

# The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

OLIVER JOHNSON, Editor.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

JAMES BARNABY, Publishing Agent.

VOL. 5--NO. 13.

SALEM, COLUMBIANA CO., OHIO, DECEMBER 8, 1849.

WHOLE NO. 221.

## THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE, PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT SALEM, COLUMBIANA CO., OHIO.

### TERMS.

\$1.50 per annum, if paid within the first six months of the subscriber's year.

If paid before three months of the year has expired, a deduction of twenty-five cents will be made, reducing the price to \$1.25.

If payment be made in advance, or on the receipt of the first number, fifty cents will be deducted, making the subscription but \$1.

To any person wishing to examine the character of the paper, it will be furnished six months, for fifty cents in advance; to all others, seventy-five cents will be charged.

No deviation from these terms.

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.

Communications intended for insertion, to be addressed to OLIVER JOHNSON, Editor. All others to JAMES BARNABY, Publishing Agent.

## Selections.

### No Union with Slaveholders.

BY WILLIAM L. BOWDITCH.

"We will extend to the slaveholder all the courtesy for which we are capable. If he is a worthy man, we will give him credit for all the good that he does, and our deep sympathy in all the temptations under which he falls. But to help him in his sin, to strengthen him in the slave-trade, is more than he has a right to ask."—*Wendell Phillips.*

No wrong action can be rightfully done.—No wrong can be rightfully supported. We can neither rightfully hold slaves nor support others in slaveholding, because, as we have seen, slaveholding is under all circumstances wrong. Some of the provisions of the Constitution, as we have seen, were expressly designed for the purpose of supporting slavery, and for over half a century have very materially supported it. Consequently, these provisions cannot be rightfully obeyed or supported. It is wrong to offer a bounty on slaveholding,—to give the oppressor power and influence in proportion as he tramples on the rights of his fellow-man; it is wrong to return, or aid in returning, a fugitive slave; it is wrong to aid in keeping the slave in his fetters. These things are wrong, and not all the Constitutions and laws of the Universe can make them right. We cannot, therefore, rightfully obey the pro-slavery clauses of the Constitution.

If we cannot rightfully obey them ourselves, we cannot rightfully voluntarily support others in obeying them. If it is wrong for me to return a fugitive slave, it is wrong for me voluntarily to aid or support another man in doing the act. If it is wrong for me to commit murder, it is no less wrong for me to hand the pistol to the assassin. Whatever it is wrong for us to do ourselves, it is wrong for us voluntarily to aid or support others in doing. Consequently, it is wrong for us voluntarily to aid or support others in obeying the pro-slavery requirements of the Constitution.

If we cannot rightfully obey them, it is wrong for us to promise such obedience. If it is wrong for us voluntarily to support others in their obedience, it is wrong for us to promise any such support. If it is wrong for us to return a fugitive slave, it is wrong for us to promise to return one. If it is wrong for us voluntarily to aid the slave-hunter, it is wrong for us to promise such aid. Whatever it is wrong for us to do or aid others in doing, it is wrong for us to promise to do or aid others in doing. Consequently, it is wrong for us to promise to support the constitutional provisions. We cannot, therefore, accept any office, either State or National, which renders it necessary to support these clauses, or to promise to support them. We cannot, therefore, rightfully hold any executive or judicial office, either State or National, or become a member of any State legislature or of Congress; for all these offices are obliged solemnly to swear or affirm that they will support the Constitution; and to support the Constitution is to support all its clauses, as well those which do not, as those which do. If we take this oath, meaning not to keep it, we add to our wrong, perjury; for we mentally break our oath at the very instant it passes our lips.

Some good men seek to avoid the difficulty by saying, "When I swear to support the Constitution, I mean I will support the good clauses in it, and disobey the bad, and submit to the penalty for such disobedience."—But such a course is not a compliance with the terms of the oath. You have sworn "to support the Constitution"; that is, the whole Constitution,—all its clauses,—the bad as surely as the good. Your oath is not in the alternative, "I will support the clause requiring the return of fugitive slaves, or pay five hundred dollars for every slave laid in escaping; but simply, without qualification, 'I will support the side of the oppressor.' If you aid the fugitive slave to escape from his master, you do not support the latter in retaining his property, merely by paying the legal penalty for not giving such support. You would not support a bad law, and yet you say your oath is not broken, because you submit to the penalty for not supporting it. The thief does not support the law of private property, merely by submitting to the legal punishment of his crime. To support is to be active; to submit is to be passive. You swear to be active, and you do not comply with your oath by being merely passive. You have sworn actively to support the capture of slaves. You break your oath, if you refuse to do this, or do any thing less or different from this.

Others think to find a good excuse for taking the oath by adopting another alterna-

tive equally unauthorized. "We will support the Constitution," say they, "until we are called on to act under any of its bad clauses, and then we will resign our office, and refuse obedience." Doubtless, honor requires you to resign, if you cannot comply with the terms of your oath; but what right have you to adopt or imagine an alternative in your oath where the law has made none,—where the officer administering it will admit of none? Who does not see a wide difference between an honest oath to support the return of fugitive slaves, and an oath to support such return, but with a firm resolve on your part to refuse such support when called on for it, and to resign? What right have you to take an oath which you have previously resolved not to keep, when called on to comply with it? You admit that a bad clause cannot be rightfully supported, else why do you not support it? You admit that the oath obliges you to support the bad clauses of the Constitution as well as the good; else why do you resign, if refused to support the bad clauses is consistent with your oath? You openly avow, therefore, that, at the very moment you swear to support a clause, you determine never to support it. You swear, and determine not to keep your oath! Such a course seems to us inconsistent with the plainest rules of honesty. We have no right to promise to be wrong, even though we have resolved to do right when the time for action shall arrive.

Others say, "We swear to support the Constitution as we understand it, and we consider it an anti-slavery instrument." In other words, you swear to support an interpretation which is contrary to the plain, obvious, and common meaning of the instrument; contrary to the interpretation put upon it by its framers; contrary to that followed by all the executive and legislative departments of the government, from its first establishment until now; and contrary to that which has been adjudged to be its true interpretation by the final arbiter of its meaning. Of course, you intend to support the true meaning of the Constitution. Do you really believe that the people of the United States did not mean by their words what those words then commonly meant? Do you really believe that your interpretation has ever, at any time, been considered right by the people of the United States, or by any considerable number of them? You deceive yourself with words! What is the Constitution? Not the meaning which you or I, or any third person, may please to put upon it; but that meaning, and that meaning only, which consists with its being, what it declares itself to be, the supreme law of the land. Until, therefore, you can show that the Constitution may properly receive as many different interpretations as there are outlets to support it, and still be, in fact, the supreme law, the one, single, definite rule for all States, as well as people, you have no right to say, "I will support the pro-slavery clauses as I understand them." To support them in any other sense than that which is affixed to them, as the supreme law of the land, is merely to evade the true meaning of your oath.

Others say, "We took the oath before we had any of our present scruples. We would not take the oath now; but, nevertheless, we shall continue in office, and disregard our oath!" This excuse seems to us very objectionable. How can you reap the honor or pecuniary advantages of your office, and honestly refuse compliance with your part of the bargain? When you took office, you were really told, that if you would swear to support the return of fugitive slaves, &c., you should enjoy these honors and these profits. The conscientious man, who, in striving to benefit himself, not his condition, discovers afterwards that he cannot rightfully aid, or promise to aid the slaveholder in retaining his slaves, will not think of claiming the reward which was offered to him, solely because he swore to give such aid. He will make haste to resign honors and rewards which he feels can be retained only at the price of his own degradation.

If we cannot rightfully hold any office, State or National, which requires of us a promise to support the Constitution, it is wrong to place, or voluntarily aid in placing, any other person in such office; for by so doing, we ask him to do wrong. If we vote for Horace Mann, by this act alone we say to him, as distinctly as if the words passed our lips,— "We wish to elect you as representative to Congress. If chosen, we expect the highest sanction in his power to a practice which the Scriptures rank among the highest crimes,—to man-stealing! Slavery has blinded him."

In the hope of securing a purchaser, he assures all who read, that his forty servants are mostly young and likely, and rapidly increasing in number and value. He thus virtually claims the right to seize upon and hold as his own, every child that may be born to any of those whom he calls his servants, and he proposes to transfer that right to the purchaser of his human chattels. Yet he seems unconscious that in so doing he is giving the highest sanction in his power to a practice which the Scriptures rank among the highest crimes,—to man-stealing! Slavery has blinded him.

He takes credit to himself as being willing to sell his servants at a reduced price, provided the purchaser is a kind master. He has probably never thought of the question whether it is possible for one who deals in mortal men as merchandise to be kind; and he seems equally oblivious of the fact, that whoever may be the character of the buyer, the persons bought may, by his death or insolvency, speedily be thrown into other hands. Slavery has blinded him.

And what of the editor or publisher who is willing to give currency to such an advertisement for money? Is he not blind also?—*Western Christian.*

Finally, some say, "This reasoning leads to non-resistance. You disregard the fact that all human governments must contain a greater or less amount of evil; and consequently, if ever you are to support any government in all its requirements, you must support evil." Very true it is that human governments and laws fall short of our relative standard of right, and always of absolute right. What is our duty? Clearly, as moral beings, to support the right, and refuse to support the wrong. Nothing more than this is required of us. Nothing less than this is our duty. We are not put into the world, blindly to support all existing governmental wrongs, until they can be constitutionally abolished. We are to be true to ourselves as moral beings. If we can be true to our own souls and support the government, we may give such support,—not otherwise! Right and wrong are not creatures of agreement and law. Neither the Philadelphia Convention that framed the Constitution, nor the State Conventions that adopted it, had power to make wrong in the slightest degree right, or alter at all the moral character of slaveholding. Right is right, the Revised Statutes to the contrary notwithstanding.—Wrong is wrong, the Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding. We say, therefore, we will obey the good requirements of the Constitution, and peacefully submit to the penalty of disobeying the bad. This is all that government has a right to ask of us. Institutions were made for man, not man for them. Constitutions are the work of man, and man is to be revered before his works. We see no inconsistency or impropriety in supporting the system of free-trade between the States, and refusing to support the domestic slave-trade; in supporting the patent laws, and refusing to aid in returning a runaway slave. We are good-government men, not no-government men. All governments are partly good. All we are willing to support in part; we will actively support the Constitution and laws, so far as conscience permits; we will peacefully submit to legal coercion for disobeying the rest.

Our purpose is accomplished. We have shown that we are politically united with the South in the support of slavery. We have shown that we should constantly bear upon our lips, and in our lives, the motto, "No union with slaveholders, whereby we are obliged to countenance or support slavery." We desire to see a union among the States, but not a slaveholding union! A union of freemen and free States for the sake of freedom, no one would more readily support than we.—But a union like ours, of free men and slaveholders of the States, is a union for the sake of the slave. It is a union which is, in fact, a union with slaveholders, whereby we are obliged to countenance or support slavery. We desire to see a union among the States, but not a slaveholding union! A union of freemen and free States for the sake of freedom, no one would more readily support than we.—But a union like ours, of free men and slaveholders of the States, is a union for the sake of the slave. It is a union which is, in fact, a union with slaveholders, whereby we are obliged to countenance or support slavery.

### Slavery and the Missionary Work.

As an illustration of the blinding influence of slavery, we copy the following advertisement from the Religious Herald, a Baptist paper, published in Richmond, Va.:

WHO WANTS \$35,000 IN PROPERTY? I am desirous to spend the balance of my life as a Missionary, for the Lord's sake, and therefore, offer for sale my Farm, Five Vines, adjacent to Williamsburgh, and containing about 600 acres—well watered, well wooded, and abounding in mair-together with all the crops and stock, and utensils thereon. Also, my house and lot in town, fitted up as a boarding establishment, with all the furniture belonging to the same.

Also, about forty Servants, mostly young and likely, and rapidly increasing in number and value.

To a kind master, I would put the whole property at the reduced price of thirty-five thousand dollars, and arrange the payments entirely to suit the purchaser, provided the interest be annually paid.

SCERVANT JONES. Would any Northern Christian believe it possible, that a true disciple of him who came to preach deliverance to the captive, and the opening of the prison to the bound, could assign, as a reason for wishing to sell forty human beings, a pious and benevolent desire to be a missionary? Mr. Jones does this, and apparently in all sincerity! Slavery has blinded him.

In the hope of securing a purchaser, he assures all who read, that his forty servants are mostly young and likely, and rapidly increasing in number and value. He thus virtually claims the right to seize upon and hold as his own, every child that may be born to any of those whom he calls his servants, and he proposes to transfer that right to the purchaser of his human chattels. Yet he seems unconscious that in so doing he is giving the highest sanction in his power to a practice which the Scriptures rank among the highest crimes,—to man-stealing! Slavery has blinded him.

He takes credit to himself as being willing to sell his servants at a reduced price, provided the purchaser is a kind master. He has probably never thought of the question whether it is possible for one who deals in mortal men as merchandise to be kind; and he seems equally oblivious of the fact, that whoever may be the character of the buyer, the persons bought may, by his death or insolvency, speedily be thrown into other hands. Slavery has blinded him.

And what of the editor or publisher who is willing to give currency to such an advertisement for money? Is he not blind also?—*Western Christian.*

## From the Chronotype. Slavery in Kentucky.

The Slaveocratic Constitutional Convention of Kentucky, have had some rich discussions on the slavery question, on a proposition to forbid the importation of slaves into the State, intended so as to admit the importation by any one for his own use. They have also a proposition before them to prohibit emancipation, and to require the expulsion of the free blacks from the State!

On the non-importation clause, Mr. Clark opposing it said— "I am not unwilling to declare here before the State and world, that I believe Slavery as it exists in the Slave States of this Union, elevates the character of the white race, its dignity, and its morals, and I trust we shall frame a Constitution that will perpetuate Slavery in this State in all time to come."

The same clause, which is a moral avowal of the doctrine of nobility, also declares that he is unwilling to confer on the Legislature the power to legislate on the subject of Slavery at all. "The great mass of the debates professed themselves opposed to Slavery, provided the question were of its introduction. If they were founding a new State, it should not be admitted. They declared that every human being should be free. Yet taking things as they were, they regarded Slavery as a blessing to both whites and blacks, and deprecating all measures tending to emancipation! There were, however, two noble exceptions. Mr. Root ably and eloquently pleaded against shutting the door to freedom, and regarded slavery as a curse from which the State should alight, and hope to be freed. Mr. Garfield opposed a motion to lay the discussion on the table, because, as he said, there were two "literary gems in embryo" which he wished to see developed. The first was, that Slavery was a moral blessing to blacks and whites. The second was the doctrine that the being who descended from heaven to free mankind from the shackles of sin, came also to assist in giving the shackles of human despotism." He wished to have the discussion continue till these strange doctrines could be demonstrated. It is hardly necessary to remark that that would be making it a permanent assembly.

In the Louisville Journal of Oct. 16th, is an editorial commentary on these proceedings, in which, under the most downy tenderness towards the Slave Power, some terribly sharp truths are presented to the Slaveholders. We don't remember when we have seen the practical system so cut to pieces as it is here. "Alas! the son of Eve, could not have stabbed it more precisely to the heart, with 'the kinder end of the spear'." Mr. Prentice has done in this article. Whether his fifth rib will be tickled with some slaveholding Job's bowie knife in consequence, remains to be seen.

Mr. Prentice hits the production of cotton as having reached a stage at which it can no longer absorb all the energies of the planting States, and consequently the demand for slaves in the most unmet. This will cause accumulation of the article in Kentucky, and perhaps turn back the tide. He thinks that while general emancipation would be bad policy, slaves from abroad should be excluded, and the institution be kept, if possible, in its present limits. He then makes the very remarkable statement, that— "In every Slave State there is a maximum of white population which is never passed but when once attained the white population gradually diminishes, while the proportion of slaves rapidly increases. This has been more particularly remarked and generally applied to the low lands of Virginia. The reason usually given for it is, that the lands have been worn out under the impoverishing influence of slave culture. But the census proves the same to be equally true of the upland, soil-rich lands of Kentucky. Some of the counties containing the richest lands in the State have actually decreased in white population."

Mr. Prentice gently reminds the Convention that 120,000 non-slaveholding voters, representing five-sixths of the white population of the State, and not having one single representative of their class in that body, may have some rights and some interest in the settlement of the slave question. "To be sure, he says, it is a wonderful compliment to the integrity and high character of the slaveholders, that these non-slaveholders should have entrusted their interests so entirely to their keeping, and it ought to stimulate the slaveholders to be exceedingly magnanimous and consult the interests of the laboring white men as well as their own!—Can anything be more absurdly ingenious than this turning into a compliment to the slaveholders of what is really a most astounding proof of the shame, ignorance and utter degradation of the non-slaveholding whites?"

Mr. Prentice argues with irresistible force against forbidding emancipation and driving out the free blacks, a class of men to whom he gives a high character as peaceful, trustworthy, law-abiding citizens. On the latter point, he warns the slaveholders that the free blacks have rights and property, and that they who have especially deprecated interference with such rights, should beware of setting the example of treachery. Says he, "if there be any right of property deserving to be characterized as entitled to more sanctity than another, it must be a man's right to himself." Exactly so Mr. Prentice, and there you have sewed up the slaveholders. There never was a time in the history of any free-man, colored or white, in which his right to himself was not "entitled to more sanctity" than his right to anything else. By what right then could this freeman be enslaved? Surely not by any right of property. It must be the right of power, or self-defence, or philanthropy, or something else—the right of wrong, most likely—anything but the right of property. When slaveholders claim their slaves by the right of royalty, priesthood, or

benevolence, there may be more or less sense in it—very little we think, if not less—but when they claim them as property, they only furnish the Abolitionists a logical club to knock their brains out. The claim of property in man, notwithstanding the oily eloquence and ready wit of Henry Clay, is absurd, impossible and abominable.

### What has the North to do with Slavery?

The following letter from a Washington correspondent of The Tribune may possibly help some to answer the question.

WASHINGTON, Tuesday, Oct. 16.  
MR. GREELEY—Facts are stubborn things. When Mr. Gott offered a resolution in the House of Representatives last winter, declaring Slavery in the District of Columbia to be a disgrace to us in the eyes of all Christendom, the Southern members held a meeting in the Senate Chamber, in secret, in the night time, and threatened to disrupt the Union. Is it any wonder that Northern men, with Northern hearts and Northern heads, should cry 'Amen!' to the efforts of these Southern fanatics, when they see, in the very heart of the capital, on Pennsylvania avenue, between the Halls of Legislation and the Halls of Legislative power, on God's holy day, a wagon load of HUMAN CATTLE in the form and likeness of their Maker, chained and manacled to the vehicle like sheep in the butcher's cart, ready for the sacrifice of blood and life?—such a scene occurred here on Sunday last, Oct. 14, year of our Lord 1849. The cries of the miserable wretches as they jolted over the rough pavement at a brisk trot, mingled mysteriously with light and careless voices of God's people returning from the cushioned seats and damask stools where they are wont to worship the Most High, and pray for all mankind! The slave driver had been into Maryland to purchase his 'Live Stock'—probably for the Southern market,—and was taking them to the stables, to be inspected by the dealers in 'God's image cut in clay!'—Oh, did it ever occur to the pious, Christian Slaveholder, or to any Slaveholding freeman who acknowledges himself accountable to a Hereafter, what a fearful distance lies between him and everlasting happiness! When Almighty Power and Retributive Justice go forth to lift the pall of darkness from the world, to unloose the shackles of the oppressed, and open the eyes of mankind to light and truth, how will some of the patriots and saints of to-day call upon the rocks and mountains to cover them from that unsleeping Eye which sees every where!

How long are we to suffer this reproach? Will Slavery continue in the District? Is there not one yet who has arisen with genius fit and courage sufficient to stab the monster to the heart, and rid us of the disgrace? Will men in Congress still truckle to power, and let the seal of everlasting shame and guilt be burned deep on their front—or is there light ahead?

A New Phase.  
The correspondent of the Journal of Commerce announces that a Southern Democrat, on the first day of the session of the Senate, will submit a proposition on the question of Slavery, which will settle it as regards the Territories, and Clay and Calhoun will support it. This is the substance— "That California shall be divided into three States. "That the law of the Missouri Compromise shall be applied thereto. "The Correspondent says: "The bill which will be introduced in the Senate will provide, first, for the establishment of four Territorial Governments, to wit: that for New Mexico, that for Deseret, that part of California north of 36° 30' min. and west of Deseret, and the part of California south of 36° 30' min. shall be authorized forthwith to form a State Constitution, and shall be admitted into the Union. Also, that a new State shall be admitted from the eastern part of Texas, and south of 36° 30' min. Texas and New Mexico, but will provide that the question be submitted to a Board of Commissioners.

California will not be allowed to take the Ocean boundary, which has been proposed in her Convention. "The Territorial questions, mingled with the slavery agitation, and the uncertainty as to the permanence of either of the present party organizations, will give an extraordinary interest to the coming session, even at its very commencement. The slavery question is the great humbug of the day, and will swallow up all others.

John Van Buren.  
This adroit politician, son of the magician Martin Van Buren—a clip of the old block, has a letter in the Boston Republican, correcting certain errors in the report of his recent speech at the Free soil meeting in Faneuil Hall, by the editor of that paper.—Mark the following paragraph from it:— "I did not avow my determination 'never to go into a National Convention with slaveholders.' I have never objected to a man on the ground of his being a slaveholder. I said that so long as the Southern States made pro-slavery the sole test of eligibility to office, it was obvious that no National Democratic Convention could be held, for the basis of a National Convention is a willingness and an obligation to support the nominee of the Convention, whoever he may be."

This is the length and breadth of Mr. Van Buren's "free soil" principles. He objects to the nomination of no man-stealer as a candidate for democratic (?) suffrages; he only objects to the making of perpetual slavery a national democratic test. It is manifest that he is willing that the Southern wing of democracy should be pro-slavery to any extent locally; only the Northern wing must be left free to be anti-slavery locally, according to circumstances; while the party itself must agree to 'run for luck.' Bad luck to all such compromisers!—*Liberator.*

From the Anti-Slavery Standard.  
Things Political.  
The Annual Agony is over. The ballot-boxes have closed upon the Sibyllian Leaves from which our South-sayers seek to spell out our Destinies. Their imperfect utterances were flashed from Maine to Louisiana almost before the last lingering voter had torn himself from the scene of his imagined victory or defeat, and all may read them as they list. It has on the whole been a tolerably comfortable season for us impartial lookers-on, because the Elections have, as a general thing, resulted in the disappointment of all parties. The Democrats in New York have not quite carried their point, while the Whigs rejoice with trembling over a victory which they foresee must grow into a Defeat. In Massachusetts the Taylorites have had a rebuff such as they little expected and which must have materially qualified the pleasure of their absolute success. While the Free Soilers, everywhere, have had a lesson as to the inefficiency of their Method to accomplish any sufficient End. They have not only been taught, if they have the grace to learn, that Slavery is not to be abolished by the means they use, but that their own are not to be relied upon so as to develop what virtue there may be in them.

We sincerely wish that the success of the Free Soil Movement had been greater. Not that we think that it is of any particular moment to the Slaves, or to the Country, whether Zachary Taylor or Martin Van Buren be the Chief Goliath at Washington, or whether George Briggs or Stephen C. Phillips be set to keep the Massachusetts Wing of the National Prison-house; but because we believe that many of the sincere Anti-Slavery men of that Party will learn the wisdom of their attempt only through the Disappointment of Success. We have no objection to their Conditions and Amalgamations where they had the honest object of defeating the party which is now the especial Representative of the Slave Power, for such is the only means by which political success can be achieved, and it is absurd, having accepted the process, to quarrel with the necessary steps.— Politics is a very coarse and clumsy machine, at best, and they who are too fine gentlemen to bear its legitimate and necessary workings had better let it alone. In our Country it is only to be fed by votes, and people who wish for a griot to their minds must not be too particular as to what goes into the hopper. Nothing can well be more comical than to see gentlemen professing to believe that the Country is to be redeemed by a majority of votes, turning up their noses at the very votes that are essential to the redemption they seek.

The first thing which a Voter has to swallow is the Constitution under which he votes, and which is the Commission he gives to his minister whom he appoints by his ballot. If his Aeschylus has been enlarged by the degeneration of this monstrous Camel, with all its lumps of Pro-Slavery Compromises and concessions, one would think that he would hardly strain at a poor little goat of a Democracy—a Whig either, when "we who whiffle of Time has again brought around his revenges." We wish to see all the elements that principle or policy can unite brought together for political onslaught upon Slavery, not because we believe that they could do any thing to the purpose, as long as they are enumerated by the fitters of the Constitution; but because we believe that this is a stage that must be passed through before a large class of minds will discover that nothing can be thus done. We believe that many of the leading Free Soilers, who are out of the Whig and Democratic parties, are since, men who have made actual sacrifices of personal position and political promotion for what seems to them a high duty. We wish they could be put in a position, for once, in which by trying what they can do they will find that they can do nothing, and that they must begin their work over again. But the fearful falling off of the crop of Free Soil votes, even in the States most favorable to their growth, since the late harvest-time, looks ill for the future. It looks as if the constitution of the Free Soil Party were too queer for prolonged life, unless it can get a large infusion of fresh blood into its veins.

We have never expected that any large portion of the American People would come up to the ground occupied by the American Anti-Slavery Society, in relation to the Constitution of the Union. That ground was discovered and it maintained by men who have looked at the Constitution, and the Union with the eyes of the Slave, and with the single purpose of discharging the grand duty of this Age and Country, as far as they were concerned, to him. Such are not the views or purposes of the mass of the Northern People, not even of that portion that goes to make up the Free Soil Party. The motives and arguments that have been urged to influence its action, as far as they have come within our notice, have been chiefly drawn from the selfish interests of those addressed. The preponderance of the South, her injustice to the North, the unequal distribution of high Offices, her hostility to Northern interests, and other similar topics of a personal or sectional nature, have been the main springs which the managers of this Movement have played upon. This is the natural course of things and one not to be complained of. But these considerations do not come home to the daily business and internal lives of those addressed, and therefore their influence is but transient. Witness the disintegration of the Free Soil Votes in Massachusetts. There are the Slaves, and here is the political punishment of permitting them to be such; why should Zeal diminish and love grow cold? The existence of an Ultra, Fanatical, Anti-Slavery body is as essential to political Anti-Slavery as the Steam in the Engine is to the motion of the Train.

It is true that an enlightened self-interest or an intelligent self-respect would lead to political action that might result in the en-