

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

BENJAMIN S. JONES, EDITOR.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

ANN PEARSON, PUBLISHING AGENT.

VOL. 15.—NO. 10.

SALEM, COLUMBIANA COUNTY, OHIO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1859.

WHOLE NO. 732.

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 to be 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 (16 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.

CONTENDING FOR PRINCIPLE.

It is remarkable that in all the great struggles which have advanced human nature, the contest has been for a principle, and not for the redress of some overt wrong. One of the most instructive periods of English history—that of Charles I.—furnishes us an example quite in point. The revolution which overthrew this monarch, and established forever the liberties of England, was not occasioned by special atrocities—it came as the result of an upward tendency of the public mind toward strong for kingly authority. Charles, not knowing the signs of the times, not comprehending the genius of his own age, fell a sacrifice to the spirit of progress, rather than to his own vices. Hence thus alludes to this matter:

"The grievances under which the English labored, when considered in themselves, without regard to the constitution, scarcely deserve the name; nor were they either burdensome on the people's properties, or otherwise shocking to the natural humanity of mankind. Even the imposition of ship money, independent of the consequences, was a great and evident advantage to the public, by the judicious use which the king made of the money levied by that expedient. All ecclesiastical affairs were settled by law and uninterrupted precedent, and the Church was both a considerable barrier to the power, both legal and illegal, of the crown. Peace, too, industry, commerce, opulence, nay, even justice and lenity of administration notwithstanding some very few exceptions; all these were enjoyed by the people; and every other blessing of government except liberty and its property security." (Vol. 5, p. 93.)

The contest which, a century and a half later, established the independence of this country, originated under similar circumstances. The country was in the main as well governed as colonies usually are, and the point of resistance was that of an abstract right—the right to tax without parliamentary representation. It was purely for a principle that Washington, Adams, Jefferson, and their coadjutors stood up in defiance of British power. Some collateral abuses, recited in the Declaration of Independence, had made the government of the mother country offensive, but these were only incidental, and might have been corrected by a change of administration, without revolution. But the aim of the great simultaneous movement of the colonies was to secure themselves a proper recognition of rights. They did not complain of excessive taxation, but of an excessive liability—so long as England claimed the right to tax them irrespective of their consent, they had no security against oppression. It was this dangerous principle, much more than any special abuses, that required to be uprooted, and against this was the whole storm of the revolutionary war directed. Local abuses there were, no doubt, for such there are in all governments, but these did not constitute the real cause of that memorable struggle. The principle of freedom was involved in the controversy, and those who inaugurated the strife, did not wish to wait till the chains were actually upon them before they made resistance. There was, indeed, at this very juncture, reason to suppose the colonies highly favored. Great Britain was not the worst of masters, and the burdens of the colonies were actually light; as in the time of Charles I., there were few extraordinary abuses of government, but a universal desire for the introduction of better principles. It was this state of things which deceived such men as Dr. Samuel Johnson, whose "Taxation no Tyranny" is at once a monument of big mental powers, and of his too implicit confidence in mere outward appearances.

The contest for principle is not confined to the State. We have ample proofs on every side, that all reforms in the Church take their rise, not so much from overt acts, as from a cool survey of abstract principle. In other words, reform is undertaken, not because things are specially worse than usual, but because the body politic demands a new element. The Church outgrows the old, and demands the new. Israel may patiently toil for hundreds of years in bondage, but at last there will be a call to go out into the wilderness and worship, and if this call is not heeded, it will sooner or later work the overthrow of all resisting forces. From some source there will to every people in the course of time, spring up new light, and the prosperity of Churches and nations depends upon a readiness to receive such light whenever and

however it comes. An experiment of this kind is going on in the M. E. Church at the present time. Our people have new light on the subject of slavery. The period in which slave-holding was considered either a venial fault, or at most, a sin only when marked by atrocious circumstances, is past. Methodists in this northern latitude regard slavery as a crime, and being a crime, it is such under all circumstances—the character of the motive does not change the nature of the act. It is like the counterfeiting of money, or the poisoning of wells—an act of essential, inexcusable wickedness. By some means this conviction has seized upon the mind of the Church to a very large extent, and a corresponding adjustment of our disciplinary regulations is imperatively demanded. It is in vain to meet this emergency by saying that the Church is as useful and pure as she has ever been, or that her Bishops are as good, and her numbers even greater than ever before, or that there is no special abuse in her administration or increase in the number of her slave-holding membership. These are considerations which, however important in themselves, do not belong to the case. We have a new state of things to provide for. Our people demand the reprobation of crime—they ask that we put away sin—they would have us cease to fellowship what they now see God abominates. This is our condition. The Church calls not for the amendment of her polity at this or the other point, nor for the correction of a few specific wrongs, but for the recognition of a great principle, namely, that all men are men, and should be treated as men, the slave code to the contrary notwithstanding. We are not driven to this demand by any unenvied abuses, or any marvelous discoveries of human infirmity, much less by a propensity for innovation, or by a want of attachment to the polity of the Church—it is the demand of sheer truth—of conscience impelled by the word of God. It will never do to leave this matter to be settled by those who look only to actual occurrences, for whatever may be the signs of present prosperity, the elements of death are among us; the principle of chattelism is one of deadly hostility to all religion, and if tolerated, must ultimately corrupt the whole Church. We must either cast out this abomination, or die from its effects. However dormant the poison now, it cannot fail to become active hereafter. But it is even now working, and though its effects are not visible to all, a practiced eye must note the gradual assimilation of the Church to the state along the Border. The snake spots are visible, and the proxymus will come on; the fangs of the old serpent, the devil, have thrown the deadly virus into the veins of the Church, and it must be removed or we die. Absolute, instant prohibition is the very least that should be attempted on our part, and this will avail nothing, unless "the blood that makes the wounded whole" shall speedily be applied.—Northern Independent.

DR. CHEEVER ON THE AMERICAN BOARD.

[The Philadelphia correspondent of the N. Y. Tribune, writing under date of Oct. 4th thus speaks in relation to the proceedings in the Board.]

Dr. George B. Cheever of New York obtained the floor, and moved the following amendment or addition to the report concerning the Choctaw and Cherokee Churches:

"Your Committee add that in the opinion of the Board the holding of slaves should be pronounced an immorality inconsistent with membership in any Christian Church, and that it should be required that these Missionary Churches should immediately get away from themselves the sin, and should cease to sanction it even in appearance."

DR. CHEEVER'S SPEECH.

Dr. Cheever proposed this amendment because, for the redemption of the B and from the imputation already brought against it of complicity with the sin of slavery, it was bound to give to the world some such expression of its views; and this seemed the only occasion. It was not to be endured that through the attitude and influence of this Board in the sanction of slavery, the power of the Church with the Gospel of God against this sin should be hindered and weakened. But so it has been, while this Board had churches under its charge to whose communion slaveholders were admitted as Christians. Whenever this is done, the power of the Church in her appeal against slavery is destroyed. But not only so, such an appeal convicts the Church of hypocrisy and leads the world to infidelity for how can the world respect a Church that is seen receiving to her own fellowship and defending, on grounds of expediency, that which she denounces to the world as sin. And such is the gross and shameful inconsistency in any Church professing to regard slavery as wrong, and warning the world against it in the name of God, and yet admitting slaveholders, the only persons under heaven who practice the sin and make merchandise of men, to the Lord's table in good and regular standing as Christian merchants in human flesh. If slaveholding be permitted in the Christian Church, neither that crime nor the system that grows out of it can be condemned by the Church nor made to appear sinful in the eye of the world. But if made to appear by other efforts, influences, and teachings that those of the church, if made to appear sinful by the world's philanthropists taking higher and more consistent ground than the Church takes; if made so to appear by the common conscience of the Church under the law written on their hearts—the common sentiment and impulse of mankind compelling them to regard slaveholding as oppressive and unchristian, while the Christian conscience, debauched and stupefied, proclaims it as a virtue, or if wrong in the beginning yet passed into a necessity and a virtue, by expediency, by long possession and practice, on the principle of wrong becoming right because of the difficulty of undoing the wrong, and the long-continued and accumulated profits of the wrong passing into a vested system, sanctioned and protected by law; because, also, of the wrong, with its profits and its means of living, passing into

an inheritance, and having descended from slaveholders to their families, from men-stealers to their children, from planters to their households, as a domestic institution;—if the conscience of the Church, on these grounds, demands its toleration, demands the admission of slaveholders into the Church by the right of possession in crime, by the principle of squatter sovereignty on the premises of God passing into sacred, sanctifying custom, and being exalted into law—then the conscience of the world must inevitably oppose and despise the conscience of the Church as an unchristian conscience; the moral sense of the world cannot do otherwise than reject such a polity as unsound and rotten, such professed godliness as an abomination, such orthodoxy and benevolence as hypocrisy and a lie.

The dealings and character of the Church become condemned and vile in the sight of the world on the points of common justice and humanity between man and man; and, if the church were the only hope of the world's salvation in such a case—policy depended on the Church, there would be no hope, no possible redemption. The world will set the Word of God itself against the Church, and the Church must become a scoffing and a by-word. Here is the alternative: either a total blank infidelity, or else the reception and belief of a false, anti-Christian, slaveholding Christianity; either the reception of the Word and rejection of the Church, or the rejection of the Word and reception of the Church. Either the Church is false, or the Word is false. Which dilemma is to be adopted? Or will the world, unable to distinguish between the Church and the Word, reject both together? Such is the frightful gulf which the practice of any sin by the Church, though condemned in the Word of God, opens before us. Now, if there is any sin at all in Slavery, slaveholding is that sin. And, if the system of slaveholding is wrong, the slaveholder himself is the sinner. There could be no such thing as Slavery, if the slaveholder himself did not voluntarily hold slaves. If he holds them not as slaves, but as freemen, denying any man's right to them as property, but only to protect them from being held as slaves, then he is not a slaveholder. If, in such a case, he is compelled, in order to keep the power of protecting them, to seem to be a slaveholder, then, in order to avoid the appearance of evil, and preserve the Church from seeming to sanction the crime of slaveholding, he ought to be kept out of the Church, in order that slaveholding be not brought in and sanctioned.

The pretence of injustice toward a good man, in keeping him out of the Church because of his entanglement in this sin, must be a shield for the continuance of the injustice of Slavery. It might just as well be argued that murder is not a sin *per se*, because murder is simply the killing of a man; but the sheriff also kills a man when he hangs the murderer, and therefore, murder cannot be indicted as a sin *per se* since the sheriff has to do murder as a virtue. The Church may not seem to do evil, and thus embolden others to practice the evil, and maintain it as right—rather than embolden the world to practice Slavery by letting them imagine, from the admission of slaveholding to the Church that slaveholding is not essentially sinful, but may consist with piety and the will of God, let every slaveholder in appearance be kept out of the Church, that the slaveholders in reality may not get in. Ten thousand evil examples out of the Church are not so bad as one within. Hence the indignation, sarcasm, contempt against rum selling deacons.—Hence the very popular storm of rebuke against the American Tract Society for its course in protecting the iniquity of Slavery. It is a singular contradiction when those who accuse the Tract Society for covering up this sin refuse to call upon the American Board not to sanction it, or even denounce as Abolition agitators, who ask the Board to keep this sin out of the Churches. The American Board itself in 1836 passed a resolution forbidding the missionaries to hire slaves, even though at the wish of the slaves, and for the purchase of their freedom, because this could not be done without incurring the reputation of slaveholding. So careful was the Board at that time of their Christian reputation, that they said "As it has appeared to the Committee that in consequence of these transactions the Board, or its missionaries, have been regarded by some as holding slaves, therefore resolved, that the missionaries among the South-western Indians be instructed to enter into no more such contracts, and to relinquish all such contracts." This is certainly the right principle. But if more to be applied to the hiring of slaves, how much more to the holding of them by Church members; how much more to the exclusion of such slaveholders from the Church; and if the imputation upon missionaries themselves of being slaveholders was so anxiously to be avoided, why not also in the case of Church members? Is it more sinful for a missionary to hold slaves than for any Church member? Or can the Board any more easily afford to wink at Slavery in the Missionary Churches, than in the Missionary household? In either case it is such an enormity that the Board ought not to be willing for a moment to incur the imputation of it. The Board ought to have placed themselves in absolute and total opposition to this wickedness in any shape. As a Board of Commissioners for the salvation of the African race, they might annually have renewed their testimony against Slavery, and their demand for its abolition in various appropriate and powerful modes. At any rate they should carefully have avoided sanctioning it even in appearance. They have had it for 48 years directly in their way, directly beneath their power, directly calling for action against it. Under the system of inaction and indifference, it has so maintained its ground that at length not only the Ecclesiastical bodies that maintain the system which makes them the reproach of Christendom stand ready to receive and nourish the slaveholding policy and power of the United States, are waiting to receive a Slave State, into the Union, from under the favorable tuition and moulding of the religion of the Board for nearly fifty years! Experience shows that the only attack with the word of God against sin which cannot be evaded, is that

which designates the sinner, and not merely the system. If any door of industrial apology or exception be opened, the whole system rides through it. The General Assembly of 1850 resolved that "the holding of our fellow men in the condition of Slavery, except in those cases where it is unavoidable by the laws of the State, the obligations of guardianship, or the demands of humanity, is an offense in the proper import of that term as used in the Book of Discipline". Through that exception all the slaveholders in the land immediately passed in procession, as by an enlargement in the eye of the needle all the camels in the world, with all their accumulation of baggage, may be seen marching into the kingdom of heaven. In the Assembly of 1855, the Presbytery of Winchester, in Virginia, notified the Assembly and all the Churches, that the exceptions stated in the resolutions of the Assembly were considered to cover the vast majority of cases, if not every case of slaveholding in the land; and in address to their constituents, published after the adjournment of the Assembly, united in the body of representatives from the Southern States, the same thing was avowed in terms unqualified, and of greater length. Since that time, the kingdom of salvation by slaveholding suffereeth neither, and all are pressing into it, and the violent take it by force. It is now asserted that the obligations of guardianship, the demands of humanity, and the dictates of the highest piety, as well as the laws of the slaveholding States, require the perpetuity of the system, and constitute, for every case of slaveholding, a case of good intention, justifiable motives and circumstances, and of religious expediency, and necessity. The state of the conflict in our country, the aggressions of the Slave Power, the impious doctrines advanced and avowed in behalf of Slavery as a righteous system, the most unfortunate and disastrous complicity of the Board hitherto with it, as well as claims of the millions crushed by it forbid that the Board should any longer refuse an open attitude against it, or should neglect any of the precious opportunities offered in the providence of God effectually to oppose it, or should relinquish their power over it and their hold upon it until they have administered all those means of grace to it which God has given in his word, all those agencies of reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness, and all that authority of discipline committed to the Churches against such a sin for its removal. If the Board deliver up this authority and power, which is greater than the strength of Sampson against Dagon, they will play the Dullah to the Philistines, without even the eleven hundred pieces of silver; nay, their treasury will be emptied, their sin, and their moral dignity will be degraded irreparably by such a transaction. On the other hand, if they let this iniquity off; if, instead of opening the prison door and letting the oppressed go free, they let the iniquity and those who practice it go free; if they let this moral monster in the Church of Christ escape out of their hands, whom God has denounced as worthy of death, and whom God has bound before them in the very act and character of his wickedness for their authoritative application of the sentence of God's Word, then they will be more guilty than the besotted Ahab, King of Israel, when, out of pretended humanity, peace, and worldly wisdom, he released, unaccompanied, the enemy of his country and his God. "Thus saith the Lord, Because thou hast let go out of thy hand a man whom I appointed to utter destruction, therefore thy life shall go for his life, and thy people for his people."

The Board have no right to let slavery escape, or to refuse to execute God's commission against it, and, least of all, on the ground of the difficulty of confronting it and dealing with it, when in his good providence he has laid this giant sin on his own altar before them, and given them the sword of the Spirit to plunge into his heart. Let them stand and exercise this royal priesthood against sin. A grander occasion, a more solemn and illustrious opportunity of striking such a blow could not be asked by them. It is as Mount Carmel in the gaze of the world, who have seen as traveling up hither as to the challenge of the trial of power between God and Baal. Let the Board, before renouncing its guardianship of these churches, apply the truth of God and the discipline of Christ's house to them, and put away this sin, and then, if the path of duty is plain to give them over to some other papulage, it can be done with honor in faithfulness to Christ, but not till then. The Board ought not to relinquish their trust with these churches till they can do it with clean hands—till they have either cast out the demonic possession that afflicts them, or have brought them to Jesus, and laid them at his feet for this purpose. But here they are advised to give over these unweaned sufferers, whom Satan hath bound and tormented these many years, into the hands of doctors who do not regard the possession as the work of Satan, or as any affliction or iniquity at all, but on the contrary, as the ministry of an angel of light, and a desirable instrumentality of God's most holy missionary providence. You propose, if you agree to this, transferring over your patient to these new guardians—in effect, to say: "Take him; we can make nothing of him; he is more plague than profit—very obstinate, incurable devil, whom the world and the Christian Abolitionists will not suffer us to keep any longer as a saint. But you can take him as a child of God, and nourish him with food convenient for him, and harness him for a work of glory in your own missionary field. With you it is a work of love; with us it is nothing but toil, difficulty, embarrassment and danger." We cannot, in faithfulness to our trust, in honor to God's Word, or with any dignity or safety to ourselves, pursue any such policy as this. We are driven to the wall, and cannot refuse to "stand up for Jesus," in the true meaning of that watchword here, where that watchword was issued from the dying lips of that young soldier of Christ, who is known to have spoken it in reference to this very conflict against Slavery, and to have meant by it, with all the dying emphasis of those principles for which he had been excluded from his former church, and had gathered around him a new band, "Stand up for Jesus in protection of the cause of the dumb and down-trodden slave, with the gos-

pel of the abolition of this wickedness." That was what young Tyng meant; and what we see young and old, Young Men's Christian Association, churches, assemblies, Missionary Societies, holding back from its reality, rejecting and denying its true meaning, and yet boasting of it in another sense, we tremble at the last words of Malachi, and cannot but feel that except God turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and of the children to the fathers, in this thing, he must come and smite the land with a curse.

THE ELECTION.

The agony of another election is over, and the smoke of the battle is fast clearing away. Of course a number of disinterested patriots have again obtained office, and the party politicians are busy, on the one side glorifying over their success, and on the other pillaging their defeat, by ascribing it to reasons satisfactory to themselves, but certain however, that next time they will achieve a "glorious victory." If one-third of the professions and promises of the hundreds of candidates, who were up for office at the recent State election, were reduced to practice the ensuing year, Ohio would be one of the best governed, and happiest commonwealths the sun ever shone upon. But the apostolic injunction, "Put not your trust in princes," might well be rendered in these latter days, "Put not your trust in politicians!" since the whole business of getting a nomination first and an election afterwards, is generally based upon a most thorough system of promising, equivocaling, and maneuvering. The whole substance of political action is represented mainly by a very popular political phrase, "Availability," signifying that qualification in an office-seeker which will enable him to catch the votes of all, by not committing himself too much to anybody.

But it is the fault of the people themselves if they are enjayed or betrayed. They are the leaders, if they knew and lived up to their power, not the men who merely are on the tickets. If individuality and personal independence more generally prevailed, party fetters would not so thoroughly enchain all that is good of beneficial in public sentiment.

We hope that now the election is over, a little thought may be given to something for the moral and social well-being of our people. Many of those who have a horror of mixing up moral questions with politics, we should think might afford in the brief intervals between the caucusing and button-holding of one year and another, to heed a little the claims that sobriety and virtue have upon them.—Analyst. [Cleveland.]

NORTH CAROLINA QUAKERS.

Daniel Worth, in a communication to the *Worshiper*, thus speaks of a difficulty encountered in his labors:

I am like to have some opposition from a quarter least expected. Carolina Quakers, though professing to be anti-slavery, have constantly supported slaveholders for office at the ballot-box. Last year I remonstrated with them earnestly on the inconsistency of such a course. This year they went in a body to the polls, and voted for and elected a slaveholder to Congress, the leader of the mob which drove Bro. McBride from the South. I immediately addressed a somewhat lengthy letter to a leading Quaker, wherein with great plainness of speech I showed the inconsistency and wrong of such pro-slavery voting. I asserted and proved the fact that the Quaker Church was one of the firmest supports of slavery. I understand they call this ridiculous and abusive. I am taking measures for the publication of the letter, when the world shall have an opportunity to judge whether I have done them wrong, or whether as a body they have not for more than seventy years stultified their profession by pro-slavery voting.

Compromise has been defined "that by which Satan is permitted to triumph over righteousness," and Quaker compromises to vote for "the least of the evils" (devils) are no exception to the above rule of definition.

Practical proof that Kansas is a Slave State is offered in the following advertisement, taken from a Leecompton paper:

ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS REWARD.—I will pay the above reward to any person who will return to me, or lodge safely in jail, giving me notice thereof, of a NEGRO WOMAN AND FIVE CHILDREN! The woman is black, heavy set, weighing about 160 pounds, and has a black spot between the eyebrows. The children are as follows: Lewis, a boy about nine years old, a mulatto; Limus and Cyrus, both black and younger; Ellen and Ann—one of them, Ellen, about two years old, the other about five months old, both mulattoes.
E. D. ROBERTS, M. D.
LECOMPTON, Sept. 2.

East India Cotton.—India begins to feel the stimulus of improved transportation, as well as high prices in the staple of cotton. The Liverpool circulars of the 10th instant state that there are at sea from India, and due before the end of November, 225,000 bales to Great Britain, and 10,000 bales to the Continent, against 95,000 bales and 700 bales respectively last year; further considerable shipments were in process. The quality has been greatly improved, which will make it compete successfully with the lower kinds of American cotton.

TREN.—The *Universal Review*, (British,) in a notice of the works of Dr. Mackay and Colley Gratton on America, says: "Most voyagers in America repeat the same thing over and over again. We are rather tired of hearing that the hotels are of enormous size; that you can have your clothes washed by steam; that the lake steamers are the most luxurious in the world; that the ladies dress in an exaggerated style of fashion; and that most persons eat in a tremendous hurry.

BEECHER ON COLOR.—Free colored people exist in every State in our Union and are greatly increasing—particularly in those States in which laws are passed forbidding them to go there; for laws are like hoes that cut off the tops of the weeds, making each root send out forty new shoots! They are separated from other citizens by the badge of color, and by a prejudice which is fastened upon them by the existence of their kind in slavery. For I hold that the prejudice which exists against color, is not against color; and it is not against colorless, nor indolence, nor impertinence; because you shall find, in nearly twenty States, that wheretoever color is subordinated to a man's interests, he can eat with color, and sleep with color, and ride with color, and do everything with color; if a man only owns the color, he has no prejudice against color. There is not the relation of life that cannot be endured with color as black as *blignia*, if it is only owned. It is only when color owns itself that there is prejudice against it.

SPEECH OF WENDELL PHILLIPS.

[The following extracts are from a lecture given by Wendell Phillips, before the Fraternity Association of Boston.]

Government arrogates to itself that it forms men. As well might the man down here in the Court House, who registers the birth of children, imagine that he was the father of all the children he registers. (Loud laughter.) Everybody knows that government never began anything. It is the whole world that thinks and governs. Books, churches, governments are what *we* make them. France is Catholic, and has got a Pope, but *we* the most tolerant country in the world. Now England is Protestant, and has tolerated written all over her statute book, and she has a Pope in every village, and the first thing that tests a boy's courage is to dare to differ from his father. (Applause.) Popery! why, we have got two as signal Popes as they had in Europe three centuries ago—there is *Belloc* at Avignon, and *Adams* at Rome. (Great merriment, followed by loud applause.) So with government. Men think government forms. Let us take an example.

Take Sir Robert Peel and Webster as measures and examples;—two great men, remarkably alike. Neither of them ever had an original idea.—(Laughter.) Neither kept long any idea they borrowed. Both borrowed from our quarter, high or low, North or South, friend or enemy. Both were weathercocks, not winds; creatures, not creators. Yet Peel died England's idol—the unquestioned head of the statesman of the age; Webster the disgraced and bankrupt chief of a broken and ruined party. Why? Examine the difference.—Webster borrowed free trade of Calhoun, and the tariff of Clay; took his constitutional principles from Marshall, his constitutional learning from Story, and his doctrine of treason from Mr. George Ticknor Curtis; (laughter,) and he followed Channing and Garrison a little way, then turned dogface in the wake of Douglas and Davis (applause and a few hisses); at first, with Algernon Sydney, (my blood boils yet as I think how I used to declaim it,) declaring the best legacy he could leave his children was free speech and the example of using it; then of Preston S. Brooks and *begree* he took lessons in smothering discussion and hunting slaves. In 1850, when the world was asleep, he rebuked the slave-trade; in 1850, when the battle was hottest, he let Everett omit from his works all the best anti-slavery utterances!

Sir Robert Peel was just like him. He "changed" every opinion, violated (so says one of the *Reviews*), *et sic* pledge, broke up every party, and deserted every colleague he ever had; set his son went down in glory. Why? Because his step was ever onward; he lived to learn. Every change was a sacrifice, and he could truly say, in 1829, the glorious Latin Webster borrowed of him, "*Vera pro gratia*."—I tell you unweakened truth. But Webster's steps, crablike, were backwards. (Applause and hisses.) "Because thou art *vittibus*, shall there be no more cakes and ale!" Because you have your prejudices, shall there be no history written? Our task is unlike that of some meetings of late—*History*, not *flattery* (Applause.) by conviction. He sunk from free trade to a tariff; from Chief-Justice Marshall to Mr. George Ticknor Curtis;—from Garrison to Douglas;—from Algernon, Sydney to the slave overseers. I read in this one of the dangers of our form of Government. As De Toqueville says so wisely, "The weakness of a Democracy is, that unless guarded, it merges into despotism." Such a life is the first step, and half a dozen is the Niagara carrying us over.

But both "budded better than they knew." Both forced the outward world to think for itself, and become statesmen. No man, says *Disraeli*, ever weakened government so much as Peel. Thank Heaven for that—so much gained. Changing every day, their admirers were forced to learn, to think for themselves. In the country once I lived with a Democrat who never had an opinion on the day's news till he had read the *Boston Traveller*. (Laughter.) Such close imitation is a little too hard. Webster's retainers fell off into the easier track of doing their own thinking. A German once sketching a Middlesex county landscape, took a cow for his fixed point of perspective; she moved, and his whole picture was a muddle. Following Peel and Webster was a muddle; hence came the era of outside agitation—and those too lazy to think for themselves at least took a fixed point for their political perspective—Garrison or Charles Sumner, for instance.

We shall have enough to do, if we do our duty. The world is awake—some wholly, and some only half. Men who gather their garments scornfully and close about them when their fellows offer to express sympathy for the bravest scholar and most Christian minister the liberal New England sect know—these timid little souls make daily effort in the market-place, crying for a broad church, a broad church—and one who lives by venturing a bold theory to-day, and spending to-morrow in taking it back; stuffing that he has been "Dropping buckets into empty wells, and growing old in drawing nothing out," assures you that it is not cowardice, but lack of