

# The Oregon Sentinel.

PER ANNUM, IN ADVANCE.

JACKSONVILLE, SATURDAY JULY 2, 1864.

VOL. IX.—NO. 24.

**O. F.—Jacksonville Lodge**  
No. 10, A. F. & A. M.  
Hold their regular communications on the Wednesday Evenings on the 1st, 3rd, 5th, 7th, 9th, 11th, 13th, 15th, 17th, 19th, 21st, 23rd, 25th, 27th, 29th, and 31st of each month, at 7 o'clock, at the Masonic Hall, at the corner of 1st and 2nd streets. Brothers in good standing are invited to attend. The dues are \$1.00 per month, and \$2.00 for initiation. ALEX. MARTIN, W. M. Sec'y.

**REGON CHAPTER NO. 4, OF THE GRAND ARCH MASONS, JACKSONVILLE, OREGON.**  
Hold their regular communications on the 1st, 3rd, 5th, 7th, 9th, 11th, 13th, 15th, 17th, 19th, 21st, 23rd, 25th, 27th, 29th, and 31st of each month, at 7 o'clock, at the Masonic Hall, at the corner of 1st and 2nd streets. Brothers in good standing are invited to attend. W. H. S. HYDE, H. P. Sec'y.

**B. F. DOWELL, ATTORNEY AT LAW,**  
JACKSONVILLE, OREGON.  
Office in all the Courts of the Third District, the Supreme Court of Oregon, and the Supreme Court of California. War Scrip promptly paid. Oct. 18.

**J. GASTON, ATTORNEY AT LAW,**  
JACKSONVILLE, OREGON.  
Office in all the Courts of the Third District, the Supreme Court of Oregon, and the Supreme Court of California. War Scrip promptly paid. Oct. 18.

**GEORGE B. DORRIS, ATTORNEY AT LAW,**  
JACKSONVILLE, OREGON.  
Office in all the Courts of the Third District, the Supreme Court of Oregon, and the Supreme Court of California. War Scrip promptly paid. Oct. 18.

**J. S. HOWARD, ARCHITECT AND CIVIL ENGINEER,**  
JACKSONVILLE, OREGON.  
Office near the South end of Oregon Street. January 2, 1864.

**PETER BRITT, PHOTOGRAPHIC ARTIST,**  
JACKSONVILLE, OREGON.  
Office near the South end of Oregon Street. January 2, 1864.

**G. W. GREER, DENTIST,**  
JACKSONVILLE, OREGON.  
Office near the South end of Oregon Street. January 2, 1864.

**R. O. J. GATES, DENTIST,**  
JACKSONVILLE, OREGON.  
Office near the South end of Oregon Street. January 2, 1864.

**DUGAN & WALL, HARDWARE AND COMMISSION MERCHANTS,**  
JACKSONVILLE, OREGON.  
Office near the South end of Oregon Street. January 2, 1864.

**RESIDENT CITY, CAL.**  
Office near the South end of Oregon Street. January 2, 1864.

**MAX MULLER'S, PHOTOGRAPH ALBUMS at HAINES BROS'S**

**Conciliation.**  
The following sensible article, from the daily *American Flag*, of San Francisco, should be read by every true Union man. It applies in Oregon as well as elsewhere:

There are a number of professed "Union organs" in this city and elsewhere, that insist upon the adoption of a "conciliatory policy" toward Copperheads and traitors. These "moderately loyal" journals think that the Union party will be seriously impaired by the open denunciation of the sympathizers with the rebellion, and recommend a "conciliatory" course as the most effectual mode of securing the conversion of traitors into loyal men. For ourselves, we should no more think of employing argument or persuasion upon Copperheads than upon the venomous reptile that has been selected as the most appropriate type of their party. The hatred of the traitor to his country does not originate in the intellect, and cannot be removed by argument. It springs from no misapprehension of facts, and no statement of facts can cure it. It would be as practicable to attempt to turn Floyd, or Benjamin, or Polk, or Pillow from their adherence to the Confederate cause by a resort to logic and rhetoric, as to endeavor to sway the Secessionists of California by similar appeals. Yet, according to the theory of divers "loyal" papers of this State, Grant should throw aside the weapons of carnal warfare, and resort to the milder instrumentalities of argument and persuasion. The sensitive feelings of traitors are to be respected, and all language which can wound them is to be sedulously avoided. Such is the line of policy prescribed to us by the self-constituted censors of the "loyal press." But we cannot adopt the prescription—so long, at least, as we continue to regard treason against our country as a crime rather than an error; a moral taint rather than an intellectual aberration.

The "moderately loyal" have long enough practised this mild and inoffensive policy of "conciliation." And what are its results? Instead of making treason odious and traitors detestable, they have educated the public mind into a condition of latitudinarian toleration that ignores all the moral distinctions involved, and causes the difference between rebels and loyal men to be regarded as mere political differences. It is in consequence of their teachings that such papers as *Brown's Press* have come to be viewed as mere "opposition journals," instead of organs of the Confederacy, which they really are. It is by virtue of their milk-and-water loyalty, and the lukewarm patriotism which they have taught, that the mouthpieces of treason have come to be treated as respectable opponents to be refuted by argument, rather than as organs of the public enemy, to be suppressed and silenced by the strong hand of authority. There is a point in every controversy where argument is exhausted, and beyond which it is an impertinence and a folly. Long ago that point has been reached in the issue between loyal men and the adherents of the Confederacy. What we now require is, that every man's position should be clearly defined, and that the full responsibility of his position should be cast upon each individual. And so, too, with all parties, sects and organizations, of whatever name or description. The "Union party" can derive no strength from the ostensible adhesion of secret enemies. Those who are not heartily with it are virtually against it; and the sooner they are compelled to show their true colors, and array themselves openly with those who have their good wishes, the more easily it will be to nullify their power for evil. What is to be gained by pretending to regard as friends those who we know are enemies at heart, and who are only restrained from avowing their hostility by prudential considerations? What kind of political wisdom is that which seeks to swell the apparent strength of a party by enrolling among its members, and counting as a part of its reliable forces,

mercenaries who stand ready to desert to the enemy the moment they can do so with safety?

So far as the Union party is concerned, it is above all things else desirable that it should know upon whom it can count in the day of trial. No man whose loyalty is more than skin-deep will be driven from its ranks by the honest denunciation of any party, or any sect, that chooses to array itself against the Government. In the existing state of things, the Union party has nothing to gain by conciliation. This is to-day a policy by which treason alone can profit.

A stern and unrelenting intolerance of disloyalty is the policy as well as the duty of those who are in earnest in the support of the Government. For that "moderation" which is sometimes a virtue is often a suicidal imbecility; and there are crises in which it becomes an unpardonable crime. In times of imminent peril, it is the watchword of the whole herd of politic and treacherous natures. Such "moderation" is only another name for selfishness and cowardice. Moderate loyalty and moderate patriotism are of the same base quality as moderate friendship; they are but synonyms for that cold indifference which is alike incapable of genuine affection or hearty hostility. The cause of the Union can gather no strength from the formal adhesion of men whom a word of rebuke administered, to the sect or party with which they are identified, can drive into the ranks of the enemy.

In fighting the great battle of Union and Freedom against its confederated foes, nothing is to be gained by the weak and shallow policy of timid conciliation. One of the greatest statesmen that ever lived summed up the whole wisdom of statesmanship in the simple maxim: "Employ all means to conciliate; those failing, all means to crush." Long ago "all means to conciliate" have been exhausted, and policy, patriotism and religion, now unite in the triple sanction of "all means to crush."

## The Constitution as it is.

Such is the watchword and battle-cry of the Democracy of these latter days. It is a marvel that far transcends all recorded feats of necromancy, how men living in the midst of passing events, and acquainted with the patent facts of cotemporary history, can be so blind as to believe that the "Constitution as it is" can be the organic law for the new nation that is to emerge from the chaos of civil war. The Constitution as it is recognizes slavery. For years it has been the chief bulwark of that institution. For years, the Christian and the philanthropist who felt an instinctive hatred of that system of abominations, were paralyzed in their warfare against it by the knowledge that it was sanctioned by the organic law of the land, and that, as loyal citizens, they were not only restrained from assailing it, but were bound to maintain and defend it wherever it had already obtained a foothold. But after the strange and momentous events of the past three years, what sane man dreams that the hideous idol of our modern Democracy can ever be restored to its ancient prestige?—that Northern freemen will again consent to have the duties of slave-catchers imposed upon them by law?—that the National capital will ever again be allowed to be desecrated by auctions, at which human beings are sold like cattle, under the wondering gaze of the representatives of all the civilized powers of the world?—or that an institution which has brought upon us all our present sufferings, will be permitted to have any legalized existence in the new republic?

All this is simply impossible. The "Union as it was" is a thing belonging to past history just as much as the Babylonian Empire or the Achaean League. The Constitution as it is cannot be the Constitution of the future. We wish to speak of it with all reverence, as the noblest, wisest, and altogether the most perfect paper charter of

government ever devised by uninspired intellect. When adopted, after grave debate and long consultation by the patriots and sages whose work it is, it might well have been considered a monument of political wisdom. It embodied all the lessons of the past, but it could not include the yet unrevealed teachings of the future. Even its originators knew it to be an imperfect work—the best, perhaps, that circumstances would admit—but still imperfect. It involved a compromise with an acknowledged wrong and an undisputed evil. We all know how the great founders of the Constitution regarded the system of slavery, and their expectation that, if tolerated for a brief season, it would quietly perish. The story has been often told, and need not be repeated. It is familiar to all well informed persons, and is disputed by none but the ignorant or dishonest.

Jefferson and Hamilton, Washington, Madison and Jay, did not regard the Constitution as perfect, in the shape in which they left it; but they looked forward to its regeneration by the removal of its sanction of slavery. Why, then, should we hesitate to declare that the world has advanced since the great charter was adopted; that God in his providential dealings has so enlightened the conscience of the nation, that it can no more rest under a constitution sanctioning slavery, than it can return to the belief in the Salem witchcraft, or the cosmology of the Greeks?

But were the Constitution ever so excellent and perfect, it would be vain to seek to exempt it from the operation of the universal law of change. Individuals, nations, institutions, forms of Government—yea, the solid earth itself, are all subject to the vicissitudes of growth, development and decay. It is a folly of which only political dreamers or political knaves are guilty, to prate about unchangeableness of any Constitution. As the world changes; as civilization advances; as the mind and will of the Almighty are more clearly developed in His dealings with the nations; as old abuses and worn out barbarisms pale before the purer light that presages the millennial years, "milder manners, purer laws," better Governments, and more perfect Constitutions will be inaugurated. He who opposes such changes attempts to bar the path of Progress and Humanity, prefers darkness to light, heathenism to Christianity, and the stereotyped traditions of the past to the bright promise of a glorious future. The English Constitution, the best under which any great community has ever existed for a period of many centuries, has undergone changes without number. From age to age it has accommodated itself to the development of the nation and the advancement of enlightenment. It was not the same under the Tudors as under the Plantagenets, nor under the Stuarts as under the Tudors. The progress of the people was not checked out of reverence to the Constitution, but the Constitution was modified to keep pace to the wants of the people. So it must be with us. Laws and governments, and all civil institutions, however excellent, are but means for the accomplishment of great ends; and when those ends can be best promoted by a change of the means, it is no wiser to object than it would be to make the casket of more value than the jewels it is designed to contain, or to think, with the Pharisees, that man was made for the Sabbath, rather than the Sabbath for man.—S. F. Flag.

## The Conservative Republican

The following article comes from the *Alton (Illinois) Telegraph*. We will recommend its careful application to certain skin-milk Union men in this county. Some of them having given a full shriek for freedom some four or five years ago, think that they ought to carry the Union party on their shoulders, in addition to maintaining the relations of "very pleasant gentlemen" with venomous Copperheads. The *Telegraph* says:

"If there is any class of men we feel jus-

tified in despising on Christian ground, it is the one consisting of those who, from want of character, have no distinctive marks from other men, except the want of marks of distinction—to find whose principles you would have to get out a search-warrant, and then make a return of *non est inventus*—not in in our ballwick. Men whom nobody can say anything against, nor anything for, except that they never hurt anybody—as far as heard from; men whose position is such that at any moment they may become the champions of any cause or doctrine without violence to past professions or consistency. They are the neuter genders of religion, and hermaphrodites of politics, dressed in political long clothes to throw the weight of the political ambiguity on the side of the tender exemption due to "phainal weakness." They are like the needles we used to be sent for when a boy—"betwixt and between, warranted not to cut in the eye." They are political dough faces gone to seed.

"Outside of those cowardly scoundrels who make the name of Conservative a mask for the most malignant, covert treason, we make little or no distinction between the neutral and the conservative. Cowardice and selfishness—the most ignoble blemishes of our human nature—are controlling elements in both. A Conservative Democrat—in the degenerative sense of the word—is one who takes to treason by instinct. A Conservative Republican is one who is waiting to take it when it succeeds and becomes popular. He wants to lock arms with both extremes, and keep a hand in the pocket of each. He votes for the Union like a patriot, and apologizes for it like a traitor. He talks with either side like a champion, but in the presence of both keeps silence like a neutral. Will not offend by saying either is right, but has no doubt both are wrong. He is prudent, and calls it keeping his own counsel—which counsel will always be found to have a *milled* edge. He has reproaches for radicals and excuses for rebels. Ultraism is true in theory but false in practice. He hates slavery, and abhors an abolitionist. The abolitionist's principles are right, but in the wrong place—good for the country that has nobody to be offended by them. He talks right, too, but out of time. It is well enough to think like an abolitionist, but heinous to act like one. Slavery is a bad thing to get, but a good thing to keep. It is wrong to maltreat a slave, but an unpardonable sin to irritate his master.

"Such is the conservative Republican. When the Republican party wins, can he not say that he always voted the Republican ticket? And if the opposition triumphs, can he not say that he always condemned the Radicals, and then drop without a qualm into the lap of victory? He holds on to the Union handle with such a gentle grip, that it will not lacerate his fingers to jerk it out of his hand. He pretends to run with the Union machine, but somehow gets tangled up with the other's ropes whenever it is like to be the first to the fire. He keeps on the Union track, only to be caught up by the rebel cow-catcher when the screech train makes the best time. He is a still-born patriot, that cannot cut the umbilical cord that binds him to the treasonable Democracy. He puts his political light under a bushel—rather he shows you a bushel to make you think there is a light under it. He is moderate, and must not be blamed for not going as far as we do. We do not blame him for not going as far as we do, but for claiming the same mileage. No doubt he goes as far and as fast as his legs and brains will carry him—but to claim the merit of being a first class coarser after getting distanced on the first heat—that is the *jokey* quality of it. Fellow-shiping with traitors, hob-nobbing with rebels and their sympathizers, and yet insisting that he is as good a Union man as he who hates both, and is willing to fight them! We should detest such emaculated creatures, if we did not find them more suitable subjects for commiseration and contempt."