feelings of our Northern Men being carried too far, even the conservative part of them. They did but just endure the compromise of 1850 which if nature permits, which I think it does not, admits slavery into Utah & New Mexico after the South had already got twice as much New Territory as they were fairly entitled to.

But we ought all the while to remember that the South, at any rate the Whig portion of it, stood up manfully against the admission of Texas, and we should remember also that the Nebraska Bill did not originate with the South but was tendered to their acceptance by Northern Men. I cannot excuse the rulings of the south for agreeing to accept it. I know they would much rather it had not been offered, but they ought to have opposed it like Men of faith & honor as Bell\textsuperscript{21} of Tennessee & Hunt\textsuperscript{21} of Louisiana, not to forgetting Houston\textsuperscript{21} of Texas opposed it.

I think we should frame our opposition so that wise and conservative southern men could unite with us in it. If we do so we may avoid the mischief on both sides.

I am very Respectfully Yours

X.

SALMON PORTLAND CHASE TO JOHN GREINER.\textsuperscript{22}

Private & Confidential

Washington, May 10, 1854.

My dear Sir,

Wade\textsuperscript{23} has shown me your article of the 3d inst. He has written, he tells me, to Galloway\textsuperscript{24} in the same sense, and I hope that letter will be published and do much good.

I send you an article which you can publish or not as you see fit. Don't print it unless you think it will be of some use.

As I said to you when here, I am entirely ready to unite with all my heart in a new political organization embracing the

\textsuperscript{21}John Bell; Theodore G. Hunt; Sam Houston.

\textsuperscript{22}He was a frequent contributor to the Ohio State Journal; at a later date the editor of the Columbus Gazette; composer and singer of temperance and political songs. See Lee's Hist. of Columbus, v. 1, p. 478.

\textsuperscript{23}Senator B. F. Wade.

\textsuperscript{24}Samuel Galloway.
names of the existing Whig Party & the liberal Democrats, which will boldly call itself the Democracy and deny that title to any proslavery organization whatsoever. Nothing short of that, in my judgment, will ensure triumph. Without that the Independent Democrats must of necessity maintain their distinct organization, although, doubtless, they will be willing to cooperate with all opponents of slavery extension, whatever organization they may think it necessary to uphold.

There must be either a new Party, "a Democratic Party, the Democracy of numbers, the Party of Liberty," or there must be cooperation between the existing parties opposed to the slavery extension scheme of the administration.

Talking of this subject the other day Wade said a good thing: "Let us have a Democracy" said he, "and try titles for the name with the rascals."

Yours truly,
S. P. Chase.

John Greiner, Esq.
Columbus, O.

P. S. Please send me the Journal Daily, I will send the price in after days.

[ENCLOSURE]

"The Position of Parties."²⁵

Will you, Mr. EDITOR, give me a little space in which to express my most hearty concurrence in the opinion announced by you in a recent number of your paper, that the Party to which occurrences now transpiring must give rise "Will be a Democratic Party, the democracy of numbers, the party of Liberty, and its name will be legion."

Nothing can be more ridiculous than to call the Administration Party the Democracy; and nothing is more certain than that this name, boldly assumed by that party and hitherto unadvisedly conceded to it by its opponents, is the chief source of its strength.

There was a time when real democrats had some objects in common with the slaveholders of the slave States. They agreed,

²⁵Follett has written "Griswold" on margin of this article, as if he were the author.
for example, though upon very different grounds, in opposition to the Alien & Sedition Laws, and to the Bank of the United States. That time has gone. The old democratic organization is now departed from its former position to a mere instrument for the advancement of the Manholders oligarchy. The great, pressing question of this day, which can neither be postponed or evaded, is the Slavery question. On that question real democrats occupy no common ground with slaveholders. Hence the growing weakness of the administration party. Hence the open revolt from its ranks of the great body of our German fellow citizens, as well as thousands upon thousands of the most honest and sincere democrats in the land.

Now there must be a party, liberal in principle, honest in purpose, and democratic in name and fact, in which all, who concur in the great act of overthrowing the Slave Power and driving slavery out of every hiding place in National Legislature or National territory, can unite.

Nobody can doubt that such a party will carry Ohio. With Ohio as a basis of action, it can carry the country. So mote it be.

A Democrat.

XI.

JOSEPH MEDILL\textsuperscript{26} TO THE EDITORS OF COLUMBUS JOURNAL

Cleveland May 29, 1854.

[Office of Daily Morning Leader]

Ed[itor]s Journal

After a temporary political separation we find our respective papers occupying a common platform and struggling to accomplish a common end. Such being the case we can approach and hail each other without formality or reserve.

The suggestion of a State convention of the people on the 13, July, has received the endorsement of all the leading presses

\textsuperscript{26}Joseph Medill was one of the organizers of the Republican party in Ohio, 1854. At Cleveland in 1852, he established the “Daily Forest City,” which was consolidated with the “True Democrat” in 1853, under the name of “Daily Forest City Democrat,” that name being changed, 1854, to Cleveland Leader. He sold his interest the following year, removed to Chicago, where he purchased an interest in the Chicago Tribune.