The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

MARIUS R. ROBINSON, EDITOR. "NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS." ANN PEARSON, PUBLISHING AGENT.

VOL. 13.---NO. 13. SALEM, COLUMBIANA COUNTY, OHIO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1857. WHOLE NO. 631.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE. PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT SALEM, OHIO, by the Executive Committee of the Western Anti-Slavery Society.

TERMS.—$1,50 per annum payable in advance Or, $2,00 at the end of the year.

☞Communications intended for insertion, to be addressed to MARIUS R. ROBINSON, Editor.

Orders for the paper and letters containing money in part payment for the same, should be addressed to ANN PEARSON Publishing Agent, Salem, Columbiana Co., Ohio.

☞Money carefully enveloped and directed as above may be sent by mail at our risk.

☞We occasionally send numbers to those who are not subscribers, but who are believed to be interested in the dissemination of anti-slavery truth with the hope that they will either subscribe themselves or use their influence to extend its circulation among their friends.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

One Square (10 lines) three weeks,	$1,00
" " Each additional insertion,	,25
" " Six months,	4,00
" " One year,	6,00
Two Squares six months,	5,00
" " One year,	8,00
One Fourth Column one year, with privilege of changing monthly,	12,00
Half column, changing monthly,	20,00

☞Cards not exceeding eight lines will be inserted one year for $3,00; six months, $2,00.

J. HUDSON, PRINTER.

LOCAL AGENTS FOR THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

George Roberts, Brighton, Michigan.
Phebe T. Merritt, Ionia, Michigan.
Adrian, Samuel Hayball, Michigan,
Livonia, Harriet Fullet "
Plymouth, Isaac N. Hedden, "
Ypsilanti, Emeline DeGarmo, "
" Samuel D, Moore, "
Union City, John D. Zimmerman, Michigan,
McRoy Grove, Tho's Fox, "
Battle Creek, Phebe H. Merritt, "
Bedford, Henry Cornell, "
Farmington, Abram Powels, "
Wolf Creek. Warren Gilbert, "
Ann Arbor, R. Glazier. "
West Unity, J. H. Richardson, Ohio.
Edinburgh, Thomas C. Heighton, Ohio.
Joseph Puckett, Winchester, Indiana,
Wm. Hern, Brighton, Indiana.
G. L. Gale, Northport, Indiana.
Wm. Hopkins, Freemont, "
Elizabeth Morse, Angola, "
Henry Bowman, Johnstown, Barry Co. Mich.
Daniel Earle, Newton Falls, Ohio.

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

HOW TO SAVE THE UNION—THE CLEVELAND PAPERS AND THE DISUNION CONVENTION.

From the Cleveland Leader (Republican.)

THE DISUNION CONVENTION.

In spite of the withdrawal of the publication of the Call for this convention, and its postponement on account of the pecuniary distress of the country as it is alleged, a respectable sized audience assembled at Chapin's Hall yesterday afternoon and evening, and discussed the propriety of dissolving the Union between the North and the South. Messrs. S. S. Foster, Charles L Remond, Parker Pillsbury, Wm. H. Burleigh, Mrs. Abby Kelly Foster, and other distinguished disunionists, took part in the proceedings. They will continue the discussion to-day.

The Convention has men of very fine talents and great ability among its members, who are influenced in their movement by a feeling of uncompromising hostility to Slavery, and who have devoted the greater part of their lives in showing up and exposing the iniquities of the system, and that too, in the most effective manner. It is a matter of regret that these men should be laboring so earnestly, and we must say futilely, in endeavoring to bring about that state of things, which for the sake of the down-trodden slaves, we trust will never happen, a dissolution of the Union, and thus gratify a great portion of the Southern wing of the amalgamation Democracy of the South Carolins, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi school, which has been laboring to bring about this identical thing for the last twenty-five years, under the lead of Calhoun, McDuffie, Butler, Bully Brooks, Hangman Foot, Stephens, Toombs and other prominent Disunion Amalgamation Democrats. We say it is a matter of regret, that the members comprising this Convention should be engaged in such a movement, because their talents and energies are completely misdirected, although they are earnest and sincere, in following what they consider to be the only plan for destroying American Slavery; and that if the same amount of labor and earnest zeal had been expended in appealing to the ballot-box to prevent the spread of Slavery, they would have done more, yea, a hundred fold more, in crippling it and eventually lead to its final extinction, than they have ever done heretofore or will do hereafter by the same course that they have pursued.

It will be seen by reference to another part of this paper, that we have given a report of the proceedings of the Convention, and will continue the reports of the doings to-day.

From the same.

This Convention was in session yesterday afternoon, and existed last night in spite of the violent attacks of the *Herald* and *Plain Dealer*. The *Herald* editors, we are informed, on being applied to by the Secretary of the Convention, Mr. Howland, to have the proceedings published, declined very cavilierly to admit them into their columns; and one of them voluntarily expressed the very amiable wish that the six thousand callers of the Convention were suspended *a la* Haman. This wish beats that of hangman Foot by a majority of 5,999; for he only wished to hang one—but that one being a United States Senator, it is presumed perhaps that the quality may make up the lack of numbers. Hereafter the *Herald* folks will have the reputation of being very pat *riotic*.

The *Plain Dealer* (its editor being an office-holder) is excessively indignant that a few gentlemen and ladies should presume to meet in the year 1857, in the city of Cleveland, within a quarter of a mile to the Post Office of the august editor of that immaculate sheet, and go through the form of resolving the great American Union out of existence. The *Dealer* emitted a quantity of slang against this harmless body, and acted as though the editor thought the union sure enough was sliding, and he, in consequence, sliding out of his fat office. He says: "It will be asked who sympathise with these men in their damnable treachery to the only bond which holds in harmony the people of these thirty-one States?"

We can answer that question most satisfactorily. The Southern wing of the Democratic party has been actively at work for years acting just like these Garrisonian disunionists, and threatening to dissolve the Union. President Pierce's Secretary of War, Jeff. Davis, and the late Mr. Calhoun, whom no one will deny having been a leading Democrat, were the principal leaders in this disunion attempt. Mr. Calhoun went so far that Old Hickory threatened to have him hung. Yet the *Plain Dealer* never denounced him as a traitor. Why? Because he was an Amalgamation Democrat, and what he did is orthodox in the estimation of the effervescent, patriotic editor of that sheet.

Not a session of Congress passed but that some amalgamation spouters dilate for hours on the possible dissolution of the Union. But the cry of "traitor," "damnable treachery," and "fanaticism," is never raised against them by the editor of the *Plain Dealer* nor does the *Herald* ever express a wish to have them hung. But when a corporal's guard of ladies and gentlemen get together for the purpose of amusing themselves, and perhaps the community, with a Quixotic attempt to dissolve the Union, the editors of the *Herald* and *Dealer* forthwith take a dose of Seidlitz powders, and in their patriotic effervescence, almost explode with indignation.

This is a free country. We are in favor of all expressing their opinions upon the perpetuity of the Union. If the Union is so mortally weak that it cannot stand the attack of a Convention of ladies and gentlemen, why then the editors of the *Dealer* and *Herald* had better call an opposition convention to neutralize the effect of this terrible disunion body.

From the Plain Dealer (Democratic.)

THE DISUNION CONVENTION.

In September it was announced that the Disunion Abolitionists to the number of six thousand had signed a Call for a Convention to meet at Cleveland to make measures for the dissolution of the American Union. With these traitors to the country the propriety of dissolving the Union is a foregone conclusion. While the country seemed distracted by the financial pressure of the times, with backruptcy staring the business interests into paralization, these Abolitionists halted in their audacious movements.—The Convention was attempted to be postponed. But yesterday the leaders of the advance guard—the "forlorn hope" of the Black Republicans arrived in this city, organized at Chapin's Hall and declaring the postponement as an unauthorized movement, leaped into the discussion of its chief end the dissolution of the Union with all the characteristic fanaticism of the last years campaign. Abby Foster, Parker Pillsbury, Remond and others were on hand. W. Lloyd Garrison arrived to-day. C. C. Burleigh, of Connecticut, was also there, all burning with the incendiary passion and expression glorifying the expediency, the practicability and the duty of our immediate dissolution of the American Union. But we cannot paint the features of the Convention so vividly as the actors themselves have done in their resolutions. Read them.

At the opening of the afternoon session the following resolutions were offered by the Business Committee. [Here follow the resolutions.]

It will be asked who there are who sympathise with these men in this damnable treachery to the only bond which holds in harmony the people of these thirty-one States? A much larger body of people from Maine to the Mississippi than is generally suspected must be counted in this category. More than six thousand have signed the Call. They themselves count upon a large body of old Liberty men, and vast numbers of the Black Republicans as their supporters. All together in a solid phalanx, they voted for Fremont last year, believing, and asserting that it was precipitating the country upon the verge of a Dissolution of the Union. They count with reason, upon gathering hosts of men brought up in the school of Black Republicanism to the extreme of this fanatical notion. They, Abby Kelley, and Foster and Garrison, will all tell you that the party will be stronger in 1860 than ever, and that thousands of public men and tens of thousands of voters are much better planted on this higher law platform than they dare to openly avow. They claim this to be the position of Governor Chase, and publicly advocated his election during this last campaign in Ohio, asserting that he was ripe for this measure, but only too much of a coward to avow it. Black Requblicans may play cool to the act of these fanatics, but in the re-action which has followed the inglorious defeat of 1856 there will be found a large body of those who will not fall back, but having been pushed to the extreme of fanaticism will maintain the position and cling to this bold and revolutionary party which would make a bonfire of the laws and Constitution of our country, with as little compunction as they would of the wooden idols of all heathendom, or the bibles of all Christendom.

From the Cleveland Herald [Republican]

THE CONVENTION OF CROTCHETS.

Our goodly citizens, with one accord, exclaimed, "It is an ill wind that blows no good," when the announcement was made, that the revulsion of the times had capsized the plans of the getters up of a 'Disunion Convention," to be held in this city. But no sooner were the words out of the mouth, than it was found to be a mere jump "from the frying pan into the fire," inasmuch as that postponement had resolved itself into a Call for a meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society—an organization holding disunion doctrines. In truth, this small band of dyspeptic men and bilious women, associated in this Anti-Slavery Society, tried a new scheme for mischief by giving the movement the name of a National Disunion Convention, but failing to make that scheme work, they relapsed into their old monotonous tread-mill of treason, and, for two days, have been talking to empty benches against this "infamous Union."

The central position of Cleveland, has made it a convention focus, and we beg, for the credit the city, that it will be well understood our geographical position alone determined the place where these restless, diseased spirits should congregate. We have not recognized a citizen of Cleveland as having any part or lot among this motley crew, who would, had they the power, drive the ship of State upon the rocks; they are all imported traitors.

The Convention is made up of Abby Kelly and Abby Kelly's husband, Parker Pillsbury, the hairy C. C. Burliegh, and the negro Remond.

There are lesser stars twinkling around these larger luminaries, but their names are not known and we can only "wonder who you are." The society here congregated, numbers a score or more, from white through all the shades of color to sooty black; and we must confess the negroes are the ones who should be ashamed of the company they are in.

Yesterday afternoon was spent mostly in endeavoring to frame a resolutioon which should embody the indignation which the society feels towards the Herald. We did say to one of the lesser traitors, who wished a notice inserted without paying for it, that in any other country, save this, the necks of every one of their number would be stretched; and we also said that if treason was justly punished by death, it would be serving them right, although we doubted whether their necks were worth the hemp. That's all we said, and this was reported to the convention. One of the male females arose and wished the name of the Editor inserted in the resolution, that it might go down to posterity as infamous, but the sister was overruled by the suggestion of a jet black brother, who insisted that the society had better let the HERALD alone and mind its own business.—So the committee was instructed to get a resolution prepared on the subject of the HERALD's course, for further action in the evening.

The evening session, at least until after nine o'clock, was spent, mainly in villifying Salmon P. Chase. Burleigh thinking himself the great attraction in the evening as well as in the afternoon, kept the floor, although the whole crowd of dyspeptics had *cacoethes loquendi* so bad that they could not refrain from hopping up around the room like popping corn, getting in a word here and there.

We believe the meeting broke up this afternoon, resolving to shake the dust from its feet when it leaves Cleveland, as being a place true to the Union.

From the Herald of the 20th.

ROW-DE-DOW.

The Convention of lunatics did not go home yesterday afternoon as we had anticipated.—The fact was, that after passing a set of resolutions twice over, they got into a snarl, and remained to pass them a third time in order to make all sure. Mr. Watkins, a colored brother who didn't quite "go the whole animal," caused considerable trouble in the camp by his malapropos romarks. The "bretheren and sisteren" kept popping off around him like bad eggs on a hot day, but Brother Watkins wouldn't be quiet. He thought the dissolution of the Union cry ridiculous. This caused a terrible flutter among the faithful, and the whole crowd, headed by the nondescript Burleigh, tried to gag him by unseemly interruptions. Watkins farther said that the man is a contemptible coward who attempts to throw the blame of the slavery of 1857 on the shoulders of the framers of the constitution, or who calls Washington and his compeers—as he had heard the Garrison party style them—diabolical villains. This caused another squirming. He then said that after dissolving the Union, we had so right to interfere in the institutions of what would then be a foreign country. He asked Burleigh if this was not so, Burleigh—"No!" Watkins—"Why?" Burleigh—"*I sha'n't say at present!*" Brother Watkins bearing rather hard on the disunionists, a woman in petticoats came to the rescue of those in pantaloons, and amid a general row, stated that if they were going to do nothing but talk, the women had better go home, take off their bonnets, and mind their household duties (Sensible woman!) She farther said "the convention had nothing to do but pass a resolution dissolving the Union; and *when that resolution was passed, the Union would be dissolved!*" The resolution either was passed, or not passed, we could not discover, which, neither could the convention, so, for the life of us we can't say if the Union is in existence at this hour or not. Just at this time a copy of the Herald of last evening found its way to the platform. There was a general rush for it, and, after reading the notice of the Convention's doings—a putting of heads together followed. Abby Kelly's husband arose, full of wrath and cabbage,—denounced the HERALD,—said that instead of recommending the slaughter of the tyrants in the South, we should begin with cutting the throats of the tyrants in Cleveland, beginning with those arch tyrants, the editors of the HERALD. We should do this to-day, and talk of farther proceedings to-morrow. Several other cut throat speeches were made, and the Convention went home to Graham bread and water.

The interesting crowd gathered again in the evening. There were about seventy-five disunionists, men, women, nondescripts, negroes and all; with about the same number of outsiders who had come to see the fun. Three or four of the professional spouters did their best to tire the audience, and succeeded to a charm. A female delivered a set speech in a sing-song style. An infidel appealed to the God he did not believe in, and based arguments on the hopes of the hereafter he did not recognize. Two negroes who had the misfortune to be shown around in England as strange animals, and who were the raree shows of the season in that country, because "any strange beast there makes a man; when they will not give a doit to relieve a lame beggar, they will lay out ten to see a dead Indian," boasted of their acquaintance with the nobility, and Abby Kelley interpolated the remark that were the editors of the HERALD in England at the same time with one of these colored brethren, they would be glad to ask him to introduce them into the fashionable society they could not otherwise gain admittance to!—If we remember rightly the "Aztec children," supposed to be but a remove from idiots, had a greater acquaintance with royalty and nobity than "Box Brown," or the negro Remond. Three things troubled the speakers throughout the whole evening; the Constitution, the unfortunate speech of Brother Watkins, and the article in the Herrald. From the attention bestowed on it, the last appeared to trouble them most.

The miserable fanatics have gone home—if they have any homes. After vilifying and threatening assassination to every one who differed from them; preaching non-resistance, and proclaiming the murder of all who differed from their treasonable opinions as a duty to humanity; alluding to the proscription of abolitionists in the South as infamous, yet breathing fire and slaughter on every man who dared question the policy of abolitionism—after all this they have finally gone out to preach their treason wherever the people will be forbearing enough to allow them. What heinous crime has this city committed that such a convention of cowardly men, unsexed women, and impudent negroes, should gather within its borders?

From the same.

Mr. Watkins, associate editor of Fred Douglass's paper, will lecture to-night at the Wesleyan Church, Euclid street, near the Public Square, on "The Anti-slavery Movement and the Popular objections urged against it." Mr. Watkins is a man of undeniable talent, and an eloquent speaker—He opposes *in toto* the fire-brand of disunion doctrines of the Garrisonian lunatics, and fired hot into their camp yesterday and the day previous.—He is well worth hearing. The lecture commences at half-past seven. Admission free. A collection will be taken up to defray expenses.

MIXED RACES IN SPANISH AMERICA—THE BEAUTIES OF AMALGAMATION.—Dr. Tschudi, a distinguished German naturalist, has recently published his "Travels in Peru," a work of great interest and value, in which, among other matters of curious information, he gives a list of the crosses resulting from the intermixture of the Spanish with the Indian and negro races of that country.

The settlement of Mexico by the Spaniards took place as the same time, and the intermixture of races has been perhaps greater in that country than in Peru. The Mexican soldiers are said to present the most unequal characters that can be met with anywhere in the world. Some are brave, and many others quite the reverse, and possessing the basest and most barbarous qualities. This, doubtless, is the result in part of the crossings of the race.

The following is Tschudi's list of the crossing in Peru:

White father and negro mother—Mulatto.
White father and Indian mother—Mestizo.
Indian father and negro mother—Chino.

Report of Speeches and Discussions at the Cleveland Disunion Convention.

(*Continued*)

FIRST DAY—EVENING SESSION.

MR. RUSSELL of Cleveland, said that when the people become abolitionists to the extent necessary to make them willing to sacrifice the union for the overthrow of slavery, he thought it likely slavery might be better abolished without disunion. Many of the people of Cleveland, he was sure, were opposed to slavery, and honestly so, who would much rather see the system abolished by the power of the union than by its dissolution. They might choose dissolution rather than slavery, if that were the only alternative. But they thought that by less effort than would be required to dissolve the union, slavery might be abolished and the union stand. He thought reformers often had too little charity for those who had not advanced so far as themselves. Men are often repelled by severe censure, when, by a more genial influence, they might be won over to truth. He was in favor of full and free discussion; he hoped we should have distinctly stated the views of all parties, in this convention. His own mind, he confessed was not fully made up. The question is, is dissolution a necessity? That it would be a calamity in some respects, all will agree. Great interests would be jeopardized, if not sacrificed, by it. Again, if dissolution be a necessity, how is it to be accomplished, and what are to be its results? That the abolition of slavery would be one result he had no doubt; but there are other great interests to be regarded. Slavery is an evil, but not the only evil of the land.

PARKER PILLSBURY, said, he did not believe there was any use in wasting the time of this Convention in discussing the question whether we can abolish slavery in the country and save the union. It was too late to talk about that. We had ourselves only half believed our own doctrines.—He believed it was time to appeal to the more heroic elements of human character. The slaves should be encouraged to rise and assert their liberty in the spirit of 1776, rather than drag their chains from generation to generation. And the Northern people should stand forth in the same spirit. Where, he asked, is Ohio, with her Republican Legislature and her Governor Chase? Can you protect your own citizens from outrage? I will not ask you if you can protect Margaret Garner and her children, and others in their condition, for you have shown that you cannot. It is time you should take the matter out of the hands of Governor Chase and his cowardly minions, and pitch the slaveholders into the lake, when they come amongst you in pursuit of their victims, or to interfere with your citizens. I should rather see Cincinnati laid in ashes, than that she should have permitted the deeds to be done in her midst that have been enacted there with impunity. Better give Ohio back again to the Indians and the wolves, than permit your soil to be trodden by monsters more fearful than wolves, or any other ravenous beasts of prey. Let us come up to this work in earnest, resolved to trifle no longer. Let us demand that the union cease, in the name of God, and be as earnest as the champions of slavery are in the slaveholding states. Let us bear in mind that every hour of this meeting is a pearl of great price, and not waste our time in useless and irrelevant discussions that can amount to nothing.

A. PRYNE, of Ravenna, Ohio, did not agree with Mr. Pillsbury. He took it for granted that this convention was appointed for the fullest discussion of the different views of those coming together. It was useless to call, or hold, such a convention, if the whole question is to be regarded as settled without investigation. Honest people are in doubt upon this matter of dissolution, they have their objections and arguments against it, and are not to be satisfied by Mr. Pillsbury's talk of "trifling" and "waste of time."

This question must be discussed in the light of the constitution, and in its bearings upon the anti-slavery enterprise. If this is to be forbidden then it was useless to come here at all. I am opposed to disunion. I should regard it a disaster, as well to the slaves at the south, as to the whole country. What is the Union? In what does it consist? I have heard good argument here to-day against the American Government. But none, that I am aware of, against the union. If the corrupt administration of the government were all annulled, and the men who have perverted it all removed, the union would still exist and be all the stronger on that account. All the outrages of which you so justly complain have been done in violation of the compact which constitutes the union. Before the colonies came together there was no union. What was the process by which a union was formed? The Declaration of Independence was the first national act by which the colonies were brought together. Now if the Government has trampled upon that instrument it has trampled upon the Union. Nobody objects to the Declaration of Independence, yet on this is the union based. But the states afterwards adopted the Constitution; and is slavery in it? Mr. Pillsbury thinks it is a waste of time to inquire into this question, but if this be so, then it is useless to argue the question of disunion at all, for in dissolving the union, you also destroy the Constitution; and before deciding to do this you must decide upon its character.

I do not, at present, propose to go into a constitutional argument, except to refer to a few particulars. I believe it is admitted on all hands that the constitution, when literally interpreted, is an anti-slavery document. Its first sentence declares its object to be, "to establish justice and secure the blessings of liberty." And then, as you proceed with it from clause to clause, it makes provision for the protection of the rights of all the people. It cannot, then, be necessary to destroy this instrument to abolish slavery. But Mr. Burleigh says, it has always been regarded pro-slavery. With his keen logic and long experience, he should not be satisfied with such an argument as this. On this ground the New Testament itself should be trampled under foot, for this slaveholding nation has always claimed Christ and his Apostles for slavery, just as it has claimed that the Constitution is pro-slavery. Even the sermon on the Mount has been so construed; how then shall he say, on this ground, that the Constitution is pro-slavery, and the New Testament not?

Mr. Burleigh gave us some striking illustrations of the incompatibility of liberty and slavery; but these, of course, did not affect the permanancy or value of the constitution, as liberty alone is in it and no slavery. And the same is true of the union, the terms of which are written in the Constitution. True, slavery exists at the South, but is it necessary to destroy the union on this account? Oil and water will not coalesce but if you had them both together in a valuable vessel, you would pour off the oil and fill up the vessel with pure water; you would not destroy the vessel. Fill up the union, then, with freedom and drive slavery out; it is too valuable to be lost.

Mr. Burleigh says, if a man, wanting an instrument to chop trees with, goes to his anvil to make it, he will make an axe, and not a scythe. But, I answer, if a man goes to work chopping trees with a scythe, that fact doesn't make it an axe, whatever he may assert, or whoever may have made it, and we should not join him in declaring it to be what it is not. Again, the men who adopted the constitution were not the men who administered it, even at the first. It was made by the whole people, while a few men, comparatively, had charge of its administration; and their's was a mal-administration. I claim, then, that the Constitution and union, for they are one, are in favor of freedom, with no alloy, or mixture, of slavery about them.

Again; look at this question in is practicable anti slavery bearings. I know it is common to declare that the destruction of the union would be the destruction of Slavery. I do not believe it.—There are at the south six millions of freeman, and only three and a half millions of slaves.—I believe the whites of the south with their intelligence, and arms, could continue to hold these ignorant and defenceless slaves in bondage. Look at Brazil, where slavery reigns supreme. Look at the West Indies, where the slaves were five to every freeman, yet slavery existed there and might have done so for ages. I know southern Statesmen have sometimes declared that the South, unaided, could not hold her slaves. but we don't regard them as good authority in other matters, and should not believe them here. It is true the north loves to uphold slavery and is guilty with the south; it is also true that slavery could live on if the union were abolished tomorrow, and I regard this dissolution movement as selfish in its character—a plan to throw off responsibility—and most disastrous in its efforts upon the anti-slavery movement.

Again I would like to have somebody tell us how the union is to be dissolved. Each can draw a circle round himself and refuse to take part in the Government, but none the less will the Government and union exist; and so long as one twentieth of the people choose to elect officers and carry on the Government, it stands secure.

C. C. BURLEIGH, replied to Mr. Pryne. He had he said, gone into no argument of the Constitutional question in his remarks to which Mr. Pryne had alluded. True he used one illustration which had a bearing on the question, but had used it for another purpose, merely to show that the union as it is, and has been in its practical workings, is pro-slavery, and in this he understood Mr. Pryne to agree with him. The actual, existing union, is the relation existing between the North and South at this time, whereby the North aids the South in holding slaves. Our friend agrees that the government has always been pro-slavery.—Now the riddle is here,—that the relation should be entirely favorable to freedom and yet the action always, even from the very first, pro-slavery. If the union is the Constitution, and the Constitution is Anti-slavery, how is it that in spite of its anti-slavery character, it has, always, from the very hour of its formation, been made practically pro-slavery, and this too, at first, by the very people who formed it.

Our friend supposes it is conceded that, literally construed, the Constitution is anti-slavery. It is not conceded. I say, that by no plain common sense reading of the Constitution, is it anti-slavery. You cannot take a dictionary, construe the language according to its plain meaning, and make it an anti-slavery document, to save your soul from perdition.

Mr. Pryne claims that the universal declaration and practice of the whole nation no more proves the Constitution pro-slavery, than the common doctrine of the land, that the New Testament sanctions slavery, proves the Sermon on the Mount, and the other teachings of Christ and the Apostles, to be pro-slavery. But let him remember that it is not Jesus and Paul who declare their teachings to be in favor of slavery, but other men. If Jesus and the Apostles, had declared their doctrines to be in favor of slavery, and had gone on all their lives in the practice of slaveholding, then the cases would be parallel; but we bring you the practice and declarations of the men who *made* the constitution; while you bring us the declarations of those who DID NOT preach the Sermon on the Mount, or utter the other teachings of the New Testament.

The simile of the axe and scythe, to which Mr. Pryne objects, is exactly in point. Here is a nation which has made, as he says, an ati-slavery constitution. What is this constitution? It is what the people have made. Now the nation from the beginning has *used it* as a pro slavery instrument. This was the thing they wanted. Is not the inference unavoidable, that they *made* what they *wanted*?

Our friend says it is not necessary to destroy a a vessel that is good, by which he means the Union, merely because the contents are mixed or impure. I remember when I was a boy and used to assist in cider making. We sometimes had old barrels that had become so musty as to be worthless, and the best we could do with them was to break them to pieces and use them for kindling wood. So of the Union. There is no purity in it to render it worthy of preservation.

Our doctrine is "no union with slaveholders", Mr. Pryne says the same. We all agree that the existing practical Union *is* with slaveholders; but he says this must be so changed that justice shall be established and freedom protected according to the true, legitimate Union. This would be to dissolve the present union; and the relation which he proposes could not properly be called a Union at all, any more than the relation between the criminals confined in the penitentiaries and the people who place them there could be so denominated.

Amongst those who contend for the anti-slavery character of the Constiution, there are many who give evidence of want of confidence in their own arguments, by going and voting for candidates for office who take the common views of that instrument:

MR. PRYNE.—For one I do not, and never did, vote for a man who believes the Constitution to be pro-slavery.

MR. BURLEIGH.—Then our friend did not vote for Salmon P. Chase. If Mr. Chase had not believed the Constitution required the giving up of fugitive slaves, he would never have allowed Margaret Garner and her children to go back to slavery.

The opinion has been expressed here that a separation of the North and South would be—unless demanded by moral considerations—a great disaster to the North. I do not believe this. I believe it would be a blessing to the North if the South were cut loose from it, financially and as a matter of physical prosperity; and if a prayer of mine could accomplish such a separation that prayer should not be wanting. I believe it would relieve the North of heavy pecuniary burdens; it would save our national honor; it would prevent the return upon us, from time to time, of crushing commercial difficulties. So if I had no moral objection, to a union with the south I should still be desirous on other grounds, that dissolution should take place; for, so long as we are in union with slaveholders, we shall meet these manifestations of the divine displeasure; as God's laws are irreversable and retribution always follows transgression.

The idea that in separating from the South we desert the slave and leave him, without hope of freedom in the hands of his master, is as far as possible from the truth. It is not true that a few men in the West Indies were able to hold five times their number in slavery. It was British bayonets that did it, and it was not so much moral motives and arguments, as the consideration that they could not spare the bayonets necessary to guard it securely, that induced the British Government to abolish the system, within its colonies. Nor is it true that Slavery stands strong in Brazil; on the contrary, so precarious is the system there, that the Government of that country is legislating with a view to its partial, if not total, abolition. John Quincy Adams declared years ago, that the principal use of the United States military was to protect the slave interests of the country. Mr. Giddings has since shown the same to be true. And leading statesmen all over the South, have again and again admitted, and declared, that a dissolution of the Union would result in the downfall of slavery. True southern men often threaten disunion to frighten the North into doing their bidding, and it answers their purpose. But the very fact that they make that threat thus available, and design so to use it, is the best possible proof that nothing but the *strongest* conviction that slavery could not exist without northern aid, could ever induce them to weaken the power of their threats by declaring it. Mr. Pryne, then, will see why it is we consider their testiminy good in the one case and not in the other.

Six millions of whites, it is said, could continue to hold three and a half millions of slaves in bondage. I believe it could not by any possibility be done. Should separation take place the "Canada line" would be the boundary of the slave states. The under-ground railroad would appear above ground, and the force necessary to prevent the slaves gaining their freedom by running away,—supposing them to make no violent resistance, would be so large and so expensive that slave labor would not pay, and must soon be abandoned.

Then there is the danger of insurrection.—Twenty-five years ago Nat Turner, whose name will sometime be placed with the name of Washington, headed an insurrection in the state of Virginia. It was but a local affair. A few slaves joined him and a few whites were killed. Yet so great was the consternation of Virginia that she had to call on the General Government for aid, and, with the consciousness that she had the strength of the North to back her, she was still almost frightened into an act of emancipation at the very next session of her legislature! Suppose there had been no North; that which was almost emancipation would have been entirely such.

In measuring the comparative strength of the whites and the slaves, you must take several things into consideration. Remember that but a small portion of the whites at the South are interested in favor of keeping the slaves in subjection. Their interests are far more with freedom than with slavery. And remember also that there are times when the rude husbandmen, with only such arms as they can find scattered about them, will put to shame, in their achievements, the well trained military bands, with all the aid that arsenals and discipline can give them. And again; we do not propose, as Mr. Pryne asserts, in coming out of the Union to desert the slaves. Is the fact that I am resolved—from my love of freedom and justice—to withdraw from the slaveholder the aid which enables him to hold his victim secure, to be taken as evidence that I am likely to desert the slave's cause? I want to be separated from the master just because I want to aid the slave. And we can act more efficiently when thus separated from the South. Even our political power can be made effective. If any one believes that political power can effect nothing, except by legislation in the country to be effected, I will ask him if he ever heard of a great nation, which held some millions of slaves, making the declaration that if slavery was abolished in Cuba it would be regarded by that nation as cause of war against the country abolishing it? And on what ground? because that great nation looked upon the proximity of a free State, even so near as within a few hundred miles of her southern Coast, as dangerous to her institutions! What then might be said of a free republic at the north, bordering on the south for many hundred miles, and with an anti-slavery sentiment so strong that it would have no