

U. L. A.

RECORD NO. 2.

DEMOCRATIC PROFESSIONS

VS.

DEMOCRATIC PRACTICE.

THEIR PARTY AND PLATFORM REVIEWED.

Published by the Union Republican Congressional Committee, Washington, D. C.

1868

The time was, when the Democratic party was a party of progress and principles; but even prior to the rebellion, it had long since out-lived its usefulness. Following the example of Jefferson, Madison and a host of the earlier statesmen and patriots, the Democratic party contributed largely to the advancement of the principles of republican government, and the security of individual rights; but, when it threw aside the armor of liberty, ignored and derided the great truths enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, and embraced the rotten and despotic theories of Calhoun, Rhett, Toombs, Yancey, Slidell, and their co-conspirators, the great party itself, became a conspiracy; not only against the Union of the States, but also against the liberty of man. When it declared, through its leaders, for the divinity of slavery, it became the foe of liberty—and the advocate and slave of despotism. From the time it ceased to honor its great statesmen, and commenced to reward only the truculent tools of a corrupt and despotic leadership, it became the enemy of liberty—the implacable opponent of the Union. It consented, in 1860, to its own disruption at Charleston and Baltimore, that the foundation for the dissolution of the Union might be securely laid.

The power of the Union to protect and preserve liberty was the only source of its offense to the Democratic leaders. Fearing the exercise of that power by the Republicans, they organized rebellion and sought to establish a Government whose corner-stone should be slavery, and the whole structure of which should consist of states torn from the national Union.

Singly and by pairs and squads the Democratic leaders of the South, in the legislative and executive departments of the Government, boldly, defiantly marched out of the high places they had betrayed and dishonored, not only unrebuked, but cheered and encouraged by their Northern allies. Not a man but was a Democrat went into rebellion; not a man but was a Democrat sympathised with or aided rebellion. The rebellion was, in its conception and progress, a Democratic measure, inaugurated, advocated, conducted, defended, and supported by none but Democrats. Its purpose was the establishment of a slave empire. Its advocates held that capital should own labor, that slavery was a divine institution.

Upon such theories and for such purposes was the Democratic party, by the voluntary action of its leaders, dissolved, and the war for the disruption of the Union entered upon with the approval of these leaders in every section of the country.

At the first National Convention of the Democratic party after the inauguration of rebellion—at Chicago, in 1864—the Democratic leaders, though separated from their Southern allies by pending hostilities, did not fail to express their sympathy with their old allies, declare the war for the preservation of the Union a failure, and the restoration of the Union as *it was* the only road to peace.

Strange to say, the same leaders who made, conducted, and consented to the rebellion still control the Democratic party. They were the ruling power in the national nominating Convention recently assembled,

and succeeded in forcing upon the party, candidates and a platform pledged to renewal of strife, even to war, if need be, in the interest of the defeated authors of the rebellion, and with the avowed purpose of restoring to its control men fresh from an assault upon the national life. Can any further evidence be required of the utter unfitness of the Democratic party under its present leadership to rule the country.

True, these wily and unprincipled leaders have, in the platform adopted by their 4th of July Convention made some specious promises. But what are their promises worth? Their whole political career is but a schedule of violated pledges and unmeaning pretensions.

As actions are a better index than words to the purposes of men, let us test the promises of these leaders by their practice; compare their words with their actions, leaving to honest men the conclusions.

The late Democratic Convention, which selected as its candidates Horatio Seymour and Frank P. Blair, commences its platform with the following declarations:

"The Democratic party, in National Convention assembled, reposing its trust in the intelligence, patriotism, and discriminating justice of the people, standing upon the Constitution as the foundation and limitation of the powers of the Government, and the guaranty of the liberties of the citizen, and recognizing the questions of slavery and secession as having been settled, for all time to come, by the war or the voluntary action of the Southern States in Constitutional Conventions assembled, and never to be renewed or reargated, do, with the return of peace, demand—

"*First.* Immediate restoration of all the States to their rights in the Union, under the Constitution, and of civil government to the American people.

"*Second.* Amnesty for all past political offences, and the regulation of the elective franchise in the States by their citizens."

Here we have, 1st. The stereotyped declaration of devotion to the Constitution by a body of men, one-third of whom are fresh from a four years' war against the Constitution, and the other two-thirds of whom fully sympathized with efforts to overthrow the Government.

What faith can be placed in the pretended veneration of such men as Hampton, Forrest, Vallandigham, Seymour, and Clymer, and the other leaders of that Convention, all of whom either fought against the Constitution, or remaining in safe places, exerted all their power and influence to de-

feat the efforts of the Government for its preservation?

2d. A simple recognition that with the downfall of the rebellion, slavery actually perished, but there is no acceptance of the logical consequences which follow the extinction of slavery. The freed people are wholly ignored.

Slavery abolished and the right of secession still maintained. These are all the results of the war as understood by the Democracy. In all other respects the States are, as they were, to be held in the iron grasp of a governing class, a privileged aristocracy, who are to lord it over 5,000,000 of the subject race, and retain in ignorance and degradation all of their own race not members of the favored class. That is, the 300,000 old slave masters, who made and conducted the rebellion, are to take possession of the conquered States and people and run the Government machine in the old groove.

LET THEIR WITNESSES TESTIFY.

That the purpose of the Democracy is, to destroy the reconstructed State governments, and restore the rebel leaders to power and control—let their candidates, and the men who controlled their convention witness:

[Extracts from letter of Frank P. Blair, June 30, 1863.]

"The Reconstruction policy of the radicals will be complete before the next election; the States, so long back excluded will have been admitted; negro suffrage established, and the carpet-baggers installed in their seats in both branches of Congress. There is no possibility of changing the political character of the Senate, even if the Democrats should elect their President and a majority of the popular branch of Congress. We cannot, therefore, undo the radical plan of reconstruction by Congressional action; the Senate will continue a bar to its repeal. Must we submit to it? How can it be overthrown? It can only be overthrown by the authority of the Executive, who is sworn to maintain the Constitution; and who will fail to do his duty if he allows the Constitution to perish under a series of Congressional enactments which are in palpable violation of its fundamental principles.

"If the President elected by the Democracy enforces or permits others to enforce these reconstruction acts, the radicals by the accession of twenty spurious Senators and fifty Representatives, will control both branches of Congress, and his administration will be as powerless as the present one of Mr. Johnson.

"There is but one way to restore the Government, and the Constitution, and that is for the President-elect to declare these acts null and void, compel the army to undo its usurpations at the South, disperse the carpet-bag State governments, allow the white people to reorganize their own governments and elect Senators and Representatives. The House of Representatives will contain a majority of Democrats from the North, and they will admit the Representatives elected by the white people of the South, and, with the co-operation of the President it will not be difficult to compel the Senate to submit once more to the obligations of the Constitution. It will not be able to withstand the public judgment, if distinctly invoked and clearly expressed on this fundamental issue, and it is the sure way to avoid all future strife to put the issue plainly to the country.

"I repeat that this is the real and only question which we should allow to control us."

It was upon this letter that Frank P. Blair obtained the nomination. It was the sentiment of this letter which brought Wade Hampton, and Gen. Forrest to his support.

Senator Bayard understands the platform and the Blair letter to be substantially the same. He says: "It (the platform) is in accord, in some measure, with the sentiments of the able statesman and gallant soldier who received the nomination for Vice President, General Frank Blair, of Missouri."

Speaking of the Blair letter the Charlottesville (Va.) Chronicle says:

"There cannot be two opinions among those who desire to see the Constitution re-established as to the doctrine of the letter, and we believe that the chances are in its favor as a matter of politics at this time.

"The Democratic party is nothing unless it is bold and aggressive, and the Blair letter, as well as the previous record of the General, furnish very good guarantees that he is the man to give it that character."

The Lynchburg *Virginian* of the same date is equally explicit in its endorsement of Blair's revolutionary programme. After denouncing the fourteenth amendment and the reconstruction acts as a farce, it says:

"Frank Blair proposes to dramatize the reconstruction acts in a way that would plague the inventors 'smartly.' We hope that the reins of Government will be placed in the hands of men who will have the nerve to undo, at any hazard, the wrong that has been done."

These are but samples of the manner in

which the Democratic candidates and platform are received at the South. The Blair letter is the key note to the campaign. It furnishes the rule for the construction of the platform. Every other issue is merged in the one fact that the reorganized State governments must be destroyed. This done, and the rebel leaders placed in control, all else becomes easy. The national debt may be repudiated or the rebel debt assumed at pleasure.

As claimed by the rebel orators, the election of Seymour and Blair is to be the triumph of the "lost cause," it is to gain by the ballot all they lost by the bayonet.

Governor Wise, of Virginia, in a recent speech declared that he admitted the loss of slavery, but adhered to the right of secession which would yet triumph.

FINANCE AND THE PUBLIC DEBT.

On this subject the Democratic platform presents the following:

Third. Payment of the public debt of the United States as rapidly as practicable; all moneys drawn from the people by taxation, except so much as is requisite for the necessities of the Government, economically administered, being honestly applied to such payment, and where the obligations of the Government do not expressly state, upon their face, or the law under which they were issued does not provide that they shall be paid in coin, they ought in right and justice be paid in the lawful money of the United States.

Fourth. Equal taxation of every species of property according to its real value, including Government bonds and other public securities.

Fifth. One currency for the Government and the people, the laborer and the office-holder, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bond-holder."

This is understood to the followers of the party to mean *gold*, greenbacks, or repudiation, to suit the locality.

The Nashville *Union and Dispatch*, a Democratic sheet, says:

"The Democratic platform provides that 'where the obligations of the Government do not expressly state upon their face, or the law under which they were issued does not provide that they shall be paid in coin, they ought in right and in justice to be paid in the lawful money of the United States.'—When this was reported to the convention it was greeted with 'thunders of applause.' The Democratic party is, therefore, pledged to pay the five-twenty bonds of the United States in greenbacks. The party is also

pledged by the platform to 'one currency for the Government and the people, the laborer and the office-holder, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bondholder.' There is no equivocation or doubt about the position of the Democratic party on the greenback question. The convention has come fully up to the requirements of the Democrats and Conservatives of Tennessee and the West on this issue. And Governor Seymour has planted himself fairly and squarely on this plank of the platform.— Whatever position he may have previously assumed, he is now pledged to the payment of the United States bonds, known as five-twenties, in greenbacks, and he will honestly and faithfully adhere to that position. He has never been known to falsify his pledges."

A Democratic orator in a neighboring city recently declared that the platform meant and was intended to mean absolute repudiation. That the debt having been contracted in the prosecution of an unconstitutional war, was itself unconstitutional and void, and could not be legally paid.

Any practical man will see that the greenback and repudiation schemes are substantially the same. To force the payment of the bonds by flooding the country with irredeemable paper is, so far as the people are concerned, equivalent to unqualified repudiation.

It would postpone the resumption of coin payments indefinitely, disturb values, destroy confidence, and end in final repudiation; whereas the whole difficulty may be avoided by bringing greenbacks to the gold standard, when it will not matter whether the bonds are paid in gold or greenbacks. To keep the public faith is to restore the industries and business of the country to prosperity, give stability to values, employment to labor, and to promote economy in public and private affairs.

The sixth plank of the Democratic platform calls for the reduction of the army; the discontinuance of the Freedmen's Bureau, and reform in the tax laws. These demands have already been anticipated by Republican legislation, but not without opposition from the Democrats in Congress. It further demands that the *currency be made good*, but does not suggest how this is to be done. It is therefore inferred that it is to be done by an issue of greenbacks to pay the five-twenty bonds.

The demand of the Democracy for the protection of American citizens abroad has also been anticipated by act of Congress, by which it is made the duty of the President to afford such protection.

The platform further adopts the Republican policy in regard to the public lands.

The administration of Andrew Johnson is fully endorsed.

It enters up a long list of charges against the Republican party, which have been in the mouth of every rebel and Copperhead from the beginning of the rebellion to the present time.

It will be seen by a careful perusal of the Democratic platform that it practically confesses judgment upon every issue, except that of the public faith and the restoration of the Union, and on these subjects it declares substantially that, the currency shall be made good by violating the national obligations, and then issuing the nation's promises to pay, just what it refuses to pay. First, discredit the Government paper and then force it upon the people. And on the question of restoring the Union it declares that, to the extent that restoration has been effected, it shall be destroyed, and the States be remitted to the condition they were in at the close of the rebellion, subject to the control of the rebel leaders. As they declared the war a failure in 1864, they declare restoration a failure in 1868.

But they further declare that, if entrusted with power they will *make* restoration a failure, by force of arms if needs be, and by Executive power will compel the admission of rebel leaders into Congress and the other departments of the Government.

Thus it is, the Democrats contend for the issue of an irredeemable currency and the restoration of the rebellion; and the Republicans contend for the maintenance of the public faith and the restoration of the Union. These are the issues, and the only issues, presented by the Democracy.

THE TESTIMONY.

When the rebellion was at its zenith, in the very height of its power, FERNANDO WOOD, then as now, a Democratic leader, said:

"The war should cease, because it should never have been commenced, inasmuch as there is no coercive military power in the Federal Government as against the States, are sovereign, and in possession of all which power not delegated. If power of coercion exists at all, it is legal and not military."

Mr. Wood desired to have the Union armies withdrawn, and the rebellion put down by a suit in court. He denied the power of coercion, but insisted that if it existed at all it was *legal* and not *military*.

HOW IS IT NOW?

Mr. Wood and his associates do not like the reconstructed governments. What is the remedy they propose? Is it *legal* or *military*? General Blair has already answered, on a preceding page that, it is military and not legal; That the Democratic President to be elected must, in defiance of law and of the law-making power, destroy those States, undo what has been done, force the representatives of the rebel oligarchy into the Cabinet and the National Councils, and "*compel* the Senate to submit." And it was because of this declaration that F. P. Blair, Jr., was chosen as the representative of a proposed rebellion which, the Democratic leaders, North and South, are advocating and organizing.

WHAT THE DEMOCRATIC LEADERS SAY.

TOOMBS.

Mr. Robert Toombs, in his late Georgia speech argued that all the action of the Government in reference to the South for the last three years was void and of no effect.

The St. Louis *Times* declares :

"If Mr. Blair become President, and swear to obey the Constitution, and fail to overthrow the oligarchy established by Brownlow in Tennessee, Blair would be perjured."

"There is but one way to restore the Government and the Constitution, and that is for the President elect to declare these (reconstruction) acts null and void, compel the army to undo its usurpations at the South, disperse the carpet-bag State governments, allow the white people to reorganize their own governments, and elect Senators and Representatives."—*Blair's letter.*

GOVERNOR VANCE.

"What the Confederacy fought for would be won by the election of Seymour and Blair."

A. H. Stephens said, when the Confederacy was organized that, it was to establish a government whose corner-stone was slavery. That is what the Confederacy fought for, it is what Vance says they will gain by the election of Seymour and Blair.

ANDREW JOHNSON.

In his late veto message, Mr. Johnson says:

"All the State governments organized in those States under acts of Congress, and under military control, are illegitimate and

of no validity whatever; and the votes cast in those States for President and Vice President, in pursuance of acts passed since the 4th of March, 1867, and in obedience to the so-called reconstruction acts of Congress, cannot be legally received and counted; while the only votes in those States that can be legally cast and counted will be those cast in pursuance of the laws in force in the several States prior to the legislation by Congress upon the subject of reconstruction."

Will Mr. Johnson, as General Blair suggests, use the army to abolish the reorganized States? He has by solemn proclamation declared that the governments found in the rebel States when the war closed were usurpations and void, and he abolished them by military edict. He now declares that all the governments organized under acts of Congress are illegitimate and of no validity. What then? Only this, that the governments organized by the military without authority of law, are legal, and votes under these governments must be counted; while governments organized under military rule, and under authority of law, are of no validity and votes under them must not be counted.

So that in the mind of Mr. Johnson, General Blair and the Democratic party, it is the law enacted in pursuance of the Constitution which vitiates the Government, and the absence of law which validates them.

This is precisely the position assumed in the Democratic platform, only the Convention was too cowardly to state it as clearly as has Mr. Johnson, Gen. Blair and Governor Vance. But let us call other witnesses.

GENERAL LAWTON.

The ex-Confederate General A. R. Lawton, said in a speech at Savannah, Ga.:

"Now, for the first time, we have a platform of principles and leaders around whom we could rally. It was the noblest, best, boldest declaration of principles ever laid down in the United States, and the demonstration here to-night shows it was in unison with the feelings of the people. There was nothing that the South wanted that was not there. The military despotism which has held us in thralldom was there set in its proper light. For the first time we have a platform we can adhere to. We have a work to do which can be accomplished. We have leaders to represent those principles who will carry us out of the 'Slough of Despond.' Peace has its vic-

tories as well as war; those great principles for which we fought, and which we feared were lost, may yet be achieved."

A REBEL NEWSPAPER.

The Augusta (Ga.) *Chronicle*, a bitter anti-reconstruction journal, quotes Seymour's speech delivered on his election as permanent President of the New York Convention, and Blair's infamous letter. It then says:

"The sentiments expressed by both candidates are consonant with the views and wishes of the Southern people, who only seek for that measure of justice which the Constitution and laws guaranty to every State and citizen. General Blair has only one way in which these outrages on the Constitution can be checked and remedied and the Government restored. It is this: The President shall declare the reconstruction acts null and void, compel the army to undo its usurpations at the South, disperse the carpet-bag State governments, allow the white people to recognize their own governments and elect Senators and Representatives."

The Mobile *Tribune* asserts:

"The great Democratic party will rise in its might and majesty, and pulverize and purge the Congress, just as Cromwell purged the long Parliament. The signs of the times are pregnant with resistance to Radical tyranny, and the dagger of Brutus may aid in accomplishing our redemption from Radical rule, ruin, and usurpation."

Does this mean that they will murder Seymour, if elected, that Blair may rule?

MORE REBEL WITNESSES.

At the Democratic convention held in Atlanta, Ga., one of the speakers, Clarke by name, "pledged himself before God to fight to the last the new governments that had been set up in the South."

The Memphis (Tenn.) *Avalanche*, in alluding to Blair's letter, says:

"For uttering similar sentiments to the above we have been denounced and called impudent. Had the above extract appeared in the *Avalanche* as editorial, the political fossils would have raised their hands in holy horror, and stigmatized us as a revolutionist. We would have been taunted with the worn-out stereotyped complaint that such imprudent expressions injure the Northern Democracy and the Southern people in the North. But, strange to say, it was the publication of the letter, from which we take the above extracts, that secured

Mr. Blair his nomination for the Vice Presidency. Thus it will be seen that the North is far ahead of the South. They are ripe for revolution."

The Charlottesville (Va.) *Chronicle* says: "General Blair was an Abolitionist and a war man; but those are dead issues, and, if he was sincere in his recent letter, he will answer our purpose."

Humphrey Marshall asserted in his Louisville speech that if the Democratic ticket was elected his party would "wipe out" all that had been done in the way of reconstruction, and the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution.

John Forsyth proclaims, through the columns of the *Mobile Advertiser*:

"Mississippi must vote, and the Democracy will see to its being counted. Texas and Virginia cannot go through with the forms of the Radical programme in time to be admitted before the election, as Congress will adjourn beforehand. But they must vote."

We summon these rebel witnesses—first, because they have the control of the Democratic party, and, second, because they are franker and honest men than the Copperheads.

Lest this may be disputed we place upon the stand

EX-REBEL GENERAL WADE HAMPTON.

In his speech at Charleston, after his return from the Democratic Convention, Mr. Hampton told the people that being on the committee on resolutions in the Tammany Convention, when it was proposed to insert the clause declaring that the "right of suffrage belongs to the States," he shrewdly asked what was to be understood by "States."

"I agreed to the propositions, but at the same time said that it seemed to me that they had omitted one very vital point, which was to declare to what States the doctrine applied. I thought it was necessary to guard and limit that declaration, and to the end that we might know at what time we could go back and say who were the citizens of the States, I asked that they would declare that these questions belonged to the States under their Constitutions up to the year 1865."

To this the Northern and Western men in the Convention objected as imprudent:

"Gentlemen were there from the North, South, East, and West, and by all we were met with extreme cordiality. They said they were willing to give us everything de-

sired; but we of the South must remember that they had a great fight to make, and it would not be policy to place upon that platform that which would engender prejudice at the North. They, however, pledged themselves to do all in their power to relieve the Southern States, and to restore to us the constitution as it had existed. As we were met in such a kindly spirit, I could not but reciprocate it. I knew that I was representing the feelings of my people when I did so, and I told them that I would withdraw all the resolutions I had offered, and no doubt other Southern delegates would do the same, and would accept the resolutions offered by Hon. Mr. Bayard, the Senator from Delaware, which declared that the right of suffrage belonged to the States. I said I would take the resolutions if they would allow me to add but three words, which you will find embodied in the platform. I added this: *'And we declare that the Reconstruction acts are revolutionary, unconstitutional, and void.'* When I proposed that, every single member of the committee—and the warmest men in it were men from the North—came forward and said they would carry it out to the end. Having thus pledged themselves, I feel assured that when the Democratic party come to triumph they will show us a remedy for our misfortunes in their own good time, for which I am perfectly willing to wait. Such is the history of our platform, and such were the motives which governed the committee in its formation."

To clinch the nail, the men of Hampton's mind secured the nomination of Mr. Blair, who had already declared publicly that the State governments in the Southern States must be, and if he had power should be, overthrown, by military force if necessary.

There is a whole volume in this short speech of General Hampton. It disclosed the fact, first, that he, (Hampton,) an ex-rebel general, dictated the Democratic platform on the subject of reconstruction. Is not this a complete surrender to the rebel leaders? What more could the rebels ask than to dictate the terms of settlement, had they been the conquerors instead of being the conquered? Did Lee prescribe terms to Grant at Appomattox? Yet here is General Hampton prescribing terms to the Democratic Convention. Could subserviency go lower, or cowardice sink a party deeper, than does this one fact?

But, second, Mr. Hampton says he let up on the Democracy because they had a hard row to hoe in the loyal States, and

they thought, therefore, that a plain declaration of what they meant *imprudent*. It would not do to let the people of the North know just what they intended. The real purpose of the platform must be kept from the people. But the committee promised him all he desired, and the warmest men in making these pledges were from the North. It was because of these warm demonstrations that General Hampton consented to withdraw his other propositions. He could not find it in his heart to force these Northern Democrats to tell the honest truth before the people. Therefore he considerably joined in to help cheat the people of the North, where the fight was to be hard, but in the South he must and would tell the truth.

Any one who will carefully read this speech of Hampton's will be convinced that the whole Democratic platform is a swindle, as are the candidates, and but for Hampton's courage and Blair's folly in disclosing the cheat, and making known the real purposes of the party, they would have stood a little chance of imposing upon some honest Democrats; but now that the fraud is exposed their plan is ruined.

MORE WITNESSES.

But here are a few more choice crumbs from rebel sources:

"The Montgomery (Confederate) constitution is better than ours, (United States)."—*Horatio Seymour to Judge Rugles, in 1861.*

"The 4th of July has ceased to be of the slightest interest to the Democracy, particularly of the South."—*Richmond Examiner.*

"The spirit of Wilkes Booth still lives, thank God! Therefore, take courage! Seymour, Blair, and the revival of the great cause is the motto of every true man!"—*Pine Bluff (Ark.) Vindicator.*

The New York World says:

"For as many crimes against law, Constitution, and human nature as our Congress commits, the British people would smash Parliament and hang peers and commoners in Hyde Park.

"Blood is thicker than water. Race stands by race, all except rump Congressmen. They stand by the negroes whom they stir up to rebellion.

"The new rebellion will array the people of the United States against two hundred thousand negroes and two hundred white

negroes in Congress. God save the radical rebels if they bring on more war, for the people won't save them.

"In case of a new rebellion Jefferson Davis will have a chance to go bail for his bondsman, whose paper now stirs up the war."

THE HONESTY AND PATRIOTISM OF SEYMOUR EXPLAINED.

Captain Marshall, a brother of Thomas Marshall, said, at a recent Kentucky Democratic ratification, "that he was enthusiastic in support of Seymour, and gave his reasons therefor. Seymour was nominated as a War Democrat, for the reason that no other could win. He was called a War Democrat, but he had never given any aid or support to the Government in prosecution of the war when it could be avoided. In 1863, when the rebel troops were in Pennsylvania, and the Government called on Seymour, who was then Governor of New York, to furnish troops to expel them, he answered in the same manner, if not in the same language, as the Governor of Kentucky in 1861, viz: that he would not send them. He did send them, however, for the reason that he was unable to do otherwise."

UTICA, N. Y., July 21, 1868.

DEAR SIR:—Your letter of the 16th inst. to Governor Seymour is received. He directs me to answer your interrogatories, and say he does not own a United States bond, and never did own one; and he never dealt in bonds or banking of any kind.

Very respectfully yours,

B. D. NOXON, JR.

To H. R. DUNN, Esq., Bloomington, Ill.

This testimony ought to be satisfactory to rebels, it certainly will be to loyal men. Here is his own statement that he would not trust the Government, and of his friend that he never aided it, even in his official capacity, except as he was forced to. Nominated as a War Democrat: 1st. Because they could elect no other; and 2d. Because he was opposed to the war and sympathized with the rebellion. Seymour and the platform are an exact match. Both swindles, contrived and selected to cheat the people of the loyal States, and serve the purposes of the rebel leaders. Seymour himself admitting that he would be dishonored if he accepted the nomination. No witnesses are needed to prove that he then spoke the truth.

In view of the facts hereinbefore presented, we charge the Democratic party:

1st. That it has proved false to its early record and history, false to liberty, false to the country, its laws and Constitution, and false to the people whom it seeks to govern.

2d. That it in no honest sense represents the loyal people of the nation, but on the contrary, is consorting with, and controlled by, the disloyal and despotic partisan leaders who organized and conducted a gigantic rebellion against Constitutional liberty and in the interests of a slave-holding oligarchy.

3d. That by the confession of its own leading advocates it has, by its national delegates in convention assembled, adopted and published to the country a platform of principles for the purpose of cheating the loyal people into its support, while it rests under secret pledges to rebel leaders to give them all they desire.

4th. That while professing veneration for the Union and the Constitution, it stands pledged to destroy the one and disregard the other.

5th. That its candidate for the chief office by the confession of his own partisans is, and has been, a foe to the Government and a friend to the conspiracy for its destruction; that professing to be a War Democrat, he is and was a rebel in disguise, as is proven by his past record and the uncontradicted statements of the rebel leaders who placed him in nomination. That he has been thrust upon the party, against the judgment and wishes of its honest supporters, and by a clique of corrupt and disloyal leaders.

6th. That its candidate for the second office is in open and undissembled sympathy with the rebel leaders, and pledged to re-open the conflict against the Union if entrusted with power.

7th. That, as claimed by the rebel leaders and press of the South, and not denied by leaders or press in the North, the election of these candidates upon this platform will be the defeat of loyalty, the triumph of treason, and the renewal of rebellion. If these are the objects for which Democrats desire to vote, then Seymour and Blair are the men to vote for. If there are Democrats, and we believe there are, who desire a restored Union, just laws, the maintenance of the public faith, and the peace and prosperity of the Republic, let them vote for GRANT and COLFAX.