

# The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

BENJAMIN S. JONES, EDITOR.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

ANN PEARSON, PUBLISHING AGENT.

VOL. 14.--NO. 52.

SALEM, COLUMBIANA COUNTY, OHIO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 13, 1859.

WHOLE NO. 722.

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. Communications intended for insertion, or addressed to BENJAMIN S. JONES, Editor.

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

## The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

From the Philadelphia North American.

### AN UNREASONABLE SIDE OF THE UNION.

If the South chooses to make slavery the leading, exclusive topic of public discussion, no doubt it will do so, according to its choice. If in every convention of public proceedings the speakers leap first at this mark, and hasten to define their position where they need take no position at all, slavery will, of course, become the central point of political action. If Mr. Rhetts is followed by Mr. Stephens and Mr. Stephens by gentlemen still less necessarily required to discuss wholly of slavery, can any of these gentlemen wonder that this topic overrules all others in the northern States? The South is now showing its political course, as well as its own political course. It is for the South to say whether the next great political trial shall hinge on slavery. It is in the power of northern men in that section to decide that there shall be something else considered in that canvas, if they choose to direct public attention. There was no necessity requiring Mr. Stephens to speak two hours upon slavery on the occasion of his withdrawal from the representation of his district. He wholly mistakes the age he lives in, and with a thousand more such as him, he cannot cause civilization to return along its track of a thousand years. We do not want "African stock" for the labor of this continent, and we have no need of slavery as a substitute for new free States. The statesmen of the revolutionary age were not mistaken as to the right or propriety of slavery; on the contrary, Mr. Rhetts and Mr. Stephens are and must be the subject. A diseased excitement against advancing civilization moves them to do and to say what they now do and say, and as certainly as time rolls on, this morbid slavery worship will die out, and absolutely disappear at the end of a brief period of years.

Just at this moment we need the public attention to great works of internal policy, and to those points which are engaging the earnest attention of every civilized State. We earnestly appeal to the South for the opportunity to bring these to an issue, and we ask them to join the effort according to their interest and stake in it. How is it with the internal condition of the range of Atlantic States from Delaware to Georgia? Have they a fair share of prosperity in town and country? If not, there must be a reason for it. There is very little actual prosperity in those States, as we all know. Agriculture does not improve, and more land is thrown out every year to waste. There is no steam line to Europe from Norfolk nor from Charleston. Those States hardly pay their way as partners in the confederacy, costing much and bringing little in to the general stock. Every public man in the Union, in short knows that the industrial system of the southern States, at least, is wrong on some great and essential points, and though we may get along tolerably at the north under these circumstances, we do so in spite of the great difficulties, and not because none are to be encountered. We wish to avoid the vexed questions arising from the point of political power simply, and to address ourselves to the care of national affairs, not as rivals, but as joint partners in a common interest alone, and not as the darling idea of the south, to touch upon which is to insult the loftiest pride of southern men. There is no necessity on their part to make an intemperate discussion of a matter of excessive sensitiveness; and even if many at the north go astray in this respect, there is no consequent necessity that a southern man should think, speak and write of nothing else than slavery.

Much as the North may justly be held responsible for its prominence of slavery for ten years past, the south is responsible for much more. They will never have done with it; they cannot speed on the Fourth of July without talking of it, and from November till October, on no market day is a speaker or writer there sober on this intoxicating point. What do they suppose the consequence of this course will be on the rest of the Union? Who can talk of a tariff or a line of foreign policy without having the words caught out of his mouth by some vicious declaimer for more "African stock," or for against a slave code in the territories? The case is in the hands of the south, we repeat. Give us something else than this per institution as the theme of hope for the future, when you speak or write. Slavery is not the corner stone of a single State composing it. Slavery is not to be the goal of future advancement, and here is to be no happy future in which negroes

shall be imported in countless numbers to supply the vacant fields of the south. If southern leaders can see no other Elysium than this in looking forward, it is better to shut their eyes, and give up the world as lost. No accumulation of strength, no separation of southern States into a new confederation, can effect any such changes, that required to revive the slave trade on a great scale, and to permit the south to measure its prosperity by the multitude of its fresh negroes.

It is obvious that the desideratum we seek is not to come by mincing phrases of careful construction upon the slavery question. To ensure peace we must declare ourselves ready to fight for it, if need be, and to make a slavery test, if we can obtain no blood to reasonable doctrines otherwise.

### LIVE AND BREATHE.

Can you, brother, live and breathe in such an atmosphere? Are you not stifled, smothered and suffocated? We should perish outright, starve to death, become a skeleton, a valley of dry bones, on such food. What! place yourself in the very arms of conservative dough-faceness?—the damp, chilly, frosty atmosphere of funkism?—Out brother, out of this murky business!—Out for your life—stay not all the plain—run!

What! call yourself an anti-slavery man, a friend to your brother in chains? Pious to take God's own book for your guide, that thunders anathemas most fearful against the oppressor and man-stealer.—Profess holiness, to love God supremely and your neighbor as yourself, and then place yourself in an attitude where you are not allowed to open your lips for Jesus, in the prison-house, or on the auction-block where you are not permitted to distribute a tract, book, or paper, in behalf of your crushed brother, and in condemnation of the "Sum of all villainies"?—Not permitted to lift a single prayer in the social meeting, in remembrance of those in bonds as bound with them?—Here you are professing sanctification, with your mouth muzzled, your lips closed, your hands tied! Oh! what a life, what a life!—The mere thought of it chills the life blood! Brother, be honest, what does this mean? How does the world think of it? What does God? The Lord Jesus for whom you refuse to minister while hungry, thirsty, sick, and in prison. See Matthew 25, 31 to 46.

Holiness indeed! What is it worth if it is not Bible-holiness, the holiness of the Lord Jesus? What kind of holiness is a pro-slavery holiness, a holiness that winks at man-stealing, man-trading, soul-damning, abominations on God's earth?

All things whatsoever you would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them. Come out brother, come out of her that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. Rev. 18, 4.

What mean ye that ye rend the sea, That bind the mothers' heart? What mean ye that the dearest friends You should forever part? My justice shall not always sleep; My children shall not toil and weep!

What mean ye, since God's bounteous hand To you so much has given, Ye from your noble brother keep The sacred light of heaven? The cry they make, my mercy hear— 'Tis borne by angels to my ear!

Assembled round the throne of God, Upon that awful day, When asked, where is your brother, man, What mean ye then to say? You SOLD him—TRAFFICKED in his blood! I'll visit for your sins, saith God!

### EX SENATOR RHETT ON UNION AND DISUNION.

Hon. R. B. Rhett, formerly a Democratic Senator in Congress from South Carolina, delivered an oration at Grahamville, in that State, on the 4th. What he thinks of Union and Disunion, of the relative position of Republicans and Democrats on that question, and of the slavery agitation in general, will be seen from the following extracts, which we take from his speech as reported in the Charleston News:

"When, in the Senate of the United States I deemed it expedient, plainly and frankly, to advocate a dissolution of this Union, and the establishment of a Southern Confederacy, I was not so ignorant of human affairs as not to know that my position was exceedingly adverse to the greater part of the people of the United States, and to none more so, than to the political abolitionists, the Seward, the Hales and the Sumners of the North. For this Union was absolutely necessary to their carrying out their policy—the subjugation of the South. They are, therefore, Union men as at bazards. You have made them Union men. For, with nothing in the North to support their pretensions, they are the last people to desire a dissolution of the Union."

"After the compromise of 1852, what was the result? Have you had that peace and quietness, that peace and safety which was told you that compromise would bring you? Why, ever since the foundation of the government, has it ever been so fierce as within the last few years? The present President of the United States is a practical exponent of public opinion. Personally, he is my friend. In the controversy of 1852, he wrote a letter to a meeting in Philadelphia. In that he says: 'The agitation at the North on the subject of domestic slavery will have its day. We have already reached, or passed the crisis. Should this prove to be the case, the country will be the better for the agitation, and the atmosphere be purer.' That was in 1852. But how is it now? Mr. Buchanan was elected President of the United States, and before the first Congress met, his administration was protested on this very subject of slavery. Then was got up the Kansas compromise, the most discreditable and most disgraceful that was ever brought up on public opinion."

"My friend's prognostics of a Union in the South are not without encouragement. There are premonitions of a moral as well as physical remedy. Did you hear the mutterings of the tempest coming on the eve of the Presidential election? It is true heretofore our policy has been submission. In that policy we have lifted up some of the most bitter enemies of the North. It has been in vain that such as a Dickinson and Everett have told them you will dissolve this Union. Are you willing to be ruled by such men as the Wilsons, the Chases and the Sumners of the North?"

"Let us make up our minds; the North becomes sectionalized; we will sectionalize for our defense. We have done this. If we do not sectionalize for our defense, the result is we may be overwhelmed. Throughout the whole of the Southern States we see the people of the South uniting their forces. The Whig party are taking the position for the rights of the South, and the Democratic party dare not fall."

"If, in the Presidential election, our rights are victorious, then we have a guarantee and an arguement of a better future, if on the contrary which I think most certain to be the case, then, my friends let us separate from the North: let the glorious day spring of a Southern Confederacy at length arise upon our troubled councils."

THEODORE PARKER AND HIS BROTHERS IN THE MINISTRY.—The annual meeting of the Alumni of the Theological School of Harvard University was held a few days since. Rev. M. D. Conway, of Boston, introduced a resolution deeply regretting the failure of Rev. Theodore Parker's health, extending to him heartfelt sympathy, and expressing the earnest hope and prayer that he may soon return with renewed strength and heart unshaken to the post of duty which he has so long filled with ability and zeal. Rev. James Freeman Clark seconded the resolution. Rev. Dr. Gannett, of Boston, opposed it. He did not wish to endorse Mr. Parker's position as a preacher. He acknowledged his earnestness, great learning, and conscientious devotion to duty. He believed a portion of Mr. Parker's preaching was calculated to do great good in the world, striking, as it did, deeper into the heart of the great public and social sins than the preaching of any other man at present. But another part of his preaching was doing a great harm to society, by unsettling men's faith in the doctrines of the church and in revelation. The meeting concurred with Dr. Gannett, and the resolution was put by.

Gov. CORWIN.—Our readers to-day will find the speech of Gov. Corwin, at Xenia, of which we give the report approved by himself. It will be seen that he declares himself with the Republicans on the slavery question. The value of this declaration must be determined by what he says. To us it amounts to just nothing, to be anti-slavery and denounce and demand the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Act, and yet counsel submission and obedience to it—even to bringing "his head to the block," who should prefer obedience to the dictates of justice and humanity to its sanguinary requirements—is really profound nonsense, to use the mildest term. We confess to our astonishment at a man of Mr. Corwin's ability and high mental culture appearing before an enlightened audience to demand for an enactment of that character the respect and obedience due to law—the rule of right. We are unable to perceive any material difference between his position on this subject, and that of President Fillmore when he proposed to execute the Act with all the power of the Government.—*Ashtabula Sentinel.*

WASHINGTON, July 25.—From information received in this city, it appears that some of the southern representatives, while claiming to be opposed to the re-opening of the African slave trade are pledging themselves to introduce in Congress a bill repealing all the statutes upon the subject, leaving it, as they profess to desire, to the regulation of the several States; but as the constitution confers on Congress the power to prohibit the trade, and as death seems to be regarded as too severe a penalty for violating what some consider merely a law regulating commerce, it is thought that others who are opposed to the slave trade will agree upon a measure with a view to make the prohibition and abolition more effective by the certainty of punishment, and otherwise than capital, and thus they think that good will result from the present agitation of the subject.

A SCENE AT BEDFORD SPRINGS.—NATIONAL DEMOCRATS ON THE SIDE OF THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.—We have been informed of an incident which transpired at Bedford Springs, last week, which will easily be repeated. In the retinue of President Buchanan—who, according to the correspondent of *Forney's Press*, is piping and dancing at that watering place—is an accomplished and fashionable Southern widow, who has for several winters occupied a commanding position in the fashionable circles of the national metropolis. This lady was attended by a female slave, who, on discovering that she was on the "free soil of a free State," and not having the terrors of the Fugitive Slave Law before her eyes, took French leave of her mistress on Saturday last, and has not since been heard from. On the discovery of this elopement, the little circle who wait and smile on the President, were in a fever of excitement, and every individual of them prepared to join in the pursuit. Every national Democrat felt called upon to give a practical evidence of his attachment to the institution of slavery. The neighboring hills and fastnesses were searched with blood hound pertinacity by these gentlemen who boast that they know "no North—no South—no East—no West,"—but the poor, panting fugitive could not be found. The gallant pursuers, among whom was R. M. Magraw, of Maryland, returned crest fallen and disappointed. In the meantime, we presume, the object of this manly pursuit is far on her way to Canada via the Underground Railway.

### THE WORK OF THE AM. A. S. SOCIETY.

Harriet Martineau, of England, in a letter to the *Anti-Slavery Standard* written soon after the anti-slavery anniversary of last spring, says:

"May it be permitted that your friends here have another embarrassing question to deal with? It was always difficult to explain to enquirers the point to which controversy, wrangle, attain of character reached among the Abolitionists, and to reason away the complaint that mutual distrust, accusation and denunciation took place wherever Abolitionists appeared; but your friends could honestly show, to all who would listen, that it was your first business, your inevitable duty and doom, to prove all persons, as well as all things, and purge away all that could weaken as well as defile your body. Till this was done, you, who were the salt of your earth, could not keep your savor. It was the very condition of fitness for your work of staying corruption. The case, as at the end of twenty years—or say ten or five—is wholly changed. You now lead public opinion, as is shown by the hypocrisy of worldlings in professing abolitionism. How is it that some two or three of your heartiest comrades cannot see that a wider duty opens with your elevation of position? One would think you would all be glad to remit the charge of other folks' souls, when their condition is no longer your express and vital concern; yet we see the habit of accusation and vituperation perpetuated when the occasion has passed. It is for the Abolitionists now to lead, and for others to look to themselves as to how and when they follow. Let them take care of that! It seems to us a deplorable mistake to turn back, or keep your feet reversed, and charge yourselves with the responsibilities of persons and parties who have their own effort to make, and their own part to clear, to get up to you. Your time and temper are too precious now to be spent, as was necessary, in fighting with your neighbors, in order to obtain a footing for fighting slavery. The monster is before you, now, face to face, and society is behind you, instead of crowded between you and it. Let those behind you be of what quality they may, your concern is with the monster, and not with them. If they help you from behind, or come up to your side, well and good; if they cannot, so much the worse for them; but why lose your time and strength in scolding them, or picking out their faults? 'Why waste precious hours, and jar a propitious harmony, by occupying yourselves with the weak parts of the imperfect, and the halting of warriors? You will never be found fraternizing with hypocrites; and if you are, never to do or your quarry, your quality and destination than it has ever been yet. You know whom I mean; and they will know it: the two or three sincere and zealous workers who deserve all honor for former work, but who have not lately given evidence of the enlightenment, modesty, justice and moderation which your improved position demands. Will they not either defer to the sense of the proved leaders of the cause or undertake a department where they can do their own work in their own way? It is certain they are doing more harm by impingements which the world sees to be groundless than they can compensate for by any manifestation of virtue so misplaced as to look like faults of great gravity. It is a grave responsibility to impair or disturb your force while in full march on the open battle-field. Such is the view of your and their friends; and I do not apologize for communicating it. We desire to understand each other, in order to cooperate."

[In the same paper, but of a recent date, Wendell Phillips endeavors to correct the misapprehension under which Miss Martineau labors, and in so doing thus presents in a most clear and forcible light, the mission of the true and consistent friends of the slave's cause.]

No one appreciates our more heartily than I do Mrs. Martineau's generous and most efficient service of our cause for many years. No one remembers more gratefully how nobly she stood by it in its dark hours. No one values more highly her judgment in a case where she knows all the facts. But, living on the other side of the ocean, she cannot know our cause, its difficulties and obstacles, and the best method of guiding our ship, as we, on the spot, familiar with the details of a twenty years' struggle, are able, or ought to be able, to do. Her criticism of its general aspects, and the light which her ample knowledge and searching analysis of European affairs, has thrown upon our path, no one values more than I do. But her residence unfits her to give advice on local topics, all whose details and bearings she cannot know.

Mrs. Martineau seems (for I can hardly put my hand on any exact words) to suppose that there exists a radical difference of opinion among us in regard to the Republican party and certain leading men of like position; and she advises one side "to defer to the sense of the proved leaders of the cause." I do not know of any radical difference of opinion on those points. If any such exists, I must class myself with the small clique whom she advises to withdraw: for I give my full and hearty support to the resolutions offered by Mr. Pillsbury at New York; only I should add *The Tribune* to

Resolved, That while we rejoice in all the indications of an advancing state of public opinion against slavery, we would still be mindful that our greatest danger is not from actual slaveholders, and the open, bold and blasphemous defenders and extenders of the institution in State or Church, in politics or pulpit, but rather from those who make cautious and strong anti-slavery professions and professions, like the Republican party, the Boston American Tract Society, the recently formed New England and New York Church Anti-Slavery Society, the New York Independent, with its array of clerical editors and contributors, that are still in governmental or sectional union and fellowship with slavery and slaveholders.

Resolved, That while these organizations are thus, through their pretensions and professions, able to attract the awakened public sympathy, and control the public charity, paralyze the public conscience, and pervert every well-intended action into channels that flow only with compromise, corruption and crime, it becomes our duty faithfully to rebuke them, and to warn the people against them, as the enemies of that only radical and genuine gospel through which, under God, deliverance can come to the enslaved.

the list, and strike out one word, "enemies," substituting therefore "hindrances" or "obstacles," a change to which, I understand, neither Mr. Pillsbury nor Mr. Foster objects. I cannot call *The Tribune* or *Wagon* an "enemy" of the Anti-Slavery cause, for I think they wish it well, not ill. But their mistakes make them with all their good wishes, serious obstacles. So long as they remain in fellowship with a wife State and a sinner Church, they are, surely obstacles to real efficient anti-slavery progress. By intention, friends of the slave, and doing much to rouse and instruct the public; by position and unavoidable influence, formidable obstacles to real work. Tactics told us, centuries ago, to fear the faults of good men far more than those of the bad; and, precisely as Mr. Pillsbury's resolution affirms, and as I said at the same meeting, the anti-slavery professions and services of the bodies and persons referred to, while their grave mistakes mislead, the public mind, waste precious opportunities, defeat our efforts, and confuse public opinion.

These persons, presses and bodies referred to have a wide and deep influence. They are educating the North, and they mislead it. It is fair to say that one-half of them do not speak what they really think, and the other half do not apply their moral sense to the subject of slavery. Yet the community follows them as anti-slavery guides, and limits its faith to their *approved* views.

To prove slavery a sin—to prove all support of it, in Church or State, a sin—to make the community see it a sin of so grave and momentous a character as to justify secession from the Church without the charge of schism, and resistance to the State out of the guilt of faction—this is the work of the American Anti-Slavery Society. This is the only road to the abolition of slavery.

Now these bodies affirm slavery to be a sin, and yet support it, and claim that they rightfully may. They take for a text, "Execute justice between man and man," and then preach that you may work iniquity a little longer, and for a good purpose. They allow that right is right, no matter what the consequences; and then argue, and practice, that the end justifies the means. They have yet to make their first protest, in action, against the principal sins of these States—that is, playing with Right and Wrong, and compromising one's convictions for one's interests. They have moulded and are moulding the spirit of this people, and what is it? To speak what his inmost soul thinks, and square his life by it, is a folly the American merchant never commits—a luxury the American politician never allows himself, except like the few of the middle ages, in his most secret moments. He cannot afford to practice.

This is true of the persons and bodies mentioned in those resolutions, as well as of the Democrats and the Deacons—all, indeed, but slaveholders. Yet these men affect to be and are considered good practical, efficient anti-slavery guides.

Now how shall we teach the people aright, except by taking its idols to pieces, and analyzing the sermons of its priests and the talk of its politicians? By telling the people, at once, what all politicians say when over seventy years old and hopeless of office; what President Wayland blurted out when blazing Kansas started him out of that "despicable virtue," prudence; what Cleverly will learn when the Church, that hates and fears him, has kicked out its too confiding son, who will shut his eyes to facts and believe that which ought to be; what two out of every three decent men say to each other in chimney corners, and then abuse their neighbors for proclaiming, telling them what Seward knows to-day, but cannot run the risk of yet confessing; and thus prepare a public which will make it possible for half-way virtue to afford to join us and swell the tide (made up of a hundred motives, a score of opinions, and one heart) before the Battle shall fall.

Mrs. Martineau makes a distinction, I see, between the Church and parties. Not in a country where all parties, ethics are taught and learned at the pulpit as really as from the pulpit, and whosoever seeks to mould public opinion must watch both.

are glad it blows; some are only *quarrelsome*, and show how it blows; both classes give us cheer. Whence the danger? These, each one of these bodies still have something else better than the slave. Beecher and *The Independent* may truly say, "Not that we love the slave less, but that we love the Orthodox Church more." *The Tribune* loves the slave well, but loves Seward and a tariff, and the sweet, sad, phantom memory of the Whig party better. The Church Anti-Slavery Society longs to help the negro, provided it can be done *salva ecclesia*.

All these about their eyes to facts and tests, the commonest moral rules to stay or serve their eyes. We have the Corymbus of *The Independent* teaching that slavery is no sin; four fifths of the Churches cry "amen," pointing to that *sermon* as the Christian leader of the anti-slavery movement, and bidding individual Christians stop by it and not risk their salvation by looking farther. Shall we let it pass? or try to save the best portion of the nation's mind, the religions, from such delusion?

The great danger for all reforms is, that the effort be lost by letting the movements fall first hands that use it for a side purpose. History is full of instances. MISPLACED CONFIDENCE in the legacy which defeated reforms have left the world as a warning; and no one has more faithfully elaborated the lesson than the author of the "Thirty Years since the Peace."

Beside, nations, like individuals, are often in peril when nearest to what the world calls success. If hoodwinked then, though they may not wholly fail, they may fall far short of what they owe their times. The anti-slavery cause in England, when, in a critical moment, it accepted the bastard Compensation for a true child, married the noblest triumph the world ever hoped on, and as a moral movement, flung away half of the good it owed and might have done the moral growth and future of England and the world. We shall shun such rocks. Our pleasantest and nearest duty is to educate such men as Beecher and Chace, and the Church Anti-Slavery Society—the wedding couples of Channing and the baronets who cling to SEWARD—people who mean well, but see men as trees. Our hardest work, and most distasteful, is to save worthy men and well-meaning from the judicial priestcraft of *The Independent*, which never treated a weak foe fairly, and never lacked forbearance towards a strong one; and from the shrewd time-serving of *The Tribune*, which, fallen down from Greeley's honest blindness into the hands of money-launderers, hires the best seamstresses to catch every puff of the popular breeze.

It is a fact that, in the order of growth, men must stand, honestly, in the position some of these bodies occupy. "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." As to the honest position of all such bodies, we look on their positions as hopeful while they are with their faces Zionward, and are in motion. But when they take root there, shut their eyes to further light, and cry to those behind them, "We have reached the goal—stand with us, it is enough," then we need most distrust all men of confidence in them.

Utter ignorance never doubts. It is a proof of insight when a man begins to doubt, to weigh methods and opinions. A large portion of the awakened mind of this nation stands doubting which method is best, or that of a compromising party and a pro-slavery Church. With a penny press piloted into all nooks and shambles, with universal suffrage welding every man's heart to great political questions, with a voluntary and democratic Church erecting each man into a judge of morals and ethics, we have a public roused to vivid interest, capable, each individual, of appreciating the whole issues, and determined to meet and share it, such as no England, in its *humble* bound Realm, can conceive. Such a public is our jury—such appliances our tools. It is no information our people want, but direction and a purpose. The ear, the confidence, the support of that people we must win. So far as it now gives, either to other and mistaken views, we must un-derceive it, and the only way to do that is to criticize the method and position of those who are striving to guide opinion and are most likely to succeed in misleading it.

We know the danger. "Men," says Arnold, "are tories by nature." All men, when first approaching this cause, seek to save what they have loved; and are therefore in double danger of falling into those hands which tell them they can do their whole duty to the slave without sacrificing their Church or their vote, their business or their respectability.

There are thousands to whom these papers and the men I named are the end of all argument. Men heed *The Tribune* on their eyes, and refuse to see—have no opinion till Leonard Bacon has spoken; thousands live, move and have their being in the Republican party, and hush their children with the name of Garrison. Now, what do we argue, on general grounds, with those who believe in an infallible Church, Party, Press or Person? First unseat the P. p. Great statistical truths unfold the centuries like an atmosphere, permeate literature and men's thoughts, and finally change the world. But to teach the *mass* of men in our own age, history seems to teach us that we need to cry "Woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees!"—with Luther, to excommunicate the Pope, or with Channing, to attack *Adover* and the Abolitionists.

I know of no prominent advocates in the ranks of the American Anti-Slavery Society who have ever denied this doctrine. We have unanimously asserted it in resolutions, scores of times. There may be, there must be, among men who think each for himself, differences of phrase and of judgment, how much time to devote to each topic, and just where, on the moral scale, to place each body; but nothing more.

If there were, however, that radical difference of opinion Mrs. Martineau supposes, our platform is not only large enough to hold both sides, but *we* was especially built to accommodate them; and we use our money and our hours daily in stryng all honest workers, of all opinions, to join hands on it. If Mr. Pillsbury did insist on calling Beecher or Chace an "enemy" of the cause, and Mr. F.

shall we talk of broken Constitutions? The answer will be, "All true, though something of a bore, but let the lawyers settle that." Witness Kansas, the shuttle-cock of party.

Shall we lose ourselves in statistics, and prove the waste and ruin of slave labor? We are addressing the full grown Yankee to whom that is A, B, C; but he "guesses" he can snatch a fortune while the system lasts, and let them care who come behind."

Shall we exert ourselves to make people believe Buchanan a weathercock and Douglas a huckster? No need of more owls at Athens, or coals at Newcastle.

Shall we wear an audience with Cuba and the slave trade? Why, even Dr. Adams and Dewey—a Democratic caucus if far enough North—*The Tribune*—even the Boston Courier (if election day is not to near) will do that work. Having become men, let us put away childish things.

Shall we say slavery is a sin and quote Channing on the dignity of human nature? The hearer will say, "True, but *The Tribune* or *The Era* will allow that, and yet show us a royal road to duty, with no thorns in it, and no sacrifices to make."

AND THIS BRINGS US TO THE CLOSE ARGUMENT, TO MUTUAL CRITICISM, OUT OF WHICH GROW FRESH, VITAL PURPOSE, EARNEST VIRTUE, AND INTELLIGENT, CONSISTENT, EFFICIENT ACTION.

Does any one ask how, if these half-and-half friends are so dangerous, we can speak of them as cheering signs of the times? I answer: their existence is encouraging, because it shows that sagacious men believe hatred to slavery to be a power in the State, and hasten to make friends with it and use it. When his ante-chamber is full of suitors, the courtier knows his star is in the ascendant. Some of those bodies are really the wind, and we