

The Herald.

A. K. BHEEM, Editor & Proprietor.
J. A. DUNBAR, Editor & Proprietor.
C. A. LITTLE, P. A.

Friday Morning, July 24, 1868.

President—Gen. Ulysses S. Grant.
Vice President—Schuyler Colfax.
Auditor—John F. Hartranft.
Seymour—Jacob M. Campbell.

Republican County Convention.

Delegate Elections.

At a meeting of the Republican County Committee, on the 18th inst., it was ordered that a Republican County Convention be held at Rhenus Hall in the Borough of Carlisle, on Monday the 10th day of August next, at 10 o'clock A. M. for the purpose of nominating a County Ticket, and selecting Senatorial and Congressional Candidates.

21. That an election for two delegates to represent each Ward, Borough and Township in said Convention be held at the usual places of holding Ward and Township Elections on Saturday the 9th day of August next. Said elections to be held in the Boroughs and Townships between the hours of 7 & 9 o'clock P. M., and in the Townships between the hours of 4 & 6 o'clock P. M. of said day. A full Convention is earnestly desired.

July 18th 1868. By order of the Committee.
C. P. HOMERICK, Chairman. CHAS. H. MULLAN, Secretary.

The Rebels forgot, one plank in their platform which should read thus: "No distinction between the loyal soldier who fought for his country, and the rebels who took up arms to destroy it."

Seymour will probably poll the full Copperhead vote, but will lose all the conservative Republicans who aided the Democratic party last year. His nomination is the weakest one that could possibly have been made. Even in his own State he has always run behind his ticket.

ALLUDING to the "headless rooster" now on exhibition in New York, the Herald don't see anything remarkable about it, and adds: "Headless bipeds are to be met with every day in our streets. There were a vast number of them in town during the sittings of the Democratic National Convention."

THE RESULT.—Seymour delivered a "famous speech," as the Copperheads thought, on the Fourth of July, 1868, when at the Academy of Music, New York, was crowded with people who had gathered to get advice from him. Ten days after, the most dreadful riots which ever took place in that city occurred, and patriots were butchered without mercy.

A GROSS INSULT.—The nomination of Seymour is an affront to every Union soldier, an insult to the friends and memory of every dead hero, and an offence to every loyal man. If the Copperheads can bear the burden they have just shouldered, no one but themselves can find fault after the election.

POOR CHASE.—What a miserable end has this ambitious renegade reached! Rejected by the traitors of the Copperhead rebel party, and spurned by his former friends, the Republicans! Poor Devil! He did not even receive the support of Hampton, Forrest, Brick Pomeroy and the other great lights of the blackleg New York Convention.

HENRY A. WISE, while addressing a Seymour and Blair meeting at Richmond said that he did not care for the platform. It told a lie in its first resolution. It said secession was dead; that was not so; secession was more alive than ever. He supported the nominees, and especially Blair, because he had declared that he would assume military power. This is the hope of all Southern rebels.

SHERMAN FOR GRANT.—Gen. W. T. Sherman, who commanded the army that marched to the sea, has declared for Grant, and against the rebel ticket nominated at New York. The Corps are now busy calling him a house-burner, &c. He knows them, and will help to whip the scoundrels at the ballot-box as he did in the field. Hurrah for Sherman!

THE DIFFERENCE.—The Republican party placed at its head at Chicago, on the first day after the convention, and that, too, by a unanimous representative vote of the patriots of the land. The Democratic party, at New York, after five days' bitter fighting, including private bickering on the Sabbath, placed a renegade soldier at the tail end of the ticket.

"MY FRIENDS!"—This was the term of endearment addressed by Horatio Seymour to the New York rioters of 1863, who burned down Orphan Asylums, ransacked women and children alive, and strung up to lamp posts the objects of their hate. He certainly knew the import of the words when he called these red-handed murderers his "friends"; and his true position is easily understood in the light of the proverb that "a man is known by the company he keeps."

THE ADOPTION of the Democratic Repudiation platform cost the people nearly twenty millions of dollars the first day. The New York journals report that a decline of one per cent. in Government securities instantly followed the promulgation of that manifesto. This was a loss of two months' interest, and figures up the sum we have named, on the interest-bearing debt. The repudiators desire to make it cost more than that before they get through.

Work to be Done in this Country.

The Republicans of this country have become too much accustomed to regard themselves as unable to successfully compete with the Democracy. As a result of this feeling we find indifference and inactivity in the different political campaigns. This is entirely wrong, and we sincerely hope that in this most important of all campaigns in the history of the country to find every friend of the party in the county ready and willing to put his shoulder to the wheel, and do his utmost to push on our great and glorious cause. We may not be able by a single effort to carry our ticket in the county, but we must not forget that in its effort upon the State and national ticket every Republican vote cast here counts just as much and has as great an influence as one cast in a strongly Republican district.

Let us all, then, enter upon the campaign with zeal and enthusiasm, determined to do our full share in the great work.

Never did we have the Democracy at so great a disadvantage. Their candidates and their platform alike breed distrust and division in their ranks. The old time enthusiasm and energy seem to have entirely deserted them.

The successful termination of the war to preserve the Union, and the attendant overthrow of slavery has robbed them of their great source of political inspiration, while the success of the Congressional policy of reconstruction has so utterly taken out of the hands of their rebel allies all power of mischief, that assistance even from that quarter is no longer possible.

The single element of public plunder still serves as an incentive to action among the leaders of the party, but the masses seeing no gain for themselves cannot be aroused even by this appeal. Of course sympathy with the rebels serves as a cement to hold the party together, but it utterly fails to kindle the enthusiasm and zeal which in days gone by were wont to make them dangerous, and, too often, successful foes.

On the other hand the Republican party embracing in its creed the great principles of right, justice, equity and humanity, feels confident of success, and enters the campaign with the determination to win. Everywhere will it poll its full vote, and add to that vote thousands of converts, who to-day are ashamed of the candidate who by his rebel harangues incited the bloody draft riots of 1863, and who are unwilling to endorse the repudiation policy of the New York platform.

It becomes us in this county to make unusual efforts, and now is the time to begin. The campaign is fairly opened, and a thorough organization of the party should at once be perfected. "The boys in blue," and Grant and Colfax clubs should at once be organized. Republican documents and journals should be scattered far and wide. Let meetings be held throughout the different townships, at which the farmers and mechanics may meet and discuss among themselves the vital issues of the campaign, and there let the masses become informed of the dangerous policy of the Democracy, and the character and antecedents of their candidates. Let these things be done and we will be able to make great inroads upon their majority in the county. All we need is enthusiasm and a few men can accomplish but little, but let the people themselves take hold of the matter and within a few years, if not this time, will we be able to carry Cumberland county for the cause of right, justice and humanity.

Unblushing Fraud.

The Volunteer of yesterday contains a leading article which it says is copied from the editorial columns of the New York Tribune. After giving the total majority for President LINCOLN in eleven States, and commenting upon that result, the article proceeds as follows:

Here is a list of States which are reasonably certain for SEYMOUR and BLAIR: Connecticut, 9; Delaware, 3; New York, 23; Kentucky, 11; New Jersey, 7; Missouri, 11; Pennsylvania, 20; Wisconsin, 3; Ohio, 21; Kansas, 4; Indiana, 10; Maryland, 7; Oregon, 6; California, 9. Total, 100.

Now one hundred and fifty-nine votes are a majority of the full electoral college. If the Radical Congress decides to count the votes of the reconstructed States, we may add to this Democratic vote the following: Alabama, 8; Mississippi, 7; Georgia, 24.

Swelling the Democratic column to 184 votes. Now the infamy of this publication consists in the fact that it never did appear in the New York Tribune nor anywhere else in the Carlisle Volunteer; and to print it as an extract from the Tribune is a most stupendous fraud. That the New York Tribune or any other respectable or truthful newspaper should all its readers that either New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Nevada, Missouri, Kansas or Wisconsin are "reasonably certain for SEYMOUR and BLAIR" is so utterly preposterous that it carries its own refutation with it. That the Volunteer should attempt to befoul its readers is entirely in keeping with its own venacious reputation, but we are not content that its base forgery of a respectable endorsement to such an enormous falsehood should go unchallenged.

THE ISSUE.—The issue is fairly before the people. On the one hand the Copperheads offer NATIONAL DISGRACE! ANARCHY! CONFUSION AND WAR! On the other, the Republican party offers HONOR! HAPPINESS! PROSPERITY! PEACE!

Choose ye between them!

A New Rebellion Threatened.

This the Democratic Convention was well fitted, and in a great measure controlled by rebel delegates is a fact well known throughout the land that comment upon it is almost unnecessary; but, in order that our readers may have some idea what those rebels intend to do if they can succeed in electing SEYMOUR and BLAIR, we propose to give a few utterances from the lips of their leading men.

Ex-Gov. WISE of Virginia says, he cares nothing for the platform of the party, that its very first resolution is a lie wherein it states that secession is dead, for, says he, it is more alive now than ever; he further says he will support the candidates, and especially BLAIR, because he promises to take the sword in his hand and restore to them (the rebels) their rights.

Gov. VANCE of North Carolina said a few days since in the speech he delivered at Richmond, "the cause of the South is not lost, but will again triumph in the election of SEYMOUR and BLAIR."

And now comes WADE HAMPTON, the leading rebel of them all, who delivered a speech to the Democratic-rebel association in Baltimore, in which he told his Maryland friends that they were especially dear to the Southern heart, not because of revolutionary ties, or from old associations, but, says he, "there are still warmer reasons why I should make my acknowledgments, for I remember that when I was a soldier in the glorious army of Northern Virginia, the sons of Maryland swept across the borders, and again stood side by side with South Carolina in the great contest for liberty."

He goes still further and says that great contest for liberty (meaning the rebellion) is not ended. We of the South submit, not because we feel ourselves conquered, but because to create trouble, or raise riots would injure the Democratic party. This may not be his precise language, but it is in the main correct.

Thus it is boldly proclaimed by the leading men in the party; that if the Democracy succeed in electing SEYMOUR and BLAIR, riots and war are once more to be inaugurated, and the doctrine of rebellion to be disseminated throughout the land at the point of the sword, and the mouth of the cannon.

Honest, peaceful Democrats, are you prepared to lend the assistance of your vote to this threatened rebellion? If not, vote for GRANT and COLFAX who desire peace and prosperity and not war and ruin.

WISE, VANCE and HAMPTON, in their speeches, boast of the prospect, and BLAIR, the candidate for the Vice Presidency, boldly threatens a new rebellion, and a thorough organization of the party should at once be perfected. "The boys in blue," and Grant and Colfax clubs should at once be organized. Republican documents and journals should be scattered far and wide. Let meetings be held throughout the different townships, at which the farmers and mechanics may meet and discuss among themselves the vital issues of the campaign, and there let the masses become informed of the dangerous policy of the Democracy, and the character and antecedents of their candidates. Let these things be done and we will be able to make great inroads upon their majority in the county. All we need is enthusiasm and a few men can accomplish but little, but let the people themselves take hold of the matter and within a few years, if not this time, will we be able to carry Cumberland county for the cause of right, justice and humanity.

Under this analysis it is evident that Grant, who is no orator, may yet be a statesman, while Seymour, who is an orator, is not therefore a statesman, unless he has other claims to the title. It appears from Webster that in a low sense, a politician is a statesman; but if when Seymour's friend says he is a statesman, that we need such an office, they merely mean that he is a politician they are using high-sounding words to deceive the public, who have so often shown that they really do not want a mere politician in the Presidency. Nor can it be justly claimed that when people say we want a statesman for President they merely mean, in the language of another party to this definition, "one employed in public affairs." For Grant has been that, and on a far greater scale than Seymour. "A man versed in these arts of Government" comes a little nearer to the mark, but not near enough, since a man may be all that and yet not be of much value. The true definition is "one eminent for political abilities," and by that standard of statesmanship we propose to try both Grant and Seymour.

Whose shall we find the evidences of Seymour's eminent political abilities? He has never held a national office of any kind or description. The grand affairs of national and international politics have, therefore, been wholly beyond his reach or control. With what measure of decided importance has his name been identified? We do not remember any, and if there be such, we challenge his friends to point to it. It is not requisite that he should have been in power to carry out his suggestions. Let his friends point to any he has proposed on his own account. But eminent political abilities may sometimes be shown by steadfast opposition to bad measures, and here, perhaps, is what his friends depend upon. His objection first of all to the coercion of the rebel States. We undertake to say that this fact alone is enough to sink all his claims to statesmanship. No other course than war was possible, and at the very time that Seymour advocated peace for the purpose of deceiving Democrats and leading them to oppose any Republican policy that might have been adopted, the rebel leaders, in their Congress and State Legislatures, were proclaiming openly that compromise was impossible, that independence was their aim and had been for thirty years.

We defy any supporter of Seymour to go before the people and assert that his opposition to the war at the very outset

"Everything is Fair in War."

We are informed that the feelings of our venerable friend, the senior Editor of the Volunteer, were terribly outraged by a report which reached him from the Democracy of Middlesex township. As we heard it, we report it.

One of Mr. BRATTON's opponents for the Congressional nomination, it seems went down to Middlesex to endeavor if possible to secure the delegates from that township. The conversation, that is reported to have taken place between him and one of the leading, but ignorant Democrats is reported as follows:

Candidate.—Well you are you in for the Congressional fight?
Leading, but ignorant Democrat.—I am inclined to support Mr. BRATTON.
Candidate.—(mad).—Support BRATTON! Why?

Democrat.—Because he has stood up for the party through thick and thin, as well when it was the old union party, as now when it sympathizes and encourages rebels, and besides, I like his editorials in the Volunteer—they are fierce, vindictive and maliciously good. I like them, nay, I may even say, I admire them.

Candidate.—(With an honest face and earnest voice) What! Like the editorials in the Volunteer? Admire them! Why sit I have been writing those editorials for the last ten years!

Democrat.—(Surprised and astonished) I know you. BRATTON is a humbug. Confound it, I thought he wrote those editorials, but, if you are the man who did them up, I'll be bound to stand by you.

Candidate.—(A little ashamed of himself, but nevertheless jubilant) Bully for you! Send me the delegates from your township, and I'll give you a quarter the first rainy day I see you.

Democrat.—(With countenance all a glow, and mouth wide open) All right! Depend on me.—(Aside) Does he think he can make a bigger fool of me than I am naturally, although I am a leading but ignorant Democrat!

Common upon this transaction, certainly unnecessary. To endeavor to rob Mr. BRATTON of the credit and honor (?) due him for his staidness and BRICK POMEROY style of editorials, is truly outrageous, even though the robber be a Democratic candidate for Congress. The old maxim that Republics are ungrateful, is evidently over-ruled. Mr. BRATTON, in the ingratitude of the men you helped to rear up in the faith of your party.

The Question of Statesmanship.

We read constantly the assertion that Mr. Seymour is a statesman, and that we need such men at the head of the government. Now let us see what is a statesman. Webster defines the word to mean "A man versed in the arts of government, especially one eminent for political abilities; a politician; or one employed in public affairs." In this definition we find no reference to oratory. It appears that a man may be a statesman without being a public speaker. Jefferson and Franklin and Roger Sherman were such. They were not orators at all. But their statesmanship was of the very highest type. No matter how many, how strong or how plausible may be the speeches delivered by the man, they do not necessarily make him a statesman.

Under this analysis it is evident that Grant, who is no orator, may yet be a statesman, while Seymour, who is an orator, is not therefore a statesman, unless he has other claims to the title. It appears from Webster that in a low sense, a politician is a statesman; but if when Seymour's friend says he is a statesman, that we need such an office, they merely mean that he is a politician they are using high-sounding words to deceive the public, who have so often shown that they really do not want a mere politician in the Presidency. Nor can it be justly claimed that when people say we want a statesman for President they merely mean, in the language of another party to this definition, "one employed in public affairs." For Grant has been that, and on a far greater scale than Seymour. "A man versed in these arts of Government" comes a little nearer to the mark, but not near enough, since a man may be all that and yet not be of much value. The true definition is "one eminent for political abilities," and by that standard of statesmanship we propose to try both Grant and Seymour.

Whose shall we find the evidences of Seymour's eminent political abilities? He has never held a national office of any kind or description. The grand affairs of national and international politics have, therefore, been wholly beyond his reach or control. With what measure of decided importance has his name been identified? We do not remember any, and if there be such, we challenge his friends to point to it. It is not requisite that he should have been in power to carry out his suggestions. Let his friends point to any he has proposed on his own account. But eminent political abilities may sometimes be shown by steadfast opposition to bad measures, and here, perhaps, is what his friends depend upon. His objection first of all to the coercion of the rebel States. We undertake to say that this fact alone is enough to sink all his claims to statesmanship. No other course than war was possible, and at the very time that Seymour advocated peace for the purpose of deceiving Democrats and leading them to oppose any Republican policy that might have been adopted, the rebel leaders, in their Congress and State Legislatures, were proclaiming openly that compromise was impossible, that independence was their aim and had been for thirty years.

We defy any supporter of Seymour to go before the people and assert that his opposition to the war at the very outset

Was Statesmanlike.

Yet that is the key to his whole subsequent course. For when the rebel constitution was adopted he held it to be better than our own, and recommended its acceptance and substitution for ours. He talked of compromise, at a time when a Democratic President was still in office, and the only compromise he could have meant would have been a complete surrender to whatever demands the rebels might have made.

Was this a proof of eminent political ability? Did it show in Mr. Seymour such a capacity as ought to recommend him to citizens now when the rebellion is crushed and the war a complete success? And what are the bad measures against which he contended, and upon opposition to which his claims to statesmanship rest? Conscription, emancipation and a vigorous prosecution of the war! If the war was a bad measure, then Seymour was a statesman, for he opposed it as far as he possibly could.

The more vigorous the prosecution the more his opposition grew. There was no form the war could take that he did not contend against. He seemed constantly to imagine, or to pretend to do so, that war could be waged without expense or loss of life. In the midst of a significant struggle, when we needed the aid of all northern men, he was never weary of complaining of the conduct of the contest and of weakening the confidence of the people in their government and generals. Was this statesmanship? Was this eminent political ability? As for emancipation, his hostility to that infatuated entire course. He refused to see that it was a necessity of the war, and his statesmanship consisted in demanding that the war should be terminated without destroying slavery. Now, either Abraham Lincoln was not a true statesman or Horatio Seymour was not, for on this question they were diametrically opposed.

On the conscription question he did all that lay in his power, to engage the people against the system. He wanted volunteering to remain, the only effect of which would be to involve every locality in hopeless bankruptcy for centuries, while the evidence was visible everywhere that the bogus system had debauched the service and rendered it mercenary. All great military powers in time of war are compelled to depend on conscription. All other systems are failures. His other antagonisms were opposition to the arrest of spies, blockade runners, conspirators, traitors and fomenters of mischief, opposition to the removal of incompetent generals, opposition to the determination of the general government to countenance no compromise or surrender.

And this is all of the much vaunted statesmanship of Horatio Seymour. This is the eminent political ability that is to lead the great republic on its pathway of imperial grandeur and glory. It was search for his measures and policy, we are pointed to the party platform, with which he says he agrees and which he says he helped to make; yet at the same time we know that the financial features of that platform are in direct hostility to his own printed opinions. More statesmanship!

As to the claims of General Grant to the title of a statesman, although little has been said about them, they are much better founded than those of Seymour. The proof is in the manner in which he gained the confidence of the enemies he conquered, by his magnanimous terms and by his defense of them when Johnson wished to begin a policy of blood-revenge. That we call statesmanship of the highest kind. We point to his open and bold declaration against the "French invasion of Mexico, while yet no American. Statesman of eminence had taken that advanced position. We point to his reduction of the expenses of the War Department five millions of dollars during his brief administration as Secretary. We point to the astute manner in which he thwarted the efforts of Johnson to destroy the reconstruction system by using "him as a tool against Congress. These are positive achievements, which prove him to be a man of great decision of character, and of indubitably eminent political abilities. He sustained, Sheridan at New Orleans manfully, and all his orders issued under the reconstruction laws show him to be the man of the times."

We extract the above from that most excellent and discreet Republican organ, the Philadelphia North American.

Brains and Buttons.

The Democratic press say that the Presidential contest is between "brains and buttons," Seymour having the brains and Grant the buttons, and that brains are sure to win. Talking about buttons, they must have forgotten Blair. The Cincinnati Times asks a few questions on the subject, something in this wise: Where was "brains" when "buttons" was receiving the surrender of Vicksburg, the Western Rebel Gibraltar? He was telling his "dear friends" that the Rebels could not possibly be conquered! Where was "brains" when "buttons" (Meade) was chasing General Lee from the decisive battle of Gettysburg? He was on that very day telling the country we could not afford to prosecute the war any longer, that the Rebels would certainly succeed! Where was "brains" while "buttons" was fighting it out on that line, telling the world that the "Confederacy was a shell," and that it had robbed both "the cradle and the grave" in vain?

He was urging upon the people the truth of the Chicago platform with the celebrated clause, "after four years of failure," &c., and still insisting that the shell could not be broken, and there were enough more in the cradle and with one foot in the grave to whip us all and destroy the Republic! But previous to this in 1861, when "brains" volunteered as a mere colonel

of a regiment to sustain the old flag?

Alas, having just read the Confederate Constitution, he asked a friend how he liked the document, and on getting the reply that it was an improvement on our own Constitution, "brains" asked why he did not adopt it for the whole country, and thus end the strife forever! Well, readers, which do you prefer on the record, "brains" or "buttons"? If that is all that "brains" amounts to, every one who was loyal during the war says give us "buttons" forever. "Buttons" has gloriously triumphed thus far, and "brains" of such an added sort are bound still to lose.

The Utica Herald, published at the home of Horatio Seymour, thus baits his nomination for President:

"He has secured by indirection and subtlety a nomination which he pretends that he would not take. He has demonstrated his illimitable ambition, and he has explained the motive of the left-handed blows which he dealt in his recent speech at the annual meeting. He has stripped himself of the veil under which he prepared his toils. He is the same man that was beaten in this State in 1864, and he can be beaten no more in 1868. The candidate is to be sharp, bitter, and decisive in this State. Of the election of Gen. Grant there is no doubt. But New York must lead the Republican hosts. All that was needed to arouse determination and kindle enthusiasm is provided. Republicanism is now a duty and every voter honor call to the front!"

"For this Horatio Seymour is the same man who declared in 1861, that successful secession would be a revolutionary act; that is to say, that the triumph of the rebel arms would be much to be deprecated as the success of the Rebellion. It is the same Seymour who, in October, of the same year proclaimed that if the Union could not be preserved without the destruction of slavery, the Southern people must, at all hazards, be protected in that institution. It is the same Seymour who, in 1862, sneered at the Union army, and tauntingly asked for the promised victory; the same Seymour whose teachings led to the passage of the drafts, and fanned the flames of the riot which his friends reviled. It is the same Seymour who assailed Lincoln in his lifetime and after his death; who has never yet recognized the emancipation of the slaves; who has done more than any other single individual to obstruct the fair game and to break down the credit of the Republic. During the war he played the part of Cassander, always magnifying his own valor, always denying the fortunes of the nation, always predicting ruin, and thus always contributing to that result. He is the same Seymour who, after the Government, Horatio Seymour would have been fitly chosen to be the presiding genius of the illegally reared-on remnants of the Republic.

"The sanctity, and affability, and apparent self-sufficiency which enabled him to hoodwink the Convention, will be freely used as capital to induce Republicans in this country and in State to sustain him. They will think more than twice as fast as they are wont to do, and yielding to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love. He is the same Seymour who, in 1864, yielded to the temptation, Mr. Seymour never yet extended a political courtesy to a political opponent. No man is more bitter than he in assaults on antagonists. His speeches always overflow with bile, and malice, and utterly unsupported assertions against the party which he professes to love.