. The word *success* cannot be so employed without emptying it of its natural significance—without rendering it unmeaning or delusive.

Success consists in happily subserving the proper ends of our existence. This is obvious and certain. These are clearly indicated by the principles on which our nature was constructed. So far as in our aims and activity we rise to conformity to these, we accomplish something worthy of our powers, responsibilities and natural destiny.—*Beriah Green.*

Impressibility.

The men who come on the stage at one period are all found to be related to each other. Certain ideas are in the air. We are all impressionable, but some more than others, and these first express them. This explains the curious contemporaneousness of inventions and discoveries. The truth is in the air, and the most impressionable brain will announce it first, but all will announce it a few minutes later. So women, as most susceptible, are the best index of the coming hour. So the great man, that is, the man most imbued with the spirit of the time, is the impressionable man,—of a fibre irritable and delicate, like iodine to light. He feels the infinitesimal attractions. His mind is righter than others, because he yields to a current so feeble as can be felt only by a needle delicately poised.—*Emerson.*

If an angel were to tell me to believe in eternal punishment, I would not do it, for it would better become me to believe the angel a delusion, than God monstrous.—*Leigh Hunt.*

"Can Government abolish Slavery?"

Of course it can. There never has been a time at which it could not abolish it. And that wholly independent of the Smith, Spooner, or Godell, rendering of the Constitution. The government have the right—always had—to abolish the Constitution if need be, or so change it that it may not defeat the very end of government, and peril the existence of government itself. What it lacks is the will, not the way. But fortunately we are not reduced to the necessity of depending on the good will of the government in the matter. Fortunately for the cause of the slave,—fortunately for the safety of the nation—fortunately for the liberties of mankind, and the hope of the world, we are not compelled to stake the cause of human freedom, the fate of this continent on the moral power, the sense of justice or the sense of shame even, in this nation. God help the poor slave if that were all his hope. The Slave States themselves have done the work. Slavery is already abolished in the Confederate States. What the Nation for want of manhood—for want of simple common sense (which would lead them to do it from sheer policy merely,) to say nothing of humanitarian feeling, has failed to do, the South herself has done. Slavery as a lawful institution has no existence to day in the Gulf States. Talk of the rights of the States. There are no States there. There is no South Carolina in this Union, no Georgia, no Alabama. Talk of Constitutional obligations to a people who are constitutionally dead and damned. They have no legal existence whatever. They are not citizens but criminals. By their own acts they have forfeited every right of citizenship. The Constitution does not recognize them except as traitors. Talk of the Constitution forsooth, in reference to such men.—Talk of the privilege of slave holding. Why they have no right to life even. The Constitution does nothing for them except to define their crime and provide punishment. It knows nothing of them except as armed enemies of their country—traitors to the government and candidates for the halter.

Slaveholding in South Carolina under the Constitution. And pray who shall hold the slaves? If the provisions of the Constitution were carried out there would scarcely be a live white man in all her dominions except those sent there to execute justice. The Northern army and the slaves are the only men there who have any rights under the Constitution. Thank God the slave now has rights in South Carolina under the Constitution. The men whom the Constitution recognized as his masters are dead men. Dead civilly and dead physic-

ally or will be so soon as the Constitution is carried into effect. In the eye of the law they are already hanged, and the slaves are free for want of masters.

Slavery is therefore already abolished and all the government has to do is to recognize an existing fact. The laws are already passed that do the work.—What is wanted now is, not more laws but the execution of those which already exist.

So far then as the cotton States are concerned, which are unanimously treasonable, they have no legal, constitutional existence as states of this Union and to talk of state rights in their case seems to me like a strange ignoring of the changed state of things—the logic of events. And to talk of resurrecting dead men for the sake of finding the parties to a contract which never ought to have been made in the first place, so as to reinstate "the Union on its old basis" seems to me unaccountable in a journal so generally averse to red tape as the New Republic. I take it that the compromise in the Constitution in favor of slavery was made with men and not with the territory of a State; and if those men refuse to perform their part of the stipulation, spit upon the contract, and the folks who made it, it would surely be very clever to go on with them as though nothing had happened, even if they had not committed political suicide and had a legal existence which they have not.

Slavery is then already abolished in the cotton States, and there is nothing to prevent its abolition in other States except the will of the North. For the North now has the power in her own hands and if she does not do it she need not talk of constitutional difficulties as the reason for it. Let her compensate the loyal slaveholder, not because there is any justice in it between him and the slave: but because the North agreed that he might do the base thing and "honor is right even among thieves." And let her compensate the slave also, for he is the greater sufferer and has the greater claim for justice, and it was by her wicked connivance that he suffered.

Stand in good faith to the contract, base as it was, so long as you agree to do so, pay all the legitimate costs, then say it is ended.

As to the cotton States, so far as legislation is concerned slavery is already abolished. The slaves are free so far as the Constitution is concerned. They stand as equals with the whites. The business of the government is to protect them in their constitutional and natural rights. The contract being annulled by the hand of the slaveholder, and both being equal before the law, with certain unadjusted claims to settle, the government steps in to

enforce justice between man and man. What is the dictate of that justice? I speak not of constitutional justice for that would consign them to the gallows—every man of them which I hope will not be done—but natural justice. Why that each should have the avails of their own labor. The blacks have made the country what it is. Its wealth is the fruit of their own industry. It is fairly purchased by their sweat and toil. Let them have the land which they have redeemed by their industry. Let the cruel slaveholder live, not because he deserves to, but because mercy is better than sacrifice. But let him live as an honest man by his own labor and not by the labor of others. Let him go to work with only what he has earned as capital. Let the property of the South be confiscated, but to its proper owner, the slaves who earned it. And let the North saddle its own debts—debts incurred by its disregard of its own interests as well as of justice and human rights. Let each party pay its own legitimate bills, that each may see how much it costs to trample upon the laws of God which are those of Justice and Righteousness.

C. M. OVERTON.

Moral Lessons of the War.

In the present physical, mental and moral conflict of our nation, it is a very propitious occasion, for the philosopher, the philanthropist, the student of human nature and human history, to test the truth and power of those opinions, doctrines, creeds and theories of which the present age is so prolific. No matter how high our aspirations; how wide and disinterested our philanthropy; how great our erudition; how logical, comprehensive and discriminating our intellect, or original, powerful and brilliant our genius, we shall always find, in a great revolution like the present, our theories and plans severely tested and our minds softened and liberalized. In a crisis like the present we find all our fine spun theories and all our nice moralities, swept away and ourselves swept along by the mighty and irresistible current of Human Destiny. That germ of moral and intellectual power that was planted in New England two and a half centuries ago, reacting against stern necessity and Nature's antagonisms, and thus becoming the mightiest aggregation of mentality and spirituality that man ever saw or history ever recorded, now finds itself in "irrepressible conflict" for those external conditions that are favorable to its freedom and progress. It is a mighty upheaval of the superincumbent strata of rocky and fossilized, inexpansive and unprogressive material, that has hung like a millstone around the neck of our free institutions. It is the fiat of Destiny.

Nature has infinite, latent aspects and phases yet to be developed. Nations that possess the power of

self-development, must pass through various crises and stages of development, like individuals. Our nation is yet in its infancy—seems to be cutting its teeth—has got to be rather cross and can bite—"some."

All our labors, thoughts and opinions are worth something, but seldom worth as much to the world as we estimate them to be. Nature has so many departments of labor; so many laborers; so many ways and means of doing her work and so much longer time to do it in, than man can conceive or estimate, that we need not complain if she does not stop and pay particular attention to us, or adapt all our plans and conform to our conceptions, notions and feelings.

While contemplating the scene of this great and unprecedented contest between the two divisions of our Nation, we feel, as individuals, our weakness and ignorance, if not our narrowness, prejudice and intolerance. We would fain be attentive, docile, receptive scholars in this great school in which every battle-field is a page of history, written with precious blood for ink, and the sabre and bayonet for pens. Let it be borne in mind that this war is not simply and solely to subdue Southern rebellion, and maintain the power and supremacy of our government and institutions, nor to ameliorate the condition of the African slaves; but it is also to enlighten and subdue the North as well—subdue its vanity, vain glory, pride, vaunting, prejudice, false notions and impressions, and break down the partition walls between sects and parties, whether political, religious or social; and inculcate the great lesson of charity and toleration. Pride of country and partition are subdued and confounded and obliged to confess that they have not perceived all the elements of discord and disunion that have been at work in our midst to bring about the present crisis. The mass of the people had vainly hoped and believed that the perpetuity of our institutions without bloodshed, was unquestionable. Parties, creeds and platforms are lost sight of in the general resolve to save the country—to conquer or die. Men of all beliefs and opinions can meet and greet each other, and work, march, fight, bleed, suffer and die on deck, in the camp, fortress, battle-field or hospital; and forget the petty political or theological strife in which, heretofore, they were often engaged. The selfishness, narrowness and exclusiveness of the particular department to which they belonged and in which they labored, will thus inevitably, lose much of their repulsion and intensity. The selfish and heartless demagogue, finds his machinations thwarted and his forces paralyzed in this hour of the nation's peril. The political economist finds his theories out at sea without chart or compass, when such unparalleled demands are made upon the Nation's resources.

The moral reformer who seeks to elevate and purify man by words and deeds that speak "Peace on

earth and good will to men," will be enabled to learn, if he will, that a large part of the effective means, for human refinement, elevation and conversion, are very far from being of a moral, religious, or persuasive character. The anti-war party may, from this war, become impressed that human wars cannot yet be dispensed with, any more than the wars in the atmosphere; both being necessary for purification, invigoration, subordination, restoration, amelioration. The peace-maker may learn the significance of Christ's words: "I came not to send peace but a sword." The sincere non-resistant, who has hitherto opposed the use of all physical weapons, while contemplating the causes and results of this war, may find unanswerable arguments against his exclusive, moral means for the world's salvation; and that God makes use of such means to effect His purposes as circumstances require; that in the present state of human development, in which the animal nature so much predominates, it is idle to talk of employing moral power alone against the "earthly, sensual and devilish."

The physiologist, ethnologist and anthropologist will find new and impressive illustrations and demonstrations of the law of progressive human development, by means of the complex, diversified and ever varying and conflicting natures of races, peoples and individuals. All classes and conditions may learn something of their own blindness and weakness and to set a higher value upon all forms of human nature and all planes and phases of human activity.

J. H. C.

Has Congress Constitutional Power to Abolish American Slavery.

The "New Republic" seems to take the negative side of the above question. With all due respect, I think the power most clearly constitutional. Its first objection is that it has no more power over the subject now, than it had any time since the government existed. Certainly. But no doubt it has always possessed the same constitutional power, that it possesses now, to eradicate and annihilate the gigantic wrong, whenever it should find it necessary and expedient to do so. The very first constitutional power of any government, is the power and the right to defend and protect itself against any thing and every thing adverse to or incompatible with its existence, whether it be Institutions, Insurrections, or foreign foes. Without such power no Government could exist. It need not be expressed in the Constitution for the term, government, implies this power. No institution would be absolutely a government without it. But our Constitution declares that Congress shall have power to "provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States." Art. 2 Sec. 8. Again, It shall have "power to make all laws which shall be necessary

and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers." Sec. 9. Now suppose Congress, (which is virtually the United States assembled) should believe the institution of slavery to be adverse to the "general welfare," and its abolition necessary for the "common defence" has it not a clear and indisputable power to put it down? Let it be noted that Congress is to be the lawful and legitimate judge of what is necessary for "general welfare, and common defence." Whence comes this general impression that slavery is so sacredly and so indissolubly impressed upon the Constitution that that Congress cannot abolish it to save itself, to save the nation, or to save any thing? It gives no special power to the states to hold slaves or do any thing else which endangers the common weal. It does not forbid Congress to abolish Slavery any where within the Union, nor does it give it the least warrant or protection any farther than it may seem compatible with the "general welfare, and common defence" of the United States. Congress has long since decreed that the foreign slave trade was piracy, and punishable with death. If this be so, if that be piracy, then the domestic slave trade is morally piratical and deserves death just as much. The moral character of an act is the same in America as in Africa. Congress has power to interpret Slavery a piracy deserving death (as it really is,) any where. It seems to me a strange interpretation, that the States have a constitutional right to set up and sustain an institution, which must be protected though it subvert the Constitution itself. A Constitution made "to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, (not domestic outrage) provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty" must be interpreted to sustain an infernal plague, a hideous, triple armed, hell generated monster of injustice and despotism, in obsequious servility to the will of separate States. No matter, though it raise its crimsoned and ruthless hand against the Constitution itself—though it whelm a vast nation in blood and tears—though its awful going forth trample the God-given rights of millions in dust,—rend and sunder all sweet and holy ties, and proves itself an unmitigated and remorseless enemy of the human race, yet a Constitution made to promote the "general welfare" must not touch it but with gentle and soothing hands. Congress must stand by and witness its horrible crimes, and see it apply the torch to the political temple itself, and has no constitutional power to annihilate it! How preposterous! How absurd! It is never denied that Congress may order the destruction of property, bridges, navies, cities

and even men's lives, whenever the safety of the Government and nation may require it; but slavery must have paramount claims to all else? It may bid defiance to the Government, to all natural law, and all other laws, but must be held sacred above all human rights and interests. It must stand higher in a nation's reverence than man, humanity, moral principle on the mandates of the living God! While waging a most terrible war against the nation, with half a million bayonets at its very heart, it must not move only with reverential obsequiousness, and with gentlest expressions of kindness, and songs of soothing sympathy to placate its wrath and appease its damnable criminality! I regret the New Republic is so influenced by the oft repeated sophistry of politicians, learned in that sin-polluted capital of the United States, that he cannot see the proposition, that Congress has Constitutional power to abolish American Slavery whenever it believes it necessary, is as capable of demonstration as any other proposition whatever. Forsooth nothing seems to me more clear and indisputable.

He admits that the military law has power to abolish slavery, but denies that the Government or Congress has. Does he not know that the military is but the instrument of Congress, subject to its decrees and bound by its will? That the military has no authority except what it derives from Congress. It is specially authorized "to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces." Congress has the whole war making and war conducting power. And it is bound by a constitutional provision to "guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government." Now suppose it finds it impossible to do this without annihilating slavery? Does it mean that Congress shall do this if the slave power will permit? In defining the powers and duties of Congress, the Constitution nowhere intimates that it shall be subjected to any State Institution that may be set up in opposition to its paramount obligations. Besides, it authorizes the government to make treaties with foreign powers. Suppose all Europe in its amazement and disgust at the gigantic crime of American Slavery, should send their armed millions upon our coast and resolve never to make peace till we abolish slavery; and to save the nation, suppose the government pledges its faith by treaty to do so, the Congress and nation would be constitutionally bound to abide by the treaty. The idea that Congress has no constitutional authority to destroy the monster divests it of the attributes of government, and clothes that diabolical institution with national omnipotence and supremacy! Yes, Congress has power implied in the

very nature of government and in its Constitutional objects to eradicate the evil. And had not its advocates long since blinded and corrupted our politicians, it would have been done. It has no right to be—no right to live. This Nation has no right to protect it a moment. No Constitution can make that right which is in itself wrong. And as history nowhere records a rebellion so unreasonable and terrible as ours, so it reveals the existence of no system of gigantic and transcendent crime, equal to the toleration of slavery in this Union. No common horse thief, assassin, or murderer was ever as guilty, or ever deserved the halter as much as those political knaves who have advocated or sustained directly or indirectly this national disgrace and terrible curse, which has wrought out a general political blindness and demoralization. Our national folly and madness, in permitting such a stupendous wrong to exist, astonishes all Europe, and makes angels weep, if they can sympathize with so lost, abandoned and depraved a people.

L. C. TODD.

Confiscation.

Do you ask what is to become of the lands of the South when the war is ended and slavery abolished? I would that these, as well as lands elsewhere, could be disposed of on those great and precious land reform principles, which teach that the right of all to the soil is as equal and sacred as to the light and air. But few, even of the good and intelligent are as yet up to the level of these principles. The lands of the South will, in the main, continue to be held by the families that now hold them. It will be said that wives and children should not, because their husbands and fathers were rebels, be made homeless. And even the rebels themselves, although they have forfeited both lands and lives, we shall be slow to drive from their homes when we remember our own share of the responsibility for the rebellion. Parents who give wine to their children until they are so intoxicated as to kick the table over, are hardly the right persons to punish them for their uncontrollable feet. And we, who have fostered slavery, until slaveholders could no longer contain themselves, are in hardly a suitable relation to punish them very severely for their outbreaking insanity. The rebellion we must put down. But all the time we are putting it down we should be holding ourselves largely responsible for it and condemning ourselves quite as emphatically as we condemn the traitors. Slavery made them traitors; and we were so corrupt and cruel as to sustain slavery.—Gerrit Smith.

Let us build alters to the Blessed Unity which holds nature and souls in perfect solution, and compels every atom to serve a universal end.—Emerson.

Was it "Ridiculous?"

It seems that X. P. takes exceptions to some of the sentiments expressed in my letter to the New York Reform Conference. He appears to think me wanting in respect, to both God and man.

Now as a general thing I think that clearing up one's individual reputation or character, and redressing personal grievances is just about the poorest business that a person can engage in, and did I not consider that there are certain principles involved of universal importance, I should not challenge the opinion expressed as to the character of my performance, or the motives which led me to so express myself.

My follies and short comings and my virtues, if I have any, are of no great importance to any one except C. M. Overton, any farther than the manifestation of them has an influence on others. In this view I presume X. P. will agree with me. And I acknowledge my amenability to the bar of public opinion and criticism for any opinion I may publicly express, and shall take no exceptions to having them characterized as they may seem to any one to deserve.

In reference to that letter I will say that though it might appear trifling, and may be extravagant in some expressions, it is in the main a candid, sober expression of myself in the mood I was then in. And that mood is not a very uncommon one for me. It is true, however unfortunate and lamentable that, as the poet has it,

I sometimes feel as I could blot

All traces of mankind from earth,

As if 'twere wrong to blast them not,

They so disgrace, so shame their birth.

I felt somewhat so at that time. I felt that this earth is inhabited and cursed by a race of beings all of whom were miserable sinners. I don't know as X. P. ever felt so. I don't know as he believes that they are sinners at all. If not then on this point I agree with the Bible and differ with him. I felt also, that the inhabitants of this planet were not worthy of the planet itself; that as another poet has it,

"God's Earth is worthy better men."

I don't know as X. P. ever felt so. If not then I agree with Gerald Massey and differ from him. I think it is the common belief of the Christian world that men are all wicked sinners. The Orthodox portion of the world hold not only that men are sinners, but that they are under the wrath of God; and deserve not only death, but the punishment of eternal torments—that all who do not go to the place of torments are spared monuments of God's

mercy and do not get their just deserts. Now I did not propose, acquiesce in, or pray for any such application of justice as this.

At worst it could only be a hastening of that death which is already the doom of all; and I don't see that a few days, or years, more or less ought to interfere with any great plan for the betterment of things. It will be seen, I think that I did not have in my mind the idea of destruction for its own sake. I certainly would not, as I now feel, or as I felt when I wrote that letter, make an endless hell for mankind, if—I say it in all reverence to Him and in all respect for myself—if I were God, i. e. if I had the power, however low an estimate I may put upon them as a species. I would if I could have my way have it peopled by a nobler, higher, better specimen of humanity.

I don't know that X. P. thinks this will ever be done. If not then I agree with the Scriptures and differ from him.

The whole Christian world agree in believing that a day is coming when the wicked will be cut off and the righteous left to inherit the earth. And every day they pray for the coming of that kingdom. What did I more than (in my way) to pray for the same? Perhaps I am not good enough to ask Gabriel to fulfill his promised designs. And perhaps my method did not leave room enough for the common distinctions between saints and sinners. And in fact I don't think they do amount to much. The ritual by which God is worshipped is not of much consequence in my view. I think, perhaps I have as much living if not saving faith in Christ and the Bible, as others. And when I pray as we are instructed, "Thy kingdom come," I feel the necessity for that coming. When I invoke Gabriel it is because I believe in his mission and that that mission will be fulfilled.

I own my faith both in the need, and the fact of the second coming, and why may not I, sinner though I am, pray for it. I see no reason why I may not as well as Christians, unless it be from the fact that I mean it and they don't. Am I an egotist because I depreciate man? I don't pretend to belong to any other race. If all men are sinners surely I am one. I am quite as much dissatisfied with myself as with the rest of mankind. But perhaps it is because I have said what I would do "if I were God." Now it is of but little general consequence whether I am an egotist or not, but in the name and for the sake of human dignity and human manhood I protest against this abatement of man's rightful prerogative to judge of God in the only way he can judge him from his own stand point. I protest that a proper humility and

true devotion, require no such abasement of human intellect, and no such sacrifice of the moral sense, as this idea supposes. I aver that the whole world—X. P. and every other thinking man does think, if he does not say what he would do if he were God. At least there never was a Unitarian or Universalist but what has said "If I were God I would not torture the human family eternally." Was there ever a mother but what said in her soul "I would not send my child into hell flames." There never was a prayer put forth for the salvation of a human being, but what said as plain as words could, "I would do so if I were God."

I may have been unfortunate in my words, but the IDEA is in every man's heart that has any idea about God, and where is the harm in expressing it.

C. M. OVERTON.

Colonization.

I deprecate this nascent Colonization Party, not because I fear its success. When slavery shall be abolished, (and we are on the eve of its abolition) the party will die. Hatred of the blacks, which is the pabulum and soul of the party, gets all its life and virus from Slavery. Slavery dead, and the desire to colonize the blacks would also be dead. You and Senator Doolittle would find no more sympathy with your scheme. Nay, you would yourselves have no more sympathy with it. And if Slavery shall live, even the slaveholders will not consent on any terms to the colonization of the mass of the blacks, either those in or those out of slavery. They will, as were the slaveholders of Maryland, be found valuing the labor of black men too highly to consent to their expulsion from the country. Nor do I deprecate the party, because the first actual attempt to drive five millions of useful, innocent people out of the nation would begin a war of the races, in which the dozen millions of blacks in this hemisphere, and the whole civilized world in addition, would be against us; for there will never be this first actual attempt. When the time for it shall have come, the daring and the disposition will both be lacking.

It is for other reasons that I deprecate this Colonization movement. Its tendency will be to hold back the Government from striking at the cause of the war, and to produce hesitation, diversion, compromise, at a moment when the salvation of the country calls for blows, immediate, united, and where, at whatever damage to whatever other interest, they will fall most effectively. Not its least lamentable tendency is to foster in the American people that mean pride of race, and that murderous caste, by which they have outraged and crushed so many millions, and for which they are now, in the righteous providence of God, called to an account so appalling.—[Gerrit Smith.]

Let us have faith in the Eternal Order.

Poets.

I write so
Of the only truth-tellers, now left to God,—
The only speakers of essential truth,
Opposed to relative, comparative,
And temporal truths; the only holders by
His sun-skirts, through conventional grey
glooms:
The only teachers who instruct mankind,
From just a shadow on a charnel wall,
To find man's veritable stature out,
Erect, sublime,—the measure of a man,
And that's the measure of an angel, says
The apostle. Ay, and while your common
men
Build pyramids, gauge railroads, reign, reap,
dine,
And dust the flaunty carpets of the world
For kings to walk on, or our senators,
The poet suddenly will catch them up
With his voice like thunder . . . 'This is soul,
This is life, this word is being said in heaven,
Here's God down on us! what are you about?'
How all those workers start amid their work,
Look roud, look up, and feel, a moment's space,
That carpet-dusting, though a pretty trade,
Is not the imperative labor after all.

[Mrs. Browning.]

Labor.

All true labor "is joy divine!" Never shun your labor. Darkly come the blasts of poverty. Labor is pregnant with every blessing. Castle and fortress are destroyed by the labor of the ivy, the lichen, and the wall-flower. Ignorance is overthrown by the labors of knowledge. Rock-built citadels decay beneath the incessant action of harmoniously rolling seasons. Vice is displayed by the labor of virtue. Life is exalted by the action of its varied elements. Go, then, and do whatsoever good work your hands find to do—"with all your might," with your whole heart, and will, and judgement—work, act, labor, produce, and enrich the world. Plow, sow, harrow, and reap. Let Justice regulate thy life. Give every one something good and useful to do. Reward the laborer with the price of righteousness. Freedom is the flower of great development. Development is possible only through association, action, labor. Before the gospel nobles and priests grow pale with fear. They do not labor for the world's nourishment. The days of their power are in proportion to the industry of Reformers. It required labor to roll the "stone from the mouth of the sepulchre." Let the Savior come forth. He is the spirit and the power of labor. Under the sway of his sceptre, the world will be changed into a paradise. First, the material; then the spiritual.—[Herald of Progress.]

THE NEW REPUBLIC.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, MAY 17, 1862.

THE NEW REPUBLIC is published weekly, at one dollar a year; six months, fifty cents; single copies (post paid) three cents.

For sale at No. 288, Superior Street.

Remittances should be made in bills of Ohio, Eastern, Indiana State, or Detroit banks, Treasury notes, coin or stamps. Address,

NEW REPUBLIC,
CLEVELAND, Ohio.

Still Illogical.

It seems strange that so clear a head as Mr. Overton's, should not get this Slavery and Constitutional question into a little more consistent and logical shape. Some of his statements, are indeed remarkable. He says, for instance, that the Government has a right to abolish the Constitution! That the People have a right to "abolish" the Constitution may be true—the right of revolution, either physical or moral, as an extreme measure, is not questioned, but that Government has a right to abolish the Constitution is a strange idea indeed. Of what use is a Constitution, if the Government is not subject to it. No, no, let us inculcate no such disorderly notion as this. Let the Constitution be maintained, and let the Government follow it to the letter, until the people shall see fit, in their united and highest wisdom, to adopt a new Constitution or amend the old. In God's name let us do nothing to promote or hasten on that anarchy which more than threatens our Nation. Let us have Law and Order. Even a good thing is not to be done in a disorderly and unlawful manner; especially as there is always a just and orderly way to do good deeds.

As I have said, I have no friendship for Slavery, and no reverence for laws or Constitutions that sustain it. Our good friend Todd is generously gratuitous in intimating that I am under the influence of the popular, pro-slavery politicians! This is not one of my weak points. All that I claim is that our anti-slavery friends shall not get things mixed. So far as our friend's article is an argument in favor of the anti-slavery interpretation of the Constitution, I have no fault to find with it. I have never disputed that view. But according to that view, slavery is already abolished—is an outlaw—and Government has nothing to do in the case except to enforce the laws, and put down slavery as being itself a rebellion.

Friend Todd asserts that I admit the military power has a right to abolish Slavery. I admitted no such thing. The idea would be simply ridiculous. The military power may set Slaves at liberty; so it may horses. It may take or destroy any species of property, but it has nothing to do with the legality or illegality of institutions. It may and should set slaves at liberty, for the very good reason that by so doing it would be putting down

the rebellion (the only thing it has to do) in the most effectual way. So far as the military power is amenable to Congress, and so far as Congress may legitimately dictate the line of policy to be pursued, so far it may say whether slaves may be set at liberty, or sent back to their masters, to effectually help on the rebellion; just so far it may say whether the rebels shall be put down effectually, or whether they, as rebels, shall be treated tenderly, at whatever cost to the Nation.

My point is this—and I challenge all attempts to make it appear illogical—that all Government has to do in this case is to put down the rebellion and to do it in the most effectual way. After the rebellion is suppressed, and the rebels punished or pardoned, Government has no more to do in the case; and the Union and the equality of the States remain the same as before. If, as an incident of this suppression; any number of slaves should be running at large, after the rebellion is suppressed, so be it. So much bad luck to their owners, and their friends at the North who feel it a sacred duty to help catch them. It would only make business in that line lively. If as an incident of the rebellion, Slavery should get its death blow, as I think it will, the result will have to be welcomed with as good a grace as possible.

Mr. Overton's idea that there are no Slave States, simply because the Slaveholders, as individuals, have become criminals against the Nation, will hardly pass, I think. There is no power under this Government to abolish States. The perpetuity of the Union was the only thing counted on in the formation of the Government. There was no provision made for so serious a state of things as the present (and so we shall have to have a reconstruction) no provision made for rebellion except its suppression. States cannot possibly be stricken out, as States, so long as the Government and Constitution continue. No matter if a majority of the citizens of the Slave States lose their legal rights, through crime, the States remain, and the loyal men, whether few or many, are the citizens. I do not say whether rebels should forfeit citizenship or not. That is a point by itself. It is yet to appear that the rebellion was inaugurated by a majority of the people of the Slave States. If we are to annihilate States because a minority (or even a majority) of "bold bad men" have seized, lawlessly, the reins of Government, it is getting along rather fast for even this fast age.

The fact of a master's committing a capital crime does not emancipate the Slave. There would be heirs, most likely, to inherit the property of the criminal.

That the New Republic is in favor of "reinstating the Union on its old basis," is altogether an unwarrantable inference, on the part of one who has read its articles. It is not in favor of any such thing. It does not think it a possible thing to be done; but it is in favor of a wise and orderly recon-

struction (hence the significance of its name) through which, and only through which, the present complicated affairs can be adjusted. It holds, as every body must admit, that the present state of things was not contemplated or provided for. What then will you do? Go to work to do, loosely and lawlessly, what you want done, or seek the desired end in an orderly manner. We say the latter; and God and all wise men help save us from the former.

Exactly what the reconstruction should be, is a question for future, thorough and serious discussion.

It is idle to talk of the power of Congress to abolish Slavery simply because it is wrong. And I suggest that our friends take distinct and clear positions. Let us have one thing or another and be consistent. Let us maintain the Union as it is; or put down Slavery because it can be done Constitutionally; or have such a change in the organic law as will allow of justice being enforced, and a sound policy being pursued, without disregarding the recognized law of the land. Nor do I contend for a moment that we are bound to violate justice and right because the organic law requires it. I believe in the higher Law, and that honest Disunionists are consistent. So is the Gerrit Smith Abolitionist consistent. So is the advocate of the old Union consistent. So is the advocate of reconstruction consistent. But he who admits the popular interpretation of the Constitution, and the legal existence of Slavery, and the legitimacy of all laws that sustain it, and yet is in favor of Congress abolishing it, is not consistent.

A Word of Comment.

We cannot let the occasion of the publication of friend Leland's article, pass without entering our unqualified protest against any seeming endorsement of a practice so utterly repugnant to our sense of propriety as that of advertising for "partners". In our judgment it is very bad taste and worse morals. And perhaps our greatest objection lies deeper down, in the underlying strata of the institutions of society, than many that might be urged.

We do not say that no modest person ever advertised for a partner, but we do say that the thing itself is inherently immodest and immoral, judged by a true and elevated standard. True purity and morality consists in sustaining the conjugal relation only with such as can meet the wants of the spiritual and affectional nature. The idea that if one cannot be got another will do, or that the affairs of the heart should be subservient to business and arbitrary, external conditions, is monstrous. If a man meets a woman he can truly love, and his love is reciprocated, that love, and the relations it suggests, is legitimate. But how abhorrent to all delicacy is it to be looking about to find some one with whom to sustain a relation that should be so sacredly cherished, and reverently entered upon, and so pure and

beautiful in its manifestations, as to excite a thrill of happiness in the bosom of an angel looking on, as though if one could not be secured another would do! But is not this after all in harmony with the popular standard of morals? Alas, yes. And until a higher standard can be shown, let popular moralists be wary of too severely criticising less common, not to say less gross and indecate exhibitions of immorality.

Words Fitly Spoken.

We welcome with pleasure the article of our valued contributor, G. R. Especially so much of it as is a criticism on the spirit of denunciation exhibited in certain quarters. We believe in the old doctrine, that "there is a time for all things." At least there is a time for a good many things. But we do not feel that the present is the time for severe criticism and denunciation. The Nation is already lashed into a fever heat of excitement and agitation. What it now needs is soothing rather than farther irritating. What may in the past have been useful in stirring the sluggish elements into life, may now be destructive for the very good reason that the condition of the patient is entirely different, and so needs different treatment. Not that we are not in favor of just and thorough criticism; but let us wisely draw the line between this, and that offensive denunciation, which will never answer when the nerves are irritated. The wise physician is he who can both use the knife and the healing ointment, as the case may demand. Let there be no consenting to wrong or covering up of iniquity, but let us cultivate that good will and fraternity of feeling which we must have in order to come out of our troubles safely.

The Dead Languages.

There are some Latin and other phrases that are more expressive than any of the same number of words in the English language, and so there may be a propriety in using them. Any extensive quoting of other languages, is, however, in bad taste. Comparatively few know the meaning, and it is only the dictate of good manners for a speaker or writer to use such language as his hearers or readers are supposed to understand. The Editor of this Journal knows nothing of any language except his own, and consequently does not know whether a word or phrase of another language is printed correctly or not. Those writers, therefore, who make these quotations will save trouble and vexation by writing each letter very plain, or, and better, leaving them out altogether.

Errata.

In ORSON S. MURRAY'S article, No. 3, page 47, first column, last paragraph, for "internceive" read *internecine*.

"Partner Wanted."

Almost every newspaper I take up contains a matrimonial advertisement—"PARTNER WANTED" in bold capitals as its heading. Strange heading, this! "Partner wanted?" Some fond, loving bosom on which we can lean in confidence, and in whose heart we can find a home!

"Partner wanted" is but a reprint of the Universe. March with its stern winds advertises through thirty-one Nos. ere it marries blushing May, with April as the marriage-bond, and records their vows in the courts of time. The stars, heaven's bright tinsel, advertise for companions, then link their fair hands, with nuptial vows, and swing in the mazy dance of Infinity forever. January is married to June, and April to November. The vine lovingly entwines its tendrils 'round the oak—the courtship of its existence—then marries, blushes and retires, yielding its cherished fruits to the world outside itself.

"Partner wanted," the cookoo chirps, and coos the gentle dove. "Partner wanted," the winds of heaven sing as they marry themselves to the music of the spheres. Bough to bough unites in marriage bonds, and world to world is wed. The lofty mountains advertise for companions, and the eyes of the passing clouds catch the heading, "Partner wanted," and stoop from heaven down to kiss their rugged foreheads. The June arbors advertise for the passing shower; and "Partner wanted" call the dews at midnight down to wake with kisses the sleeping flowers. Breeze to breeze is sweetly linked, and ray to ray united. No music but the chords are married and blend together. The solo is a domestic hearth. The Spring and Summer are children of the married year; and age to age, like heart to heart, are in the courts of time united. Married hearts should sweetly blend as day embraces even.

Even words have no meaning if their advertisement "Partner wanted" has called no companions to their side. That little conjunction "and" (what would our language be without it?) is the marriage bond that links word to word; that gives to Thought its wings, and Poetry its fire. Conception is to fancy wed as sunshine to the flowers. All things by alaw divine, to other of its kind is wed.

"The mountains kiss high heaven,
And the waves clasp one another;
No sister flower would be forgiven,
If it disdained its brother."

S. P. LELAND.

Equilibrium is the Eternal Law.

Physiological Series.

BY W. BYRD POWELL, M. D.

CHAPTER IV.

MISCELLANEOUS PHYSIOLOGICAL LAWS OF MARRIAGE.

Under this head I propose to treat of some subjects which though not embraced by my discovery, nor yet, perhaps, entirely legitimate, nevertheless they seem to me, in this connection to claim a passing attention; and the first is the blood or consanguine relation of married parties.

The opinion seems to be widely extended as human civilization, and possibly it may seem as old—certainly it is thought to be, viz: that the blood relation of married parties is mischievous to children, causing idiocy, other varieties of mental habitude and also scrofulous forms of disease. This opinion amounts to a positive conviction of the popular mind, the young and the old, the male and the female, the learned and the ignorant, the wise and the foolish; all believe it, and as confidently too as they do the most demonstrable truth of every-day life. I, too, at one time regarded this as an unquestioned and an unquestionable truth, and advocated stringent measures for prohibiting such marriages; and now so strong is my prejudice against such marriages that I would not disturb this popular opinion but for my undoubting conviction that it is best for society, at large, to have the truth in relation to all subjects—that all error should be exposed, and all truth disseminated and advocated. As a disciple of Nature I have always been too loyal to doubt that her arrangements and dispensations are both wise and good. Hence I cannot intentionally misrepresent or oppose any one of her mandates, and therefore when I discover a natural law, I hold it to be my imperative duty to inculcate obedience to it.

If the consanguine relation of progenitors render parties progenitally incompatible, it must be because of some physiological law of humanity, and as the physiological laws are like the other natural laws, immutable in their action, it follows that the children of consanguine parents should uniformly be afflicted with the consequences of progenital delinquency, except in cases where the law was abrogated by some obtruding cause. Hence if the blood relation of progenitors ever did produce idiocy or scrofula, these results or their equivalents should at least attend a majority of blood related marriages; but is this the fact? All observers are prepared to answer it is not; for the children of consanguine progenitors are most frequently as sound and viable as the children of other parents.

But I concede that idiotic and scrofulous children do sometimes obtain in the families of consanguine progenitors, and why should they not? For if they did not the fact would favor such marriages. *Cæteris paribus*—all things being equal, consan-

guine marriages are as favorable as any others; for to the extent of my observation I have found that when blood related parties were physiologically compatible according to laws I have discovered, then children were as normal as those of other physiologically legal marriages.

I have met with physicians who from having observed one or two idiots amongst the children of consanguine parties, professed to have an undoubted conviction that the parental consanguinity was the cause, and yet admitted that in a majority of such marriages no such consequences obtained; such persons must have a very imperfect conception of a natural law, too imperfect to become good physicians.

As idiocy is thought to be a fearfully frequent result of the marriage of relations, I became curious to ascertain the extent of the fact, and for this purpose I opened a correspondence with gentlemen who have charge of idiotic asylums. The superintendent of the idiotic asylum of Ohio, at Columbus, informed me that he had been able to trace but two per cent. of the idiots brought to that institution to blood related progenitors. Dr. Bowne, who has the charge of a similar institution in Mass., informed me that he had been able to trace but one and eight-tenths per cent. to a consanguine parentage. In New Hampshire the per cent. is the same as in Ohio. Now the question pertinently arises whence came the other ninety-eight per cent?

Now although it be ascertained that two per cent. of our idiots are of consanguine parentage, it still remains to be shown that the blood relationship had any agency in their production. Indeed it is exceedingly presumptive that the two per cent. had the same origin that the other ninety-eight per cent. had, whatever it may have been, and this cause I hold to have been either organic or physiological incompatibility of progenitors, which operates upon blood related parties as upon others.

Some intelligent people in sustaining the opinion that consanguine marriages are mischievous in relation to the reproductive function, cite the evil consequences of in and in breeding of our domestic animals, but this citation is gratuitous, because it has not been shown that such in and in breeding has any baneful influence. In England, a country than which no other can boast finer horses or cattle, the system of in and in breeding is pushed to a great extent, for the preservation and increase of certain desirable qualities. The same is also true with reference to their sporting dogs.

Others again contend that public opinion in this relation must be correct, because they say that it is the result of the observations made by all the civilized peoples of the world, extending back into primeval ages. This would seem to have force but is it the fact? For myself I greatly doubt that the opinion is so old, but am inclined to think it is comparatively of modern date, and had its origin in a misin-

terpretation of scripture, to sustain a social prejudice.

It is true that the ancient Jews prohibited the marriage of parties who were nearly connected by blood or otherwise, but it does not appear that the objection was founded in either a physiological or pathological law, but as I think to conserve a proper relation socially between the sexes. Consult Leviticus. And further, if the Jews had a strong repugnance to the marriage of consanguine parties, or thought it to degenerate the species, how did it happen that the sons of Aaron were commanded to marry their sisters, and ever after to wed their kindred?

Finally the whole subject resolves itself into this:—the marriage of relations is offensive to our social sentiments, especially in reference to propriety; for I am confident that the physiological laws do not, all other things being equal, object to the marriage alliance of blood relations, even that of brothers and sisters, in any department of the animal creation, the human race not exempted. As such alliances are sanctioned by the natural laws, neither my judgment nor my moral faculties can object to them; but my social faculties do, and this appears to have been the fact with mankind generally, and at all times. Hence society has a right to this exercise of its social influence. But legislators have not the right, except by usurpation, to prohibit consanguine marriages by statute, and I think it to be about as silly for legislators to attempt to regulate the action of the natural laws as it was for the chief of the Natchiz Indians to rise before sun and watch for his rising, that he might direct him the course he should travel all day.

As this chapter is miscellaneous, there is another subject to which I must give a passing attention.

It is the marriage of white with black people; and I take up this subject for the especial benefit of those who are inclined to reform the institutions of nature, to the extent at least of amalgamating the negro and white species of the genus homo.

It is a singular fact in the physiological economy of our species, that physiological similitude between the sexes render them incompatible as progenitors; and in this relation there appears to have been founded in this species an instinct which causes most people in seeking a companion in marriage, to desire a contrast. Hence low and dwarfish people seek the tall and majestic, the ponderous and importable seek the spare and slender, the dark complexioned seek the fair, &c.

But these contrasts frequently obtain between parties who are extremely incompatible physiologically, and hence this instinct requires to be guided by an instructed intellect: the instinct however is right. Although it is demonstrably true that a high degree of similitude renders the respective sexes unproductively incompatible, yet it is equally true that an extreme degree of dissimilitude as that which ob-

tains between remote species, produces an equal degree of sexual incompatibility. This incompatibility may be appropriately denominated Ethnological; nevertheless its action must be also physiological.

The difference between the white and negro species of the human genus, is more than merely physiological; it is Ethnological. And the difference between the two species is exceedingly great, and the consequence of the alliance of parties who are respectively of the negro and white species, is invariably scrofulous. The progeny is a true hybrid; not to the same extent that a mule is, but so nearly so as to render it about as impossible to found a colony of mulattoes as of mules. I have never seen an old mulatto—a cross between the true white and negro types. There is to be found however, an apparent exception, and investigation proves it to be only apparent.

During the time that I was a citizen of New Orleans I observed several old people whom I supposed to be mulattoes, and their age surprised me so much, that I was induced to enquire about their respective progenitors, and I learned that they were the offspring of negroes and Spaniards.

The Spanish people are in great part of Iberian origin. The Iberians though a variety of the Caucasian species, were nevertheless tropical-African and therefore more or less affiliated with the true negro race or type; which explains the fact that the progeny of Spanish men and negro women of New Orleans, escaped scrofula and lived to become octogenarians.

There appears to be as little affiliation between the negro, and the Celt or Teuton as between the horse and the ass, and hence a cross of the former with either of the latter is I believe invariably scrofulous. Some thirty years ago Professor Nathan Smith stated in the Medico-chirurgical society of Maryland, at Baltimore, that he had made a post-mortem examination of more than seventy mulattoes, and had not met with a sound pair of lungs—they were more or less tuberculous.

As all the institutions of society either are or should be founded in natural law, and as one natural law is as imperative as another, it follows in my judgment that the intelligent individual who either advocates or tolerates the marriage alliance between the white and black types of our race, is also capable of advocating or tolerating arson, robbery, murder or any other crime against society.

There is a remote modification of this subject with which I will conclude this chapter.

"A young woman, residing in Edenburgh and born of white Scottish parents, but whose mother, some time previous to her marriage, had a natural mulatto child by a negro servant in Edinburgh, exhibits distinct traces of the negro. Dr. Simpson, whose patient the young woman was at one time, has had no recent opportunities of satisfying himself as to the precise extent to which the negro

character prevails in her features, but he recollects being struck with the resemblance, and noticed particularly that her hair had the qualities characteristic of the negro."—[Man and His Migrations.

The preceding extract I do not doubt, from the authority that attends it, conveys to us a fact, and I reproduce it for the purpose of some physiologically useful comment. It teaches our young women that if they would become the progenitors of their own species, they must be careful as to the quality of the man with whom they respectively contract an alliance.

The mother of the young woman above alluded to, by her gestation of a child by a negro man, had her constitution so depraved—rendered so negro-laid as to be constitutionally incapable of reproducing her own species in purity. A fact parallel with this is well known to those who are engaged in breeding mules and horses, that the female of the horse species by having a foal by an ass, has her constitution so depraved or rendered so assinene that she can never afterwards bear a pure foal of her own species. All that she may have will be more or less assinene.

Is it possible for the constitution of a man to become thus depraved? So far as an affirmative inference can be drawn from one fact, I decide that it is.

In Kenton county, Ky., there lived some years since, a Mr. Joseph Martin. He lived for many years with a negro woman, and had by her a numerous progeny. She died, and he married again, but the woman was white. By her he had a number of children, and they had as unmistakably negro-laid indices as had his first children. Some of the old citizens of this city know this statement to be a fact, and would so testify in a court of justice.

The Government.

MR EDITOR:—It is said there is a time for everything, and it seems to me this is the proper time to criticise the Government critics. In the past, when the slave power had but to demand and the Government conceded, criticism and denunciation were altogether appropriate. But now that the encroachments of Slavery have at last aroused the resistance of the Nation, it seems to me that such sweeping denunciations of the Government as have lately appeared in your paper are exceedingly ill-timed and inappropriate. The Government is charged with aggrandizing the few at the expense of the masses. But the fact is no country is less subject to this wrong than our own. The best possible Government can never prevent a difference in the condition of individuals; any more than nature can cause the thorn and the pine to attain the same size and assume the same general appearance. Nature simply gives all kinds of trees an equal chance for growth: so Government can only secure to individuals their right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness;"

leaving each individual and race "perfectly free" to live their own life and fulfill their own destiny.

One writer for the *New Republic* indulges in fearful and terrible prophecy. I doubt the wisdom of giving publicity to such prognostics, for there is a strange tendency, on the part of many believers in modern prophecy, to make all their calculations and arrange all their plans with reference to their fulfillment; and thereby greatly aid to enact what it would be well to avert. But if every man's hand must soon be raised against his neighbor; if "blood must flow in torrents and wild terror seize all classes," let us not carelessly add fuel to the fire of popular frenzy. The only possible danger of such overwhelming evil is that the old Democratic party may resuscitate and join the rebellion in order to "keep the nigger where he belongs." And if that is really to be feared, then how important that every friend of progress and liberty should throw his undivided influence upon the side of the Administration! The Administration is not abolitionistic enough to suit us; but it is too much so to suit our democratic brethren; and it is on this point if any, that they will rebel. As, with longing eyes, Israel looked back to the flesh pots of Egypt, so does the old democratic party look back upon the spoils of office, and the former peace and plenty of "Our Country right or wrong." During the last two years, many democrats have cast off the shackles of party; but the party itself—what there is left of it—continues most cordially to hate the Republicans, the Abolitionists and the "nigger." Occasionally we hear portentous mutterings like the following: "What are we fighting for? To carry out the schemes of a few fanatical Abolitionists: that is what the war is for." The speaker is the representative of a numerous class, who, at present, are powerless for evil; because they have no effectual organization, and consequently can offer no armed resistance. A man with these feelings and convictions, who is worth \$20,000, may be required to pay \$100 more tax because of the war. Shall we say to this man the Government is oppressive; the war is unjust and wicked? Or, shall we say to him, your former ally, Jeff. Davis feels no respect for you? He scorns you as a "damned Yankee" or a "miserable mud sill," and had as lief rob you of your last dollar, as to plunder the National treasury and repudiate private debts! He owns no law but force; so that you do but consult your own interest when you contribute to furnish the sinews of war; for the war is not merely to liberate slaves, but to protect our own property and firesides, and to crush a most wicked rebellion! When you have once convinced your man of these important truths you have most effectually secured his loyalty. I have known a man worth \$20,000, who would ride ten miles out of his way to save ten cents toll. Now, Mr. Editor, is it not really asking too much of poor human nature to require one to travel 10000 miles to serve a cause

that he hates? And there is nothing the simon-pure Democrat hates worse than abolition. Is it not altogether wise and proper to bring other motives to bear? Garrison and Phillips recognize the hand of God in this war, but it would seem that some of your correspondents, Mr. Editor, must think it all the work of the opposite personage. Of course the necessity for war is to be regretted always, but I do not regard a heavy tax upon the rich as a great calamity. I would not say, the war is a great curse, because it increases our taxes. Long, too long has gold been the God of the American people; and now it is most appropriate that it should be sacrificed upon the altar of Justice. I am aware the Government does not openly avow that the object of war is the promotion of Justice and Liberty; but already we begin to see its practical workings in that direction. The oft-repeated falsehood that the North is not responsible for the existence of Slavery, is now true, as far as relates to the District of Columbia. For one, I have ceased to fear but that the Government will advance as fast and as far as the people will sustain it. Given Gerritt Smith for President, and a people to match, and speedy work would be made of the rebellion and its cause: but with the people as they are,—Lincoln is the man for President.

When we have seen men, women and children fleeing to British provinces for the protection of liberty; when they have been sold in the shambles or burned at the stake,—we have said, Slavery has done this. And now that the mangled corpses of our countrymen cover the plain; now that the mutilated forms of our dearest friends are seen in our own streets, let us be as prompt to say, The Slaveholders' rebellion has done this; the Government is arrayed against the rebellion, and may God help the Government!

Now that the state of things has so greatly changed, let us not continue to denounce the Union from mere force of habit; nor allow our impatience and the one idea of emancipation to blind us to all other considerations. Surely Abolitionists cannot remain indifferent spectators of the tremendous conflict. Let them rejoice that Slavery is receiving severe, if not mortal wounds; while they stand as a reserve force, ready to strike the blow that shall deal Death to the Monster when he would otherwise escape with the breath of life. G. R.

Whatever shape the pious rite may bear,
 Even the poor Pagan's homage to the sun
 I would not harshly scorn, lest even there
 I spurned some element of Christian prayer—
 An aim, though erring, at a world ayont—
 Acknowledgement of good,—of man's futility,
 A sense of need, and weakness, and, indeed,
 That very thing so many Christians want—Hu-
 mility. Tom Hood.

PROSPECTUS
OF THE
NEW REPUBLIC.

At a time so momentous as the present, there is an imperative demand for the exercise of all the wisdom, heroism, self-sacrifice, charity, and the forgetting of all past differences, and the sinking of all worldly ambition, in one sublime, prayerful, determined, brotherly effort to save our beloved country from the terrible ruin that more than threatens to swallow up our liberties, prosperity, peace. How to conquer the rebels, is not all of the great problem that must be settled before there is any certainty that we, as a Nation, have anything in the future to hope for.

The NEW REPUBLIC has two leading and distinctive objects: First, by humble and modest, but earnest and thorough effort, to promote, to the fullest extent of its ability, that fraternity of feeling among all parties and classes of society, on which our salvation so vitally depends. Second, to discuss, in a free, untrammelled manner, but in no partizan, dogmatical or dictatorial spirit, all of those fundamental and practical questions and principles of Government and human rights which the adjustment of our National politics will involve.

Society is divided into three distinct and leading classes. The Radical Reformer, the Liberal Conservative, and the opponent of Progress. The tendencies of the times are toward a union of the first two classes. No radical reform or idea has been advocated, but has embodied an important, though possibly mixed and partial truth. The agitation of single reforms, has been useful mainly in the way of preparing the public mind for a comprehensive understanding and thorough adjustment of, the great political and social questions that lie at the basis of our National happiness and well-being. The law of extremes and equilibrium is a universal law. Extremisms in reform have been necessary to balance the opposite extreme of stationary conservatism. The illustration has been that of extremes; the tendency now is toward equilibrium.

The aim of the NEW REPUBLIC will be to combine an earnest and energetic radicalism with a wise conservatism. It will advocate all rational reforms, and seek to promote a greater unity of feeling, and concert of action, and comprehensiveness of view, among all classes of reformers. It will take sides with no party, and will never be involved in personal or party quarrels, of any kind, or in any degree. So far as it acknowledges and follows leadership, Jesus Christ will be its standard in morals, and Thomas Jefferson in politics. It will advocate a reconstruction in our Government so far as to allow of a settlement of the Slavery question in such a manner as not to involve the sacrifice of justice, freedom, human rights, a sound policy and the Nation's safety, on the one hand, or unconstitutional and despotic methods on the other. It will advocate a radical revolution in politics and governmental administration, so far as there has been a departure from the Jeffersonian Platform, and systematic and persistent violation of the fundamental principles of the Government. It will be an especial advocate of simplicity and economy in Government, and attempt to demonstrate the correctness of the doctrine that "that Government is best that governs least." It will advocate a uniform and national system of currency, a uniform and humane system of prison discipline, uniform marriage and divorce laws, a new and improved system of representation, and present suggestive ideas on the subject of schools, internal improvements, post-office regulations &c. It will also give the thoughts of the

blest writers on Anthropological and Physiological science.

It will not aim to be a news-paper, but will note and comment upon, the World's progress, and the leading events of the times.

TERMS: At the rate of one dollar a year for any length of time. Address,

NEW REPUBLIC,
Cleveland, O.

NEW SERIES OF TRACTS
PUBLISHED BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
ARE TO BE OBTAINED AT THE
Anti-Slavery office, 5 Beekman street, New York; 106
North-Tenth street, Phila.; and 221, Washington
street, Boston.

- No. 1. Correspondence between Lydia Maria Child and Governor Wise and Mrs. Mason, of Virginia. 5 cents.
- No. 2. Victor Hugo on American Slavery, with letters of other distinguished individuals, viz., De Tocqueville, Mazzini, Humboldt, Lafayette, &c., 5 cents.
- No. 3. An Account of some of the Principle Slave Insurrections during the last two centuries. By Joshua Coffin. 5 cents.
- No. 4. The New Reign of Terror in the Slaveholding States, for 1859-'60. 10 cents.
- No. 5. Daniel O'Connell on American Slavery; with other Irish Testimonies. 5 cents.
- No. 6. The Right Way the Safe Way, proved by Emancipation in the West Indies, and elsewhere. By L. Maria Child. 10 cents.
- No. 7. Testimonies of Capt. John Brown, at Harper's Ferry, with his address to the Court. 2 cents.
- No. 8. The Philosophy of the Abolition Movement. By Wendell Phillips. 5 cents.
- No. 9. The Duty of Disobedience to the Fugitive Slave Act; An Appeal to the Legislature of Massachusetts. By L. Maria Child. 5 cents.
- No. 10. The Infidelity of Abolitionism. By Wm. Lloyd Garrison. 3 cents.
- No. 11. Speech of John Hossaok convicted of violation of the Fugitive Slave Act, at Chicago, Illinois. 3 cents.
- No. 12. The Patriarchal Institution, as described by Members of its Own Family. Compiled by L. Maria Child. 5 cents.
- No. 13. No Slavo-Hunting in the Old Bay State: An Appeal to the People and Legislature of Massachusetts. 5 cents.
- No. 14. A Fresh Catalogue of Southern Outrages upon Northern Citizens. 10 cents.
- No. 15. The Fugitive Slave Law and its Victims. By Rev. Samuel May, Jr. Revised and enlarged edition. 13 cents single, \$10 a hundred.
- No. 16. Tribute of William Ellery Channing to the American Abolitionists, for their Vindication of Freedom of Speech. 3 cents.
- No. 17. Argument of Wendell Phillips Against the Repeal of the Personal Liberty Law, before the Committee of the Legislature, Jan. 29, 1861. 5 cents.
- No. 18. A Voice from Harper's Ferry. A Narrative of Events at Harper's Ferry; with incidents prior and subsequent to its capture by Captain John Brown and his men. By Osborne P. Anderson, one of the number. 15 cents.

- No. 19. The Abolition of Slavery the Right of the Government under the War Power. 5 cents.
- No. 20. The Loyalty and Devotion of Colored Americans in the Revolution and War of 1812. 5 cents.
- No. 21. In Memoriam. Testimonials to the Life and Character of the late Francis Jackson. 5 cents.
- A deduction of fifty per cent. will be made where a dozen or more copies are taken. Gratuitous copies will be sent by mail, for examination, on receiving the postage charge.

Reform Journals.

We propose, as a token of fraternal appreciation, and for the convenience of our readers, to keep standing in our columns, for a few weeks, the following list (which may be enlarged from time to time) of Reform Journals.

BANNER OF LIGHT.

A large weekly journal, devoted to Spiritualism and Reform literature.—Luther Colby Editor. Two dollars a year. Address, Banner of Light, Boston, Mass.

LIBERATOR.

A leading Garrisonian journal—free for the discussion of all subjects.—Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Editor. Two dollars and fifty cents a year. 221 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

INVESTIGATOR.

Infidel journal.—Horace Seaver, Editor. Two dollars a year. 103 Court St., Boston, Mass.

PINE AND PALM.

Anti-Slavery.—James Redpath, Editor. Two dollars a year. Address, Boston, Mass.

ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

National Organ of the Garrisonian Abolitionists. Two dollars a year. No. 5 Beekman St., New York.

HERALD OF PROGRESS.

Devoted to the Harmonial Philosophy, and general Reform.—Andrew Jackson Davis, Editor. Two dollars a year. 274 Canal St., New York.

THE PRINCIPIA.

A religious Anti-Slavery journal. William Goodell, Editor. Two dollars a year. 339 Pearl St., New York.

THE CIRCULAR.

Organ of the Oneida Perfectionists.—One dollar a year, or free. Address, Circular, Oneida, N. Y.

THE SIBYL.

Devoted to Dress and other Reforms.—Dr. Lydia Sayer Hausbrook, Editor. Fifty cents a year. Address, Middletown, Orange Co., N. Y.

THE PROGRESSIVE AGE.

Monthly. Fifty cents a year. Hopedale, Mass.

THE MAYFLOWER.

Devoted to the Interests of Woman.—Miss Lizzie Brunell, Editor. Monthly. Fifty cents a year. Peru, Ind.

RISING TIDE.

Spiritualistic. Monthly. Seventyfive cents a year. Independence, Iowa.

J. L. LOVELL, CLAIRVOYANT PHYSICIAN. TESTIMONIALS.

This is to certify, that in June, 1858, I received an injury in the foot by jumping from a horse, and, after being under the treatment of six of our most scientific physicians without receiving any benefit, and suffering much pain—being unable to walk—in June, 1860, through the influence of a friend, I put myself under the treatment of Dr. J. L. Lovell, of Yarmouth, Me. I did not think he would succeed any better than the former physicians, but as my friend had been benefitted by him, I could but try, and in a short time I found I could walk. I took no medicine. The lameness caused other difficulties, but now I am free from all suffering and enjoy good health. Any one wishing for further information can receive it by calling on me, or by writing to me.

MARGARET B. FLANDERS.

SOUTH GARDINER, Nov. 20, 1860.

This is to certify that I have been troubled with the bleeding, blind, and itching Piles for twenty-six years. I have consulted a number of physicians, but found no relief until last Spring I commenced taking Dr. J. L. Lovell's medicine, and in three weeks I was relieved, and am now enjoying good health. I would recommend all that are troubled with Piles to call and see Dr. J. L. Lovell.

MARTIN WARD.

YARMOUTH, Nov. 20, 1860.

This is to certify that having been afflicted with Disease of the Liver for twelve years, and having other complaints combined with that, I placed myself under the care of Dr. J. L. Lovell, of Yarmouth, Me., in January, 1859, and received great benefit from him; being so much relieved within a few months, that I could lie upon my left side, which I had not done during that time.

AMANDA ESTES.

STEVENS' PLAINS, Oct. 2, 1860.

This is to certify that we, the undersigned, having been under the treatment of L. J. Lovell, Clairvoyant Physician, do cheerfully recommend him to all invalids, both as a physician and a gentleman.

Mrs. GEO. BICKFORD,
MARGARET T. PERRY,
ELENOR HUNTER,
IZETTA PREBLE,
HANNAH WARD,
ANN WARE,
IRENA ADERTON,
HARRIET N. LINNEKEN.

RICHMOND, Oct. 19, 1860.

Examination and Prescription \$1.—Terms Cash.

J. L. LOVELL,
Yarmouth, Me.

To the Diseased.

There are persons in all parts of the country who need medical advice and council in relation to their physical health, and the relation and influence of mind thereto. Those in Spirit life, in Mediumistic connection with those in earth life, (who, for years have made disease and its treatment a study) are prepared to impart such advice and discretion through the undersigned.

Where the disease is described by the applicant the charge will be only fifty cents and two postage stamps. If written out from autograph or lock of hair, \$1 and two stamps.

A. UNDERHILL, M. D.

Cleveland, Ohio, April 24th, 1862.

P. O. Address to Box 2763.

MILO A. TOWNSEND,

DEALER IN

BOOKS, STATIONARY, WALL PAPER
Toys and Fancy Articles,
NEW BRIGHTON, PA.

S. S. BARRIE, Cleveland. D. P. BEDELL, New York.

S. S. BARRIE & CO.,

DEALERS IN

COAL OIL LAMPS, AND CARBON OIL,
No. 116 Bank St., ---- Cleveland, Ohio.

Not to be undersold by any House in the United States.

YOUR ORDERS ARE SOLICITED.

UNION STEAM JOB PRINTING HOUSE,

No. 184 Superior St., Cleveland, O.

VIETS & SAVAGE, Proprietors.

PRINTING AT EXCEEDINGLY LOW RATES!

Having recently supplied our Establishment with a good assortment of New and desirable styles of Type, we are prepared, with increased facilities, to offer the business community, for the coming season, inducements that cannot be excelled by any similar establishment in this city.

We have a full supply of Presses, (5) three Power and two Hand, upon which all Business Men, Bankers, Brokers, Commission Merchants, Insurance Companies, Hotels, Railroads, Steamers, Manufacturers, Public Officers, Contractors, etc.,

CAN HAVE ALL ORDERS FILLED ON SHORT NOTICE AT VERY LOW RATES, AND IN A MOST SUPERIOR MANNER, IF THEY WILL CALL ON US.

We are constantly adding new styles and designs of Type to our large stock, from the celebrated Foundry of JOHNSON & Co., of Philadelphia, to keep up with the spirit of the times. We intend to be second to none in our endeavors to please our friends and all who patronize us. GIVE US A TRIAL AND SATISFY YOURSELVES!

We intend to do a Cash business, but are ready at all times to make contracts that will be satisfactory to both parties.

We employ no Agents to solicit work for us.

Persons wanting Printing, will consult their interest by calling at our office, but if they can not, drop us a line, and their wants will be immediately attended to.

BLANK BOOKS MADE TO ORDER. BINDING DONE ON SHORT NOTICE.

VIETS & SAVAGE, Printers,

No. 184 Superior Street, opposite Carson's Paper Store.
Box 2291, Cleveland, Ohio.

Woman and Law.

In her new work, "Woman's Rights under the Law," Mrs. Dall discusses the question so earnestly candidly, with such good sense and good taste, in so humane and religious a spirit, that her little book is sure to awaken interest as well as to help the reader to a just conclusion. There is certainly no harm in asking the question whether the social and legal position of women is as fair as that of men. If it be so a candid statement will show it. If it be not so, every honest man will wish to remedy a wrong. Why, for instance, the most intelligent and capable woman in the land should be allowed by the law to hold property, and to be taxed for that property, and yet forbidden to have a voice in the disposition of the taxes—in other words a vote—while the dullest clodhopper who comes from a foreign country and works in her fields, but who has and can have no intelligent idea of the necessities of our Government or of any Government, should be permitted to dispose of those taxes and his mistress's share of them, is one of the practical absurdities which is defended only by a prejudice. Let any intelligent man ask himself why his mother should not vote, and the man drunk at the corner grocery should, and the answer would be amusing to hear.

The sphere of woman, we all know, is the nursery; at least, if we do not know it, it is not for lack of telling; and to no holier sphere could any human being be called. The sphere of man is the office and shop; and to no more useful sphere could any person be summoned. Since, then, both men and women have a divinely-ordained sphere, who is to make laws for society?

It is manifestly a question that will be discussed, and the law of the different States is constantly yielding more and more to the pressure of the principle that taxation and representation must go together. We men make the laws. Like all law-givers, we please ourselves. In this case those who are displeased cannot right themselves by the strong arm. It is, therefore, only the most patient and charitable consideration of the whole subject that can secure any change; and it is as the most faithful and attractive contribution to that calm and wise consideration that the books of Mrs. Dall are so valuable. They abound in the most curious and interesting information, gathered from many sources. Their tone is the reverse of truculent. They are most womanly books about women.—[Harper's Weekly.

They are the free, who dare to speak
For the fallen and the weak;
They are free, who rather choose
Hatred, scoffing, and abuse,
Than they would in silence shrink
From the truth they needs must think;
They are free, who dare to be
In the right with two or three.