

Clearfield Republican.

BY G. B. GOODLANDER & CO.

PRINCIPLES, not MEN.

TERMS—\$1 25 per Annum, if paid in advance.

VOL. XXXI.—WHOLE NO. 1627.

CLEARFIELD, PA. WEDNESDAY, OCT. 24, 1860.

NEW SERIES—VOL. I.—NO. 15.

Clearfield Republican.

Terms of Subscription. If paid any time within the year, \$1 25; if paid after the expiration of the year, \$2 00.

Terms of Advertising. Business notices not exceeding 5 lines are inserted at the following rates:

One square, (14 lines), 1 mo.	\$ 50	\$ 75	\$1 00
Two squares, (28 lines), 1 mo.	1 00	1 50	2 00
Three squares, (42 lines), 1 mo.	1 50	2 25	3 00
One square, 3 months.	12 mo.	3 00	7 00
Two squares, 3 months.	4 00	6 00	10 00
Three squares, 3 months.	5 00	8 00	12 00
Four squares, 3 months.	6 00	10 00	14 00
Half a column, 3 months.	8 00	12 00	18 00
One column, 3 months.	14 00	20 00	35 00

Select Poetry.

THE HEART THAT HAS LOVED.
 Unto the heart that truly loved,
 And loved, alas! in vain,
 A joy so sweet—a love so pure—
 Can never come again!
 But o'er life's sky, like a midnight cloud,
 The years shall darkly pass,
 And love's warm rays shall shine no more
 On the ruined heart—alas!
 The wreck within may be hid with smiles,
 Which are ever bright and bland,
 But 'tis like the ivy's verdancy,
 That covers a ruin grand!
 And think not, though the eyes are bright,
 Though the cheeks may wear no stain,
 That the love-lorn heart is all restored—
 It can never love again!

Political.

[Continued from last week.]
THE GREAT ISSUE
 TO BE DECIDED IN NOVEMBER NEXT!
 SHALL THE
CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION
 STAND OR FALL?
 SHALL SECTIONALISM TRIUMPH,
 THE CONSTITUTION BE PERVERTED;
 AND
THE UNION DESTROYED!
 OR SHALL WE CONTINUE TO HAVE
 One Country! One Union! One Constitution!
 AND
ONE GLORIOUS DESTINY?
LINCOLN AND HIS SUPPORTERS.

BEHOLD THE RECORD!
 This doctrine also means the abolition of slavery in the States. If it be true, as the black republican leaders assert, that slaves are not property, and that they are only held by usurpation and tyranny, what is more natural than for such men, when they get into power, to put down this "usurpation and tyranny," and declare the slaves free? Abolition is the natural and inevitable consequence of the doctrine that man cannot hold property in man, and hence we are not surprised to see the same men who proclaim, also, the abolition of slavery in the States.
 Now, hear Henry Clay upon this dogma:
 "I know there is a visionary dogma which holds that negro slaves cannot be the subject of property. I shall not dwell long with this speculative abstraction. That is property which the law recognizes to be property. Two hundred years of legislation have sanctioned and sanctified negro slaves as property."—App'x Globe, 1839, p. 357.
LINCOLN AND HIS SUPPORTERS IN FAVOR OF THE "IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT!"
 We believe Mr. Lincoln claims to be the author of the "irrepressible conflict" idea. At least, we find him giving it utterance in his speech at Springfield, Illinois, on the 17th of June, 1858. We quote from the volume of Debates between Lincoln and Douglas, page 1. Mr. Lincoln said:
 "We are now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed object and confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only not ceased, but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease until a crisis shall have reached and passed. A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved; I do not expect the house to fall; but I do expect it will come to the issue. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South."

true theory of our Government—the theory that established State governments to make laws to meet the exigencies, condition, climate, soil, &c., of each State, and to regulate their own affairs in their own way. There is no division of the house against itself in the Constitution; it exists only in the efforts of such fanatics as Abraham Lincoln to create strife, stir up discords, set brother against brother, and father against son, in our great and happy household of confederated States.
 Four months after Mr. Lincoln's speech we find the Hon. Wm. H. Seward, the great leader of the black-republican party, expressing the same idea in his speech at Rochester, N. Y.:
 "Thus, these antagonistic systems are constantly coming into closer contact, and collision results. Shall I tell you what the collision means? They who think it is accidental, unnecessary, the work of interested fanatical agitators, and therefore ephemeral, mistake the case altogether. It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and it means that the United States must will, sooner or later, become entirely a slaveholding nation or entirely a free labor nation. Either the cotton and rice fields of South Carolina, and the sugar plantations of Louisiana, will ultimately be tilled by free labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become marts for legitimate merchandise alone, or else the rice fields and wheat fields of Massachusetts and New York must again be surrendered by their farmers to slave culture and to the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more a market for trade in the bodies and souls of men. It is the failure to apprehend the great truth that induces so many unsuccessful attempts at final compromise between the slave and free States, and it is the existence of this great fact that renders all such pretended compromise, when made, vain and ephemeral."
 Governor Chase, of Ohio, is another advocate of the "irrepressible conflict." A few days ago, at Pontiac, Michigan, he thus stated the issue, or rather his conception of the issue between the parties:
 "I ask you to take sides and decide where you will be. If the Lord be God, then serve him; but if Baal, then serve him." If slavery be right; if capital ought to own labor, then go to the doctrine openly. If you believe that freedom is the right of man, then join the party which has inscribed on the folds of its banner "Freedom throughout the country's wide domain."
 It may be well to add that we know of no party, save the black republicans, that contends for this issue. The democratic party is fighting for the constitutional rights of all sections—for the Constitution as it is, and for the Union as it is. They have nothing to do with slavery or anti-slavery. They do not proclaim "Slavery throughout the country's wide domain," nor do they proclaim "Freedom throughout the country's wide domain," for the simple reason that the Constitution leaves that question to be settled and decided by the people of each State, and each Territory when they come to form a State constitution preparatory to their admission into the Union, for themselves. Governor Chase would break down and trample under foot his solemn and salutary obligation of the Constitution, for in no other way could his party unfurl the banner of "Freedom throughout the country's wide domain."
 Hon. George W. Julian, once a member of Congress from Indiana, and at this time the republican candidate for Congress in the banner black republican district in that State, at a Fremont meeting in Greenville, Starke county, Ohio, on the 10th of September, 1856, thus delivered himself:
 "It is no use to deny it any longer. Our republican party is a sectional party, because the South has forced us into it. The stumpers of this old line, horse-stealing democracy, not having the fear of God before their eyes, charge us with being sectional. I tell you we are a sectional party. It is not alone a fight between the North and the South. It is a fight between freedom and slavery—between God and the devil—between Heaven and hell."
 On the 16th of January, 1855, the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, the pet of the black republicans of Brooklyn, New York, in a lecture in New York city, on the subject of cutting the North from the South, said:
 "All attempts at evasion, at adorning and concealing and compromising, are in vain. The reason of our long agitation is, not that restless abolitionists are abroad, that ministers will meddle with improper themes, that parties are disregarding of their country's interest. These are symptoms only, not the disease; the effects, not the causes."
 "Two great powers that will not live together are in our midst, and tugging at each other's throats. They will search each other out, though you separate them a hundred times. And if by an insane blindness you shall contrive to put off the issue, and send this unsettled dispute down to your children, it will go down, gathering volume and strength at every step, to waste and desolate their heritage. Let it be settled now. Clear the place. Bring the champions. Let them put their lances in rest for the charge. Sound the trumpet; and God save the right!"
 In his speech in the Senate, June 4, 1860, Mr. Sumner, of Massachusetts, thus reiterates the "irrepressible conflict" doctrine:
 "Senators sometimes announce that they resist slavery on political grounds only, and remind us that they say nothing of the moral question. This is wrong. Slavery must be resisted not only on political grounds, but on all other grounds; whether social, economical, or moral. Ours is no holiday contest; nor is it any

strife of rival factions; of White and Red roses; of theatric Novis and Bianchi; but it is a solemn battle between Right and wrong—between Good and Evil."
 Joshua R. Giddings, of Ohio, in a speech in the House of Representatives, May 16, 1854, said:
 "Mr. Chairman, it has become obvious to all that these conflicting institutions of freedom and slavery cannot flourish together under the same Government.—They can never be reconciled. They ever have been, they are now and ever will be, at war with each other. Virtue and crime will not commingle; Heaven and hell cannot be at peace."
 The Rev. Edmund H. Sears is an ardent black republican. He preached a sermon on the 15th of June, 1856, for the cause, which was afterwards published as a republican campaign document. From that sermon, thus endorsed, we quote:
 "There is no peace for the country, no safety for institutions, until slavery is dislodged from the national organism; until the Government of the country is wielded for liberty, righteousness, and civilization, and not for oppression, unrighteousness, and barbarism."
 The Hon. John Wentworth, an ex-member of Congress from Illinois, and at present the black republican mayor of Chicago, in an article in his paper, the Chicago Democrat, glorifying over Frank Blair's election in St. Louis, says:
 "While the great doctrine of the duty of the Federal Government to make the States all free thus receives endorsement in a slave holding State, shall the republicans of the free States lower their standard of principle?
 "The day of compromising, half-way measures has gone by. The year of jubilee has come. Already is the child born who shall live to see the last shackle fall from the limbs of the slaves on this continent. Universal emancipation is near at hand. The republicans have thrown their banners to the breeze, inscribed with Lincoln's glorious words, 'The States must be made all free,' and under it will march on to victory after victory, conquering, and to conquer."
 This doctrine also leads to the "long and bloody road" of abolition. If, indeed, there be an irrepressible conflict between slavery and freedom; if, indeed, this be the issue in conflict; if, indeed, the one or the other must triumph and the other be crushed out, then, as a matter of self defense, those so believing, whenever they get into power, will wield all that power to crush out and trample under foot the slave States of this Union, and to emancipate their slaves. This is the doctrine of the "irrepressible conflict" so loudly defended and advocated by Lincoln, Seward, and the black-republican party. Are the people of this country prepared for this? Men of the North, are you willing to engage in this crusade against your Southern brethren; to drench this land in all the horrors of civil war; to cut the throats of Southern men, "bone of your bone and flesh of your flesh?" If you vote for Abraham Lincoln!

The disregard of the black republican party for law! They spit upon the constitution and the decision of the supreme court of the united States!
 It has been well and truly said that "the law is the concentrated majesty of the voice of the people." He who violates a law, therefore, not only insults, but commits an offence against the people. In this Government especially are we called upon to yield obedience to the laws. In no other way can the Republic exist. We have a written Constitution, which our fathers made and which we must observe, if we expect to preserve our liberty, our independence, and our Union. That Constitution says:
 "No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."
 Under this provision, the Congress of 1793 passed, and Gen Washington approved, a bill for the rendition of fugitive slaves. In 1850, Congress amended this bill in some slight particulars, not altering its main features, or violating the principle of the act of 1793. The man who refuses to yield obedience to the Constitution and this law, as well as other laws made under its authority, is an enemy to his country.
 The Constitution also established the Supreme Court as the court of last resort, to interpret the laws of the land, and makes its decision obligatory upon every citizen. He who, therefore, refuses to obey its decisions, is an enemy to his country. This matter cannot be dodged or evaded. Inculcate in the minds of the people a disrespect and contempt for the laws and decisions of the courts, and our Government is destroyed, and might takes the place of right. Strikes down the bulwarks of the laws and the courts, and where is the security for life and property? By what title, then, would the farmer hold his land, the mechanic his tools, the merchant his goods? By that title only which the mountain robber of Scotland proclaimed, when he said that while one shock of grain remained, or cattle grazed on lowland plain, the Gaul, to mountain and heather heir, with strong arm will take his share.
 How important it is to every citizen that the Constitution and the laws of the country should be observed and obeyed. The infraction of one law leads inevitably to the infraction of another. If one man is allowed to violate one law on the ground that it conflicts with his ideas of duty under a "higher law," another man will violate another law on the same pretext, until no law will be observed, and all the

barriers which Government has erected for the preservation of the lives and property of its citizens will then be broken down, and the law of force will then be inaugurated. Is it not clear, then, that the man who refuses obedience to the Constitution and laws of his country is an enemy to the Republic? Judged by this standard, where stands the republican party to-day?
 We answer, their candidate for the presidency not only refuses to yield obedience to the decision of the Supreme Court but actually declares his intention to disregard that decision! In his Chicago speech, July 10, 1858, he said:
 "If I were in Congress and a vote should come upon a question whether slavery should be prohibited in a new Territory, in spite of the Dred Scott decision, I would vote that it should."
 Having thus set the example of disobedience to the Supreme Court, it is not strange that his supporters should run off in the same channel. Foremost of them we find Mr Sumner thus advising resistance to the fugitive slave law in a speech in Boston in 1850:
 "The good citizens, as he reads the requirements of this act, (relative to fugitive slaves), is filled with horror. Here the path of duty is clear. I AM BOUND TO DISOBEY THIS ACT."
 "Sir, I will not dishonor this home of the Pilgrims, of the Revolution by admitting—nay, I cannot believe—that this bill will be executed here."
 Again, in the Senate of the United States, we see him again, reiterating his determination not to obey the law. Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, asked, "If we repeal the fugitive-slave-law, will Massachusetts execute the provision of this constitution, without any law of Congress?" Will this honorable senator (Mr. Sumner) tell me that he will do it?" To which Mr Sumner replied: "Is thy servant a dog that he should do this thing?" Mr Butler continued: "Then you would not obey the Constitution. Sir, standing here before this tribunal, where you swore to support it, you rise and tell me it is the office of a dog to execute the Constitution of the United States?" To which Mr Sumner said: "I recognize no such an obligation."
 The Hon. Edward Wade, of Ohio, in the House, Aug. 2nd 1855, said:
 "Thus, sir, the thrice-execrable fugitive slave law, with its catch-pole bevy of slave hunting commissioners and deputy marshals, becomes a nullity and nuisance—the villainous concoction of slave holding usurpation and dough-faced subserviency and dissolved like stubble before the devouring fire."
 On the 11th of March, 1850, Senator Seward, of New York, thus spoke in the Senate:
 "All this is just and sound; but assuming the same premises—to wit: that all men are equal by their nature and of nations—the right of property in slaves falls to the ground; for one who is equal to the other cannot be the owner or property of that other. But you answer that the Constitution recognizes property in slaves. It would be sufficient then to reply, that this constitutional obligation MUST BE void, because it is repugnant to the law of nature and of nations."
 Again, in his speech at Albany, New York, October, 12, 1855, Mr. Seward said:
 "It is written in the Constitution of the United States, in violation of the divine law, that we shall surrender the fugitive slave. You blush not at these things because they are familiar as household words."
 Still again, in his speech in the Senate, March, 2d, 1858, Mr. Seward thus assailed the Dred Scott decision and the Supreme Court:
 "The Supreme Court also can reverse its spurious judgment more easily than we can reconcile the people to its usurpation."
 "The people of the United States never can, and they never will, accept principle so unconstitutional and abhorrent. Never, never. Let the court recede. Whether it recedes or not, we shall reorganize the court, and thus reform its political sentiments and practices, and bring them into harmony with the Constitution and the laws of nature."
 To the same effect is the address of the republican State convention of New York in October, 1857:
 "It is one of the most lamentable features of the present democratic degeneracy, that it has invaded even the sanctuary of justice, and from the seat once honored by Jay, Rutledge, Ellsworth and Marshall, now strains its equity through the sieve of sectionalism, in accents as barbarous as they are disgraceful to the nation to which they belong and the age in which we live. The infamy of the Dred Scott decision is but a legitimate sequence to the efforts that have been put forth to sectionalize and pack a tribunal in which was once centred the respect and confidence of the nation!"
 Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, who seem to have been a pioneer in the cause of assailing the Supreme Court, it will be remembered that in 1855, in the city of Philadelphia, a band of abolitionists, with Passmore Williamson at its head, rescued a fugitive slave from the hands of the officers of the law. For this he was tried, condemned and imprisoned. Referring to this matter in his speech at New York October 12th 1855, Mr. Wilson said:
 "We shall change the Supreme Court of the United States, and face men in that court who believe with its pure and immaculate Chief Justice, John Jay, that our prayers will be impious to Heaven while we sustain and support human slavery. We shall free the Supreme Court of the United States from Judge Kane. And here let me say there is a public sentiment springing up that regards Passmore

Williamson as his prison, at Philadelphia as a martyr to the holy cause of personal welfare, and to liberty. But there is a higher law than the Constitution, which regulates our authority over the domain, and devotes it to the same noble purposes.—App. to Cong. Globe, 1st Sess. 31st Cong., pages 263, 265.
 Again in a speech in the Senate, March, 1858, Mr. Seward said:
 "The interests of the white race demand the ultimate emancipation of all men.—Whether that consummation shall be allowed to take effect, with gradual and wise precautions against sudden change and disaster, or be hurried on by violence, is all that remains for you to decide."
 Still later, only a few days ago, at Boston he boldly proclaimed:
 "What a commentary upon the history of man is the fact that eighteen years after the death of John Quincy Adams the people have for their standard bearer Abraham Lincoln, confessing the obligations of the higher law which the Sage of Quincy proclaimed, and contending for weal or woe, for life or death, in the irrepressible conflict between freedom and slavery. I desire only to say that we are in the last stage of the conflict before the great triumphal inauguration of this policy into the Government of the United States."
 Gov. Chase, of Ohio, in his speech delivered in Cincinnati from which we have already quoted, said:
 "For myself I am ready to renew my pledge, and I will venture to speak in behalf of my co-workers, that we will go straight on, without faltering or wavering until every vestige of oppression shall be erased from the statute books—until the sun, in all his journey from the utmost eastern horizon through the mid-heaven, till he sinks behind the western bed, shall not behold the footprint of a single slave in all our broad and glorious land."
 Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, in his Boston speech in 1855, said:
 "Send it abroad on the wings of the wind that I am committed, fully committed, committed to the fullest extent, in favor of immediate and unconditional abolition of slavery, wherever it exists under the authority of the Constitution of the United States."
 In a letter written on July 29, 1855, the same Wilson wrote:
 "Let us remember that more than three millions of bondsmen groaning under nameless woes, demand that we shall remove each other, and that we labor for their deliverance."
 "I tell you here to night that the agitation of this question will continue while the foot of a slave presses the soil of the American Republic."
CONCLUSION.
 It will be perceived that we have made no quotations from that still more ultra and extreme portion of the republican party led by Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Abby Foster, Gerrit Smith, Redpath & Co., who have the merit of being more outspoken, bold, and violent in their assaults upon the Constitution and the Union; for the reason that, though voting with that party, yet some of the republican leaders in some of the States, such as Indiana, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, where black-republicans is of slow growth, affect to deny their authority to speak for the republican party. So, in these papers, we have confined ourselves strictly to quotations from the Representative men—the admitted leaders—the endorsed and everywhere acknowledged founders, creators, and nurses, advocates, and chief supporters of the republican party—the men who made this party, whose talents sustain, whose counsel direct, whose acts control it. No man can gainsay their authority to speak for it, for they themselves constitute the party. We have made fair and honest quotations from their speeches and letters. And now look upon the record. What does it all mean? The dissolution of the American Union, the emancipation of the Southern slaves, and the reduction of the Southern States and Southern men into the abject position of colonies and vassals.—This is the "bloody goal" at which black-republicanism strives. And what is the lesson this brutal programme ought to instill into the hearts of conservative men of the North? We unhesitatingly answer, Union for the sake of the Union.—When bad men combine, good men ought to unite; and when the bloody banner of fanaticism is unfurled to the breeze, and when treason, grown audacious and defiant, no longer skulls in secret, but with shameless front proclaims its principles and objects to the world, it is high time for the friends of law and order at the North to rally around the Constitution, and to raise aloft the flag of the Union, while yet we have a Constitution, a Union, and a flag, and before these Black Republican revolutionists succeed in inaugurating a reign of terror like the carnage of St. Domingo, and before the Republic of North America, rent into fragments, has become a thing of the past, a fact only in the page of history. There is but one political organization in this country that has the power to resist and roll back the waves of "fanaticism." That organization is the National Democratic party. Firmly planted in the hearts of the American people, descended from the pure and better days of this Republic contemporary with Washington, and Jefferson, and Jackson, it stands forth to-day, as it has ever stood the champion of the Constitution and the Union. It has encountered and overthrown the Black Republican disunion party upon one battle field. Let the conservative men of the country now rally to its standard, and it will gain meet, overthrow, and vanquish this dangerous enemy to the Republic, and give peace and security to the Union."