

party has been in existence for some years the attachment of its adherents, could this attachment be resolved into its component parts, would be expressed by something like the following formula:

Party machinery and "spoils" 3 parts; party spirit and prejudice 2 parts; party inertia 4 parts; principle 1 part.

To pit a principle against parties and leave the party organizations untouched, as Dr. Spear would have us do, would be to give the opposing principle the tremendous advantages of party machinery, and of the spirit, prejudice and the *inertia* of party. This is precisely what the friends of Prohibition have been doing for these many years, and the result is what we have seen.

This was the difficulty which the anti-slavery men encountered in the 'fifties.

Horace Greeley* in 1854 wrote:

"It has long been our belief that a thorough dispersion of parties, with an obliteration and disuse of all their machinery, watchwords and discipline, as often as once in twelve years, if not at the close of each Presidential contest, would be a public blessing. We have witnessed such baleful results of blind partisan bigotry—of unreasoning devotion to this or that party standard because of the name thereon inscribed—of dishonest practising on this fanaticism, in the confident belief that the great body of the party will swallow anything that bears the approved label—that we should be perplexed, if required to say whether party spirit has done more good or evil."

It is exceedingly instructive to remember that although public sentiment was becoming in the North overwhelmingly anti-slavery, yet up to the very breaking of the old parties in the 'fifties these parties became more and more pro-slavery. They did not reflect at all the growing sentiment. On the contrary, with their expiring energy, they enacted the most obnoxious of all pro-slavery measures, as the Fugitive Slave Law, the Repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and made possible the Dred Scott Decision. Again an ounce of fact is worth a ton of logic. The anti-slavery principle had no chance to be heard until the Whig party (the party "more likely to sympathize with" abolition) was smashed, and party spirit and machinery got out of the way.

But we are told by Dr. Spear:

"The creating of a new political party has never succeeded, even once, in the whole history of this government. The Republican party of to-day is not an example of such creation. This party, formally organized in 1856, was not a new party contending for the mastery against two other parties in the field, and finally conquering both, but was simply the old Whig party under a new name, with elements of strength derived from the Liberty party and also the Democratic party, while some of the Whig elements, especially in the Southern States, went into the latter party. The Whig party gave place to the Republican party and was merged into it, and, with added elements, took a new name. Such are the facts in the case."

What besides these four elements constitutes a party—(1) name, (2) party machinery, (3) dominating principle, (4) membership? The

* N. Y. Tribune, July 18, 1854.