The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

BENJAMIN S. JONES, EDITOR. "NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS." ANN PEARSON, PUBLISHING AGENT.

VOL. 16.---NO. 28. SALEM, COLUMBIANA COUNTY, OHIO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1861. WHOLE NO. 802.

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, 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 $300; six months, $2.00.

☞Advertisements for patent medicines, specific remedies, chance to make money, &c., neither solicited nor published.

J. HUDSON, PRINTER.

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

For the Anti-Slavery Bugle.

LETTER FROM PHILADELPHIA.

BR. JONES: "Things is workin," as a man once said. True, things *are* working, and that to some purpose. The union saving business is now in active operation. A great amount of talent, capital, management, intrigue, fraud and deception are in requisition to put down the crisis, and the more the doctors, and priests, and politicians, and grandmas try to put the *cry* down the more it went *cease*. Their efforts to stifle free discussion in Boston, Rochester, Syracuse and other cities only make the great mass of the people of the country speak more freely, think more vigorously, and act more energetically. And even Cleveland may turn bull-dog, for the time, and with the dregs and emptyings of her doggeries and other nameless houses, to do the barking at the command of a United States official, and *gallantly* unite to return a poor, helpless woman to slavery in order to insure the contempt even of all truly (if such thing can be) high minded slaveholders, and save the union. But will all this make slavery eternal? Far from it. The days of slavery are numbered, and for this reason are the friends of the system becoming so desperate as to do any thing for a little more respite. A felon, in his cell, knowing that to morrow is his last day, would give millions, if in his power, for a month's or even one week's release. Just so with this culprit. The jury of a civilized world has heard his career of crime, and placed the mark of condemnation on his brow, and one country after another is pronouncing the sentence of death upon him. Despotic Russia, with all the tyrannical proclivities attributed to her by other nations, as a juryman in this case, has about pronounced the word guilty upon this victim which has so long been destroying and trampling down humanity.

In the face of such an array of condemnation how long, think you, can Crittenden compromises, union saving conventions, and pro-slavery gag laws, keep back the doom of slavery on our shores? The whirlwind has arisen, the storm has come, and nothing human can check it. An idea has broken loose—the idea of liberty—and no fetter of potentate, tyrant, priest, king, or government can arrest its mission. Popes have had their inquisitions, princes their halters and gibbets, despots their guillotines, Jews their crosses, and rulers their servile armies, but all have not stopped the progress of this immortal idea—the universal rights of man. Tyranny may cause much suffering yet; in its throes of despair it will make tremendous struggles for a prolonged existence, but its day of doom has come.

Our Union savers here have suffered much tribulation, but whether their sacrifices, bowings-down, drink-offerings, and deep servility will be heard by the powers below—down South—is a problem yet unsolved. Politicians have congeed, they have caused the lower law priests to conge, and induced some of the working men to show the supple knee, but it don't seem to charm the South much. Meanwhile we have some thorough, sterling anti-slavery people here who do not make much ado—but they are looking on with intense interest, and are quietly at work. It is the anti-slavery feeling here which procures the services of such world renowned lecturers as Sumner, Beecher and those eminent men, who *will* speak for liberty, even if the one is a preacher and the other a politician.—And they draw immense audiences, too, who not only admire their talents, but approve their sentiments. Mr. Sumner's subject was Lafayette.—The manner in which he viewed it made it a grand theme for liberty. His description of the character of the noble Gaul, proved his *subject* to be an abolitionist—just such a man, who if he were now to go in most of the Southern States, would be liable to lose his liberty if not his life. Mr. S. is a fine looking man, an impressive speaker; and his highest encomiums of Lafayette, and especially where he described him as an anti-slavery man, met the decided approval of the audience, and often elicited warm applause. So free speech is not quite dead here yet, conservative as this city really is.

I think the sorrows of those union saints who are wailing and weeping and almost gnashing their teeth for the sake of the Union, are pretty aptly described in these words: "Men's hearts failing them, for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your hands; for your redemption draweth nigh." Luke XXI, 26-28. Is it not so? Why some of these unionists are almost frantic. Their hearts are failing for fear at coming events, for the union (their heaven) is shaking, and so distracted are they that they know not what to do. But while their trouble is thickest, is not the political redemption of the slave drawing nigh? So it looks to me.

Slavery is called *the institution* of the South.—In the North we, too, have an *institution*, as venerable for age, as sacred to man, and as worthy the regard of all, and that is *free speech*. I think our institution is rather more respectable than theirs of the South. And our "Southern brethren," complain that we of the North have interfered with their institution. The greatest interference most of us have interposed is the right of free speech. Can't their sacred, time-honored, venerable, constitutional, scriptural institution stand before our words? If not, our sayings must have a potency, or their institution an inherent weakness, which naturally makes the conflict between them irrepressible, and which it will not require the precience of a prophet to forshadow the result, that the latter is doomed to fall where the former is tolerated. But what right have they to complain of our interference with their institution? Have they not a thousand times more interfered with our institution of free speech? Most willingly have some of our friends carried out the Declaration of Independence in regard to an occasional slave—or doing as they would be done by—obeying the higher law of humanity—but in how many hundreds and thousands of cases has our institution been interfered with, and free speech put down by mobs? Abolitionists have suffered all the horrors of martyrdom merely for a free expression of opinion. The history of the times proves this in the shape of proslavery mobs, lynchings, burnings, destruction of presses, halls, churches, and murders. I known the nature of their institution requires and even demands all this, but are we to forfeit all our rights on this account? Certainly not. Let compromisers go on, and make their decrees—the time has come when freedom of thought will be exercised, and thus our institution is bound to outlives that of the South.

We see that the south are very much opposed to coercion—they are not going to submit to force—not they—yet they are endeavoring to coerce the north—make not only their millions of slaves do their will, but enforce submission on the part of some 20,000,000 of northern people, to the requirements of less than half a million of nabobs. Under these circumstances I am glad to see that they are making such signal efforts to secede—set up for themselves—and be independent of the north and the rest of mankind. Let them come themselves out of the union as fast as possible, for financially, morally, religiously, politically and in every way we can imagine, the north will be better off with that sort of *coercion*. Heretofore they have proved ambitious covenant makers, and just as reckless covenant breakers. First to make laws, they have been the first to break them.

Is it not rather funny that they all along have had the government, the constitution, the courts, executives, and laws, they said, and the people in their favor, and now the discovery is made that these fugitive slave laws, the constitution, and the people are not quite strong enough in their behalf? When will they get things to please them? If fugitives slaves laws, proslavery judges, unprincipled commissioners, and bloodhound marshals cant do enough for them, in the name of all that is right who can satisfy their wants? Courts, mobs, priests of the lover law order, and even armies have failed in efficiency to serve them with fidelity. In view of all this what can compromisers do? They may be as servile as the veriest slaves, but that is about all the good it will do them. Make laws eternal in favor of slavery! It is an absurdity. As I before intimated, the jury of a civilized world has spoken a verdict against human oppression; and as that idea, liberty, is let loose to roam all over the earth, the spasmodic throes of a party of compromisers cannot stem the torrent of its onward course.

Some time since I believe I made reference to the meetings of the Progressive Friends here. These meetings are continuing, and increasing in interest. Various questions come up for consideration, but no matter what the theme is the slavery issue is sure to be brought in. Among the anti-slavery speakers is a young gentleman by the name of Tomlinson, who is quite well posted on the political issues of the day, and the way he uses up the pro-slavery spouters—for such have a hearing there—is no small drawback to their cause. Last Sunday Miss Dickinson made a brief and eloquent anti-slavery speech in that meeting, and when she sat down it was amid the irrepressible applause of not a few present.

For many years it was the boast of the democracy that it, alone, saved the union. But that vaunting party seems to have gone to smash—and it was destroyed beyond redemption by its own leaders and the slavery issue. Then to some of the big churches have been attributed the salt that saved the union, but they, too, have been rent by slavery. Now some of the leaders of the republican party are trying to save union by means of that organization. I am sure it will be a failure, as it ought to be. If the grace of the popular churches, and the servility of the great democracy have fallen before the tide of progress, free speech, and the *irrepressible conflict*, the comparatively new and untried republican party will be prostrated it as a reed by the sweeping tornado, from the same causes.

It seems to me that the legislatures of some of the free states are making haste to do works of supererogation in behalf of slavery by repealing their personal liberty bills. In most if not all the states which have done or propose doing so, I believe republicanism triumphed. Is not that a great anti-slavery party? It was its professions of opposition to slavery which gave the party success, and now in power it is trying to obliterate every vestige of law in favor freedom. They must be very stupid to think that these acts of baseness will satisfy the South. So far as I am see the ultra South has only contempt for such treachery, and I think it quite as good pay as they deserve.

But perhaps I have trespassed long enough on your patience for the present.

Respectfully, J. F.

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 10, 1861.

[The following was mislaid, which is the cause of its non-appearance before. It has not been injured by keeping. ED. BUGLE]

For the Anti-Slavery Bugle.

A LETTER TO REV. T. B. McCORMICK.

DEAR SIR: In your closing lecture at this place, on the iniquity of American Slavery—a lecture, *nearly every word* of which I could endorse with a hearty amen, you made one statement which is false in history, and unjust to the memory of a much abused name. As the position of the individual in question is universally belied by the Church, and very generally misunderstood by community at large, I deem it but an act of simple justice to set the matter right.

After demonstrating the guilt of the Church, and the sin of the great political parties in their complicity with the crime of slavery, you referred to the atheistic sentiment advanced by Thomas Corwin, that man had no *inherent rights;* but that as American citizens, all our civil and political privileges are conferred by the Constitution! And then, as if to add sarcasm to the infamous dogma, you remarked that this was the idea of "*Tom Paine;*" and told your hearers that "if they wished to be on the side of *Tom Paine*, they could deny man's inalienable rights."

Now, however pure might have been your motive in coupling the name of a true theist, a pure patriot, and a just man, with a sentiment at once atheistic and diabolical, I feel it my duty as a lover of truth and a defender of justice, to protest against any such profanation of the memory of an abused, belied, and despised man.

Whatever may be the thought of Thomas Paine's theological notions, his whole history in regard to the "rights of man," ought to be a sure guaranty against any such imputation, especially from all who claim to be reformers. In his introduction to "Common Sense," a pamphlet "addressed to the inhabitants of America," before the Declaration of Independence, he says:

"The cause of America is, in a great measure, the cause of all mankind. Many circumstances have, and will arise, which are not local, but universal, and through which the lovers of all mankind are affected, and in the event of which, their affections are interested. The laying a country desolate with fire and sword, declaring war against the *natural rights of all mankind*, and extirpating the defenders thereof from the face of the earth, *is the concern of every man to whom nature has given the power of feeling!*"

I might make copious extracts from the body of the work above alluded to, illustrating and enforcing the grand central idea of the Declaration of Independence, viz; the inherent and inalienable right of all men to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

But it seems wholly unnecessary. It appears to me that Thomas Paine is the *last man* whose name should be connected with the infidel idea, that human governments confer any *rights* upon the race.

Let us then, my brother, while maintaining the unquestionable right of the colored man to equal, social and political privileges with ourselves, see to it that we do no injustice to any whom ignorance, malice, or religious bigotry, have denied a just position before the world.

Yours for universal liberty and equal justice to *all* mankind.

D. M. ALLEN.

NEWBURY, Geauga Co., Dec. 31, 1860.

For the Bugle.

NUMBER 10.

MR. JONES: In resuming my remarks on the Editorial in the *Princeton Review*, let me here say that the Editor, Dr. Hodge, is mistaken in asserting that: "It is assumed that any State has the right to secede from the Union whenever it sees fit."

The advocate of secession, the old Jefferson Democrats, assume nothing. They prove their premises and the conclusions necessarily follow.

With a seeming triumph the Review asks: "Is, then, secession one of the reserved rights of the State?" I unhesitatingly answer in the affirmative; but I admit that the answer to this very important question, upon which the whole controversy rests, depends upon the solution of another problem, namely, "is Massachusets a free sovereign State?" Here let me recapitulate some of my former proofs. First: That the Constitution of Massachusets expressly asserts the affirmative of this question, and, also, expressly claims the absolute and unconditional allegiance of the people of that State. Second: That, up to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, the States, Massachusetts included, asserted in the Articles of Confederation, that: "Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence." And third: That the tenth amendment to the Federal Constitution declares that: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." Now here are three facts from official public documents. The two first are positive proofs that up to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, the States were sovereign. The third fact proves that the States are yet sovereign, unless the delegation of sovereignty can be found in the Federal Constitution. Hence, "the right to secede," being based on State sovereignty, "is a reserved right." Is the question of the Review answered? If it thinks not, I challenge its learned theological Editor, the clasical statesman on the banks of Hudson, or any one else, to point out the clause of the Constitution containing the delegation of State sovereignty. Mere implication will not do. The express grant must be shown before you can rightfully denounce men as rebels and traitors for "*bearing true faith and allegiance*" to the sovereign States of which they are members or citizens.

The Review says: Our national legislature is restricted within very narrow limits. * * * Its authority is limited by a written Constitution."

Now will the Review show where and how the Federal Government, "*restricted within very narrow limits,*" acquired the right to coerce a State into submission for repealing, by and through a Convention of its sovereign people, the ordinance by which it had previously, and in its sovereign capacity as a State, adopted the Federal Constitution as a part of its organic law?

The Review indirectly admits the sovereignty of the States, in their separate capacity, by its assertion that "impotent hostility" to the fugitive slave law, is "unbecoming the *dignity* of a *sovereign* State." On this conceded "*sovereignty,*" rests the reserved right of a State to secede without incurring the guilt of treason and rebellion, which can result only from the dismemberment of a *State* or *Nation*. These terms are convertable. Messrs Walker, Webster, Worcester, and all other lexicographers, to whose works I have had access, define "sovereign" to be "supreme in power; possessing supreme dominion, as a sovereign prince."

If this definition be correct, and it will not be denied, there is no human tribunal competent, rightfully, to call in question the reserved and constitutional, the moral and natural right of a sovereign State of this Confederacy, as one of the parties to the Constitutional compact, to secede from its co-States, with or without cause. It is true, that a State by seceding may, either knowingly or unknowingly, do a wrong to its co-States, but this is no argument against the right. The exercise of undoubted rights are often obnoxious to abuse. "Even the benign religion of the *Prince of Peace* has been made the unwilling instrument of the greatest calamities ever experienced by man."

But it is said that because "the Constitution, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made by the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land," that, therefore, secession is treason and rebellion.

While a State remains in the Union, its citizens are unquestionably bound to obey the "Federal Constitution, and all laws made in pursuance thereof," not because they owe "allegiance to the Constitution, the Union, or the Country," but for the reason that the State in its highest sovereign capacity, by a Convention of the people, has adopted the Federal Constitution as a part of its organic law; and thus, through their allegiance to the State, bound its citizens to obey the Federal Constitution. But the Federal Constitution, like the State Constitution, the domestic part of the organic law, is, from the very necessity of self-government, subject to "the right of the people of the State," so far as the State is concerned, "to abolish it and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." The great American doctrine is, "that all just government is based on the consent of the governed;" and whenever the States surrender this cardinal principle, they will soon find that they gained nothing by the American Revolution but a change of *masters*.

On the question of nationality, Dr. Hodge is sadly mistaken in his facts. He asserts: "That these States do constitute one nation, as distinguished from a number of nations bound together by treaty, is proved by the fact that they in their collective capacity, have all the attributes, and exercise all the prerogatives of a nation." Now this alledged *fact* is absolutely false as will be proven by the Doctor himself. He says: 'Our national legislature is restricted within very narrow limits by the Constitution." This is true, and it is also true that the other departments of the Federal Government are even more "*limited.*" How, then, can the Federal Government, thus "*restricted within very narrow limits,*" be truthfully said to "*have all the attributes and exercise all the prerogatives of a nation?*"

A moment's reflection must convince Dr. Hodge of the egregious error into which he has blundered. This great "nation" is so "limited in its attributes and prerogatives" that it cannot protect the property and the reputation, the liberty and the life of Dr. Hodge from the attacks of his fellow citizens of New Jersey.

Again, the *Review* says: "That the States are independent and sovereign within constitutional limits, in the management of their internal affairs, is no more inconsistent with the unity of the nation than the like independence of municipal corporations in England is inconsistant with the national unity of Great Britain."

This is another egregious blunder. Virginia, (doubtless with the approbation of Dr. Hodge,) hung John Brown for alledged treason. Did the "*municipal corporations in England*" behead Alice Lisle for alledged treason? That was the work of the "*Bloody Assizes*" under Judge Jeffreys, the corrupt tool of the British *sovereign* James the Second, to whom, under the British Constitution and laws, the allegiance of the subject was due. "The Abeville District," says Dr. Hodge, "cannot secede from South Carolina." Wonderful discovery this for a learned Theologian. Has "the Abbeville District," as a "municipal corporation in England," a "*Coat of Arms,*" or do either of them pretend to be sovereign? Ireland and Scotland have, since merging their separate sovereignty in the State of Great Britain, ceased to exhibit to the world, as the insignia of their sovereignty, their former "*Coats of Arms?*" And why, if the States of this Confederacy have parted with their sovereignty, do they keep, *each a "Coat of Arms,"* as the symbol of the "freedom, independence and sovereignty," which they won, from their previously acknowledged *sovereign*, King George the Third, by a bloody war? Dr. Hodge says: "The United States "*have one name,*" but he fails to write it down. Geography says: they have thirty-three names, and gives them to the student. Which is correct? Others say: "The United States have a Coat of Arms, and they are a nation." This sounds well, but let the phraseology be changed and see the result. The United States *has* a Coat of Arms, and they *is* a *State*. This is the legitimate result of this false theory of our complex system of Federal and State Governments, because the United States being *one*, and in the singular number, the verbs used must be the same. But further, State and Nation being convertable terms, it is just as correct to say: that the United States are "*one State,*" as to say that they are "*one Nation.*"

In reply to the doctrine "that the United States are a nation because they have a Coat of Arms," it is sufficient to remark, that as each State by its Coat of Arms keeps before the nations of the earth the symbol of its freedom, independence and sovereignty, as a State or Nation, it also, by the Coat of Arms of the United States, exhibits to the same Nations the symbol of its Federal Compact with its co-States, as equal and absolute sovereignties in all their relations with foreign States, Kingdoms and Empires.

As the Review brings Father Ritche and ex-President Madison to testify against secession their testimony will be examined in my next number.

B. G. WRIGHT.

RURAL, ILL., Feb. 10, 1861.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN BROUGHAM AND REDPATH.

Lord Brougham in reply to an invitation to attend the recent John Brown meeting in Boston, sent a letter which has been published extensively by the pro-slavery press. We give it below, as also Mr. Redpath's reply, which the said pro-slavery press will take especial care *not* to publish. Mr. Redpath's letter is pertinent, pointed, and personal. [ED. BUGLE.

LETTER FROM LORD BROUGHAM.

BROUGHAM, Nov. 20.

SIR: I feel honored by the invitation to attend the Boston Convention, and to give my opinion upon the question, "How can American slavery be abolished?" I consider the application is made to me as conceiving me to represent the anti-slavery body in this country; and I believe that I speak their sentiments, as well as my own, in expressing *the widest difference of opinion with you upon the merits of those who promoted the Harper's Ferry expedition, and upon the fate of those who suffered for their conduct in it.* No one will doubt my earnest desire to see slavery extinguished; but that desire can only be gratified by lawful means—*a strict regard to the rights of property, or what the law declares to be property, and a constant repugnance to the shedding of blood.* No man can be considered a martyr unless he not only suffers, but is witness to the truth; and *he does not bear this testimony who seeks a lawful object by illegal means.* Any other course taken for the abolition of slavery can only delay the consummation we so devoutly wish, besides exposing the community to the hazard of an insurrection, perhaps less hurtful to the master than the slave. When the British emancipation was finally carried, it was accomplished by steps, and five years elapsed between the commencement of the measure in 1833 and its completion in 1838.

The declaration of the law which pronounced a slave free as soon as he touched British ground (erroneously ascribed to the English courts under Lord Mansfield, but really made by the judges in Scotland) may seem to be inconsistent with the principle now laid down. But *I am bound to express my doubts if such a decision would have been given had Jamaica touched upon the coasts of this country.* It is certain that the judges did *not* intend to declare that *all* property in slaves should instantly cease, and yet such would have been the inevitable effect of their judgment in the case supposed, which somewhat resembles that of America.

In the elevation of your new President all friends of America, of its continued Union, of the final extinction of slavery by peaceful means, and of the utter immediate extinction of the execrable slave trade—all friends of the human race must heartily rejoice. They will, let us hope, find in him a powerful ally, as his country may expect to find an able, a consistent, and an honest ruler.

I have the honor to be,

Your faithful servant,

BROUGHAM.

"James Redpath, Esq., Boston, U. S."

REPLY TO LORD BROUGHAM.

BOSTON, Jan. 28, 1861.

TO HENRY, LORD BROUGHAM:

MY LORD: I have received your reply to our question—"How can American Slavery be abolished?"

I take exceptions to its erroneous ethical teachings, and appeal from Brougham, the English Lord, to Henry Brougham, the Tribune of the English People to sustain me.

I appeal from the nobleman whose letter is now quoted, with eager approval, by every pro-slavery journal of our cities, to the popular orator whose words, radient with the light of Heaven, have so often confounded the most cunning sophistries of the allies of the oppressor. I appeal from the Lord who so recently has said:

"No one can doubt my earnest desire to see Slavery extinguished; but that desire can only be gratified by lawful means—a strict regard to the rights of property, *or what the law calls property*, and a constant repugnance to the shedding of blood;"—to the noble young Englishman, of lowly birth, who thrilled two continents with these eloquent words:—

"Tell me not of rights—talk not of the property of the planter in his slaves. I deny the right—I acknowledge not the property. The principles, the feelings of our common nature, rise in rebellion against it. * * * In vain you tell me of laws that sanction such a claim! There is a law above all the enactments of human codes—the same throughout the world, the same in all time—such as it was before the dawning genius of Columbus pierced the night of ages and opened to one world the sources of power, wealth and knowledge; to another all unutterable woe; such it is at this day; it is the law written by the finger of God on the heart of man; and by that law unchangeable and eternal, while men despise fraud, and loathe rapine, and abhor blood, they shall reject with indignation the wild, guilty fantasy that man can hold property in man." When you have pronounced, my Lord, on this point, I may sustain certain other exceptions, not above noted, by equally excellent authority. I have the honor to be,

Your obedient servant,

JAMES REDPATH.

From the Stark County Republican.

THE FUGITIVE LUCY.

That the fugitive Lucy, was a runaway slave, and a fit subject of the Fugitive slave law, admits of no doubt. That the attempted Lima rescue was wrong and unlawful is equally clear. Yet, on the other hand it seems to us that the appetite for "dirt" was keener than the necessities of the occasion called for. The Messrs. Goshorn, the owners and pursuers of the chattle Lucy were treated by the citizens of Cleveland in such comfortable wise that they united in publishing a card of thanks in the daily papers, expressive of their compliments for the same. The elder Mr. Goshorn was permitted to make a speech in the United States Court Room in which he said, "how pleasant it would be, if I could come among you with this same girl as my servant, and enjoy your hospitality as I have now!" O, it would be very pleasant, and whenever the people of the North shall have so far succeeded in "conquering their prejudices" as to make the pleasure of the slaveholders paramount to all other considerations, he may enjoy the privilege!

Then again, the *ruse* of the conductor at Lima was well enough. Conducter Cleland discharged his duty faithfully and judiciously. But is difficult to see anything in the ugly necessity of returning a fugitive to bondage to merit the public presentation of a "Goldheaded cane," although it was perfectly proper that the conductor should listen to the speech of McKee of the *Times*, on that occasion, if the same was as innocent an affair as the reported copy of it in that paper.

If the Fugitive Law must be enforced, so be it; but, in Heaven's name, let us not pretend to obey its unchristian requirements with alacrity! We could not deny that our sympathies are with the hunted victims of the execrable law, even for the sake of saving the Union.

Could we believe that the Union requires the sacrifice of all manhood and self-respect on the part of Northern men, we would hail its dissolution with joy!

MOB BRAVERY IN SYRACUSE.

We omitted last week to inform our readers that we had been ruled for a short time in this city by a mob. The reason for this omission was, we wanted to see whether the authorities, City or County, would attempt any vindication of themselves, or the rights of our citizens. The occasion of the mob demonstration was an anti-slavery meeting, appointed to be held under the supervision of the American Anti-Slavery Society, at Convention Hall, Jan. 29th, to be continued during that and the following day. The Hall was seized before the time appointed, by just such a mass of humanity as is usually employed on such occasions, and they proceeded to organize a meeting, and passed resolutions of their own, or rather such as had doubtless been prepared for the occasion; and they conducted in all respects as mobs usually do.

The friends who had contemplated holding the meeting, finding it impossible to do so, finally retired; and in the evening held a meeting in the parlors of Dr. Pease, at his private residence, and had a very satisfactory time, considering all the circumstances. At the conclusion of this day of uproar, a portion of our citizens, feeling disgraced, and the reputation of our city dishonored, resolved to vindicate the sacredness of the right of free speech, by holding a *citizens'* meeting the next day in the same place. The meeting was organized by the appointment of Rev. Mr. Strieby of the Plymouth Church, as Chairman. After a short period had elapsed, the same scenes were enacted as had taken place the day before. The whole of these proceedings as they are detailed to us by those who were present, and what we personally saw and heard in the street on Wednesday evening, constitutes a chapter of profanity and obscenity, that would disgrace the most uncivilized nation in our world.

Some twelve or more of these ruffians have been indicted by the Grand Jury of the County, who were in session, and it remains to be seen what will be the result, when they shall be tried. We have no doubt but the prime movers of these disgraceful proceedings, originated with prominent individuals who kept behind the curtains. The guilt mainly rests upon them, though if any are punished, it must be their tools. These are the simple facts, as far as we are able to gather them; and we never made a record of events where we chanced to reside, so mortifying to our own feelings, and so disgraceful to the locality of our home as these are.

The toleration of mob rule, in any place, is the inauguration of a force that sweeps down every interest of society. No rule is so revolting as this is. And the history of mobocratic sway, is one of recklessness and ruin, the originators of them frequently being the victims of the enraged multitudes they had invoked to the first acts of lawlessness. We wonder men of thought do not reflect upon these facts in history, and seek to impose checks upon the low and vulgar, who make their reliance upon brute force, when they meet with what they do not like. We have no doubt but the originators of this war upon the peace of this city, will see the time, at no distant period too, when it will be the great regret of their life, that they had any hand in a movement, which if not checked, would sweep down every interest of morality, finance, and social security.

In a time like the present, we may expect the very sediments of society will be stirred up; and that a large portion of this will be at the control of those who shape the habits of society. And it becomes a question of vast importance, how this element is to be influenced. If the child viciously educated, soon displaces the parent from his home, treating him with bitter cruelty, can any thing better be expected of those who make up the body of mobs, when once loose upon any portion of the