

THE ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

WENDELL PHILLIPS

At the recent meeting of the Massachusetts A. S. Society, delivered a speech, the most of which will be found below.

I wish to say a word in regard to some of these topics of the Anti-Slavery enterprise which have been touched upon in our meeting to-day. I do not myself regard such an immense increase of real anti-slavery feeling, much less action, from the late years. I think there is a sort of æsthetic Anti-Slavery. Men come here—far more truly and emphatically go to the Plymouth Church in Brooklyn—as they would go to any other intellectual entertainment of a rare order. They find the good taste to know where they shall find the finest material, and there they resort. The attendance of Ward Beecher's congregation does not prove that they have any interest in Anti-Slavery, or any desire to lead an Anti-Slavery life. They want the most profound pathos, the most eloquent appeals, the most picturesque painting, the most moving language, the most natural manner, the deepest heart, and, of course, they take refuge from the fever of the New York Observer to melt in Plymouth Church. (Laughter.) But they don't go out from those walls with any design of doing an Anti-Slavery Act, and many go out from these meetings with any such purpose. I am afraid that a large share of that attention is like that given to the Octonoon, or any other striking spectacle; for it is true, and it is not conceited in ourselves to recognize it, that the Anti-Slavery movement has realized that level, secured the public attention, has held of those great national and religious problems which are the best food for any minds that seek to be fed. It is only saying that we are a decent people, in saying that, at least, men know where they will find the most interesting discussions in Anniversary Week.—I do not, therefore, regard so large an increase of Anti-Slavery feelings from these signs. Anti-Slavery meetings, interesting as they are from the quick report, the keen encounter, the personal criticism, the living and vital interest of every-day questions, are not the points by which we are to test the growth of the cause. Go with me to the boarding-schools of Boston—those of the young men from twenty to thirty, married and unmarried, listen to the oft-repeated offensive term for the negro, which never ought to pass decent lips; listen to the perpetual insult, not in defiance, but in insult, to the Anti-Slavery movement; go up and down the walks of commerce, see how real is the hostility in view of the contingent loss of business; go anywhere in society, and see how utterly the prejudices against the black man roles in the heart of Anglo-Saxons—how rarely every man is to find some excuse for his indifference or his antagonism, to lose himself in the cobweb of his excuses that any man can make up for doing nothing—excuses which would be tenable only here, which vanish in the atmosphere of any other nation than ours. I remember, for instance, a friend telling me that in Germany, a year or two ago, a very distinguished Professor of our country, learned and widely known, was attacked by a German Professor of the same standing who was anxious to know why he was not an Abolitionist. The American thought it was a good opportunity to air his American excuses. Accordingly, he entered into an elaborate account of the inter-weighing of National and State governments—how far Massachusetts was from South Carolina—how we couldn't abolish slavery there—how our fathers made a Constitution—how it was a very delicate question—the seven years war—the patriarchal institution—Mr. Webster—Mr. Choate, and so forth. And after he had made a very large chapter, he turned to his friend and said: "I suppose you see, now, how I stand, and how real our isolation, and the impossibility of any action at the north on the subject of Anti-Slavery. I suppose what I have said is sufficient." The German took his pipe out of his mouth, and said—"It is very slim!" (Laughter.) It was, indeed, very slim. The excuses vanished like thin air. They didn't get a hold; they didn't lodge a moment in the clear intellect and moral light of the European.

Now, in our country, we have got, with our Anti-Slavery enterprise, eight million of hearts and heads to deal with. Men say we are fanatics. If by fanaticism is meant that we are a class of men, large or small, who lay down rigid rules of right and wrong, who hem to the line, no matter how many chips fly in our faces, who set up the standard of absolute justice, we do just that—we put our feet down on the eternal granite of God's Right and Wrong. Well, of course, it is a nation seeking to hide truth from their eyes, and make money, and earn bread, by compromising with justice, selling their neighbor at auction. To be sure, that sits up all the bad and selfish passions. They say, when you fire a gun over placid water, if there is a dead body below, it shows itself. John Brown's rifle brought up all the dead bodies—making Caleb Cushing and Everett show themselves bobbing up to the surface. (Great merriment.) When you approach this sort of truth, you must expect a great uprising of what may be considered the dead and monstrous elements of society, arranging themselves in antagonism again to us.

What has been our history? We have begun and carried on the Anti-Slavery agitation. We pledged ourselves to use none but peaceable and Constitutional methods. Now, when across the distance of half a dozen States, we recognize the martyr saint of Harper's Ferry, men charge us of having deserted our principles. Not in the least. What have we been endeavoring to do? We have been trying to bring every earnest soul into a pledge against slavery. We never supposed that we should convert every man to our method.—We only said, and mean to say, "Here is the American people—there is the Gibraltar of slavery; we need everything we can get to take it.—we mean to rouse everything we can get to the assault." The public opinion that we mean to create is this,—it shall convince every man so unalterably of the essential sin and the momentous evil of the slave system, that we shall say that before we in either human life, nor religious institutions, nor old parchments, nor parties, are of any value whatever. We said and we mean to be understood, that we would create such a public opinion against slavery, that the Christian would come out and throw upon the altar his Presbyterianism, his Congregationalism, his Methodism—yes, his Church—at the risk of being called an infidel.—We had no church to throw. We meant, and expected, also, that the man who had rifles would bring them to the altar: and all that I, for one, mean in my pledge to peaceful and Constitutional methods was that, while I believed in types and not in bullets, in brains and not in muskets, in civilization and not in a camp, I stood here to prepare a public opinion that would hold up the man whose heart led to what I think a lower level of assault, but in some respects, for the moment

more efficient one. (Applause.) I am contented, in part, and for the present. If I may prepare material for John Brown, and induce millions to cry out Amen to the first echo of his virtues, and that is all that the Anti-Slavery movement has ever intended or professed to do.

But I charge it upon Republicanism itself that any man has found it necessary to have recourse to rifles. What says the candidate for the Speakership of the United States House of Representatives? He says, 'I say this charge of interference with slavery in the States is unfounded. The people of Ohio, the State which I have the honor to represent in part, do not wish or design to interfere with the relations existing between the races in the Slave States. If I had my voice, I would not have one single political Abolitionist in the Northern States. I am opposed to any interference, by the Northern people, with slavery in the Slave States. I act with the Republican party simply because the Republican party resists the extension, but does not seek the abolition, of slavery.' Now, Mr. Chairman, for twenty years certain parties have made the heart of the Northern people ache to abolish slavery. Certain parties have stirred up these States till the heart of every thoughtful man longs to see the slave go free. The South race, left to itself, finds vent through the ballot box; but close up the ballot box, and it loads the rifle. (Cheers.) The Republican party should write on its banner, 'Abolition of Slavery.' What if John Sherman and Henry Wilson should avow that the political movement of the Northern States seeks the freedom of every slave, through the Constitution—or over it? For the Constitution was not written by Gabriel, nor nailed to the throne of the Almighty—is it a parchment which man made, and man can amend, and there is no reason in the world why there should be a party with the purpose avowed from the outset, to abolish slavery in the States, and to change the Constitution of the United States, if necessary. There is a party in England which seeks to put down Bishops; there is a party in England that seeks to overthrow the Aristocracy of the British Government. Why should not a party here avow the purpose to tear out the red stripe of blood in the Constitution of the United States? No reason in the world, except the timidity of men that want to have office in five years, instead of fifteen. Now, if you will give the country a party, religious and political, that writes on its banner, 'Every slave ought to be free, and we pledge ourselves, life-long, to the effort to make him so,' you will unload every musket, you will disarm every physical rebellion.

I do not believe slavery will go down in blood. There is not blood enough in the thirty-one states to step it in. We are not a fighting people. Our brains have got beyond it, North and South. We are beyond it, and I should be ashamed if we were not. If, two hundred years ago, this country was planted on a system of education and individual interest to government, and in two hundred years we have not reached that length where war is impossible as a method of reform, it depends of the schoolhouse and the church. I believe that neither in the North nor in the South is there any such element as will abolish slavery in blood. The Yankees will not fight. It won't pay. You have to convince the North that slavery is unprofitable before she will get upon her feet and put it down. Let me show New England that it touches their pockets, and they will rise. Show that it is profitable to put slavery down, and there is not power enough in the slave states to maintain it. Every thinking man sees that in Kansas and Harper's Ferry. The moment the North Resisted in Kansas, the South backed out. The moment Pottawatomie wrote in the blood of the old man the purpose of the North to clean out his musket and use it, as he had done eight years before, the Border Ruffians went back from the line. They came there to find out if Yankee peddlers would fight; they found they would, and they said, 'Good morning, gentlemen, we are done with you.' The same thing would be true on the broad surface of the Union. The same was true at Harper's Ferry. Virginia was not ready to fight for the slave system. She never will fight for it; but it is not lack of courage that makes her unwilling to fight. She knows that the system is not defensible. She knows that when the north announces its purpose that slavery shall cease, it must cease. She knows as well as you do that when she sees Union, she only means robbery. I remember that, when I was a little boy, we went out on a Fourth of July, another boy and I, to Boston Common, where they sold us things that were good to eat—you remember Mr. Chairman. My companion said, 'how much have you got?' I said, 'Twenty-five cents. How much have you?' 'I've got nine-pence.' 'Well said he, 'suppose we divide?' (Laughter.) That is exactly the case with the South. The North has twenty-five cents, the South nine-pence; and she proposes an equal division. (Renewed laughter and applause.) She knows it to-day—she has always known it—that when she cries Disunion, she is frightened at her own words. She is not drunk enough, either with pride or the prosperity of the slave system, to believe in disunion. There is a story told of a couple of sons of Green Erin, who were at the bottom of a building that was about being finished; the scaffolding, three stories high, was about to be removed; and the tall man bet with the little one that he couldn't carry him, in his hand, to the top of the house. They bet a dollar; and the little man took his comrades in his hand, labored up the first scaffold, the second, then the third, and with heavy tread, making his way from round to round of the ladder, reached the topmost ridge and pitched him on. 'Now, give me your dollar.' 'Och, and by the powers, I was hoping you would drop me, the last two or three rungs!' (Great merriment.)

It is exactly so with the South. If she supposed she could be dropped from the Union, she would be like the fellow in the hod. She would be dropped into endless, invisible and abysmal depths, beyond the recognition of the nineteenth century. She doesn't want it. She never means to have it. It will never come in that way. I doubt if it will ever come by the offer of disunion. No; the state of our Northern mind is just this: The Anti-Slavery movement has stirred it to its very depths. Made up of religious, literary appeal—made up of the fugitive slave travelling through all our borders—made up of the treason of great men, like Webster, going down to his grave cursed by one half and lamented by the other half of the Union. When such a man as Ward Beecher goes back to his pulpit, and falls into the ranks of the apostles of corrupt ecclesiastical machinery, there is a natural rebound of the thousands that trod him. He will make many a man a come-over who trusted that, hanging to his skirts, he might still cry, 'I am a church member; for, is not Beecher an Abolitionist?' Such a man is robbed of that excuse; he cannot hide behind Plymouth Church from the rebukes of the Garri-

sonians; and he will be a come-over. So, when a great politician falls, it makes Abolitionists. We dig men out of the mire into which Daniel Webster plunged them, and set them up on the feet their mothers gave them. This process has been going on for years. John Brown is a part of it, Kansas is a part of it. If the great Republican party had said to Kansas, 'No use for your rifles; we will protect you on the floor of the United States Senate; there shall not a man dare to touch a hair of the head of a dweller in the loneliest shanty in Kansas, that the arm of the Union shall not be stretched out efficiently to protect him; there never would have been war in Kansas; there never would have been any border forays. Do you suppose that the South can rise up and send you by hundreds, our merchants, our travelers, our residents, guilty of nothing but a Northern dialect, and, although that craven United States Senate dare not call for the execution of this United States Constitution, which we are called upon to lend every hour of our lives, do you suppose it is forgotten in the records of the Northern people? No. Every one of these men has a circle, and that circle are Garrisonians. One of the young and ardent said to me: 'I carried a musket down State street when Anthony Burns was carried shamefully back to slavery. Two months after, my own brother, hopelessly ill of consumption, was obliged to skulk through Georgia and the Carolinas in a baggage car, for fear his name, from Boston should be known, and left the last relics of the strength which disease had even him be taken by tarring and feathering; and that is the last musket that I shall ever raise for the Union of our thirty slave States.' (Applause.) That conviction to which this young Boston member of our holiday troops came, every circle of these banished men came to throughout the Union. If you do not give them the ballot-box, they will take the rifle; if you do not give them the Anti-Slavery movement, they will tear the Church to pieces.

Man talk of abolishing that movement. Abolish it! You should have heard Ralph Waldo Emerson, at Salem, the other night. 'Man talk,' said he, 'of destroying John Brown; I think the Almighty created mercy as the foe of despot; and I somewhat doubt whether Virginia can annihilate mercy.' (Applause.) 'Oh, no,' he continued, rising into still fiercer voice, 'that oldest Abolitionist of you all, who piled the Shenandoah mountains, whose first name was Love, and his other name Justice—I think he existed before John Brown, and will probably survive him.' (Renewed applause.) I think he will. And unless you give this principle channels, it will tear the Union, Church and State, asunder. While you have a slaveholder in the presidential chair, while you have overhauls in the United States Senate, you will have John Brown's altar at Harper's Ferry. And he is not the last of them. You cannot control it. You must give it channels. Let me borrow again from Emerson. He told us, on this very platform, two years since, that two hundred years ago, men said there is a devil in every teakettle; if you do not let him out, he will tear the house to pieces, and make an earthquake throughout the city. So men made a hole in the lid, and the devil's steam came pouring out from every kettle. By-and-bye came a thrifty genius, and he said, 'Why waste this devil? make him a groove—let him move in safe channels'; and the Conard came across the ocean, the locomotives wedded States together in a day! So men said, years ago, there is a devil down in the heart of these ignorant millions; keep him quiet; put a Bank on him, then a Throne, and a Pope. By-and-bye came a thrifty man, and said, 'Give him channels, give him the press and the ballot-box; and he takes up the world, and carries it along as it has never gone before.

So this anti-slavery movement is seeking to find channels for this anti-slavery purpose to move in. Give us the ballot-box; give us a political movement in which the self-respect of men can allow them to operate; give us a Church that represents not rascals, but Christians; give us a press that will afford expression to the ultimate wish and the entire heart of the American people; and we shall not be clumsy enough to go back to the rude, vulgar, awkward system of two hundred years ago; we have got a better. We shall abolish slavery in the swift purpose of eighteen million of thoughtful ingenious Yankee hearts. And until you do it, the land will stink with constant convulsion. Virginia will in vain banish Helper. She will in vain fight against the multiplication table—for Helper's book is nothing but the multiplication table printed two hundred times over. Mr. Garrison said that when the Southerners fought against Helper, they were fighting against the multiplication table. Two and two make four; two and two make twenty-two. John Brown and his associates went down to Harper's Ferry, and made a good deal of the multiplication table. Oh, no, the South understands this question fully as well as we do. She does not need enlightenment, as Mr. Martin expects to our doings, the religious and political machinery of our country, is because we mean to have both. We mean to have a party outside and above the Constitution, that writes Liberty on its banners, and the use of all means that God and nature put into our hands to achieve it. We mean to have a Church that reads the Sermon on the Mount, and endeavours to practice it, knowing no races, no castes, no conditions, but believing, with the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal. And until we gain those two channels of natural, legitimate, usual human work, the land will shake with that outside agitation—the bees rushing to and fro, until the queen bee is found—the nations striking and clashing against each other like frigates in a storm, until the battle is fixed, and the thunder begins to rattle from one side to the other of the marshalled hosts. (Applause.) We are coming to that period. The South sees her danger in Harper's Ferry. She knows that the whole mass of Northern mind is, at last, roused to the trial. I rejoice in insurrection for that very reason—not that it will ever achieve emancipation, not that the negro will ever be competent to an organization of arms that shall defeat this Federal Government; but the moment the Carolinians know that the spirit of insurrection—in other words, the manhood of the slave—is so awake that they must remain in perpetual conflict in order to keep the slave quiet, that moment they part from the system. The thunder clouds are on either side of the heavens. The manhood of the slave is the black, overhanging heavens of the Carolinas. The roused religious conscience of the North is the other cloud, such as, in Milton's picture, overhangs the Caspian. John Brown came near being the electric spark that was to melt them together. Another spark may come; and, in the conflict, the Bastille which we have attacked for half a century will come down in an hour. (Applause.) But it will come down not by war from the North, but by resistance on the part of the

slave; no, it will go down by Virginia, at the door of the United States treasury; saying, 'Harper's Ferry is too real a danger; how much will you pay me to be honest?' (Laughter.) I have faced John Brown three times; save me from the fourth, and give me compensation.'

That might have been saved to the honor of our nation, if a heat had been seated in the United States Senate. If those black brows, buried at Marshfield, had had within one tithe of that Puritanism which went with the saint of Harper's Ferry, he might have hurled a thunderbolt from his high place in the State, which would have saved the inroad upon Virginia. The hour has passed away. Our government has not held together; the ship, which we fondly thought was so well built that it would ride on the tempest, has parted. Mere discussion has not been sufficient to put down an enormous wickedness, as it was in Great Britain. A corrupt and burdened monarchy did more than a Republic, fresh from its cradle; for the aristocracy of Great Britain, with its debt and its Church, its nobles and its ignorant masses, bore up the discussion of a quarter of a century, and on the hearts of Christian men, as the result of moral agitation, wrought out the decree of immediate and unconditional emancipation. Our government, that we thought so much better in the strength of its youth, in the flush of its theoretic progress, with universal suffrage, with a Protestant Church, with an equal people, has proved unequal to the discussion, and we have sunk down to the level of insurrection and rifles, blood on the plains of Kansas, and the ballot-box superseded by the camp. But there is a conservative power sufficient, still, I believe, in the eighteen millions, to drag back the maddened people to the place that becomes them in the history of nations; and we shall yet see slavery come down by the submission of thirteen States, to the avowed and fair purpose of the Christian, aroused North. I do not believe, therefore, that our enterprise is changing in the least. It is merely passing through a new phase of its existence. We thought the evil less rooted; we supposed that it lay upon the surface, whereas it has struck its roots through the strata of a million customs; to loosen it puts at hazard Church and State alike. But we have almost brought the American people to that decision which says, 'Government or no government, law or no law, let slavery come down!' (Cheers.) Whether he broke law or violated government, God bless John Brown! (Renewed cheers.) So says the American heart in the Northern States. The American head will soon follow; the American hand will soon begin its work, in obedience to that heart and head; and we shall see slavery the victim of its agitation, the victim of pure politics and a Christian Church. The system may be strangled, and this government, for aught I know, survive; if not in its present form, at least the fragments will come together and crystallize round a purer and better center than our fathers ever could have commanded, had they tried.

WOMAN'S RIGHTS.

[A correspondent of the N. Y. Evening Post thus notices the proceedings of the recent State Woman's Rights Convention at Albany.]

ALBANY, February 4, 1860.

The National Woman's Rights Convention is now in session in this city, at the Hall of the Young Men's Association. A large number of members were present yesterday; among them Senators Fiero, Warner, Sessions, Lapham, Montgomery, and Assemblymen McVean, Mather, Montgomerie, and Assemblymen McVean, Mather, Montgomerie, Savage, Powell, Slingerland, Hough, Regan, Pelton, Jeffords, P. Clark, Payne, Van Horne, Palmer, and other good-looking young men. The attendance was large.

The speakers were Wendell Phillips, Jane Elizabeth Jones, Antoinette L. Brown Blackwell and Frances L. Gage. Mrs. Jones' remarks were the most logical. Her points were clearly stated, deductions distinctly presented, and she insisted that women could not be hanged or taxed consistently with the constitution, so long as they had no vote, voice, or even assent to give to the laws. Mrs. Blackwell's appearance was greeted with applause. She opened her remarks by saying that if men should be subjected to the same indignities and disabilities as women are they would be indignant; and that was just the way she felt. They would not rest contented till they had obtained a repeal of the odious laws, &c., and neither would she. If women were the equals of men, they were entitled to the same civil rights and privileges; if they were distinct—another class of beings—certainly they should have a voice in legislation. It might be right to hang men, because they enacted and assented to the law, but to hang women, who had no voice, who had received no trial by a jury of their peers, was manifestly murder. She also commented upon the fact that two persons, a brother and sister, equally well educated, and making their way through the world, would exhibit a striking disparity. The man would have made a remarkable advance in energy and intellectual power, while the woman, not having had occasion to employ her talents, would have receded and made less attainment.

Mrs. Phillips, in his remarks, pursued these ideas of Mrs. Blackwell. A man would marry a woman his equal, and would become great, strong and gifted, so that people would praise and admire him, and depreciate the wife at his side; and sometimes such a man would himself adopt the same idea, and, wearing his affections from her who had helped make his greatness, would seek for some "affinity." There were two vices which were threatening to engulf our people, intemperance and prostitution; the former the vice of northern barbarism, now furthered by scientific invention. Our people needed intellectual stimulus to drive the sensual principle from their minds, and none more so than women. Unless this was allowed, and they had the permission to earn their own bread respectively, they must sink in this vice and become the destroyers of our young men. Our customs made them such. Legislation and preaching could not avert the dire calamity—it could only be done by giving women the right to labor and to win.

The case of Mr. Norton, who, many years since, perpetrated a malignant slander against his wife, and had repeatedly since that taken from her bookshelves regularly the proceeds of her literary labors, was cited as in point to show the necessity of the passage of a law allowing married women the control over their own earnings.

There have been such bills introduced into each branch of the legislature, and one of them will probably become a law.

John Brown will tramp the shaking earth,
From the Blue Ridge to the sea,
Till Liberty shall come at last,
And open each dungeon door,
And God's 'Great Charter' hold and move
O'er all his humble poor.

THE BILL TO PREVENT SLAVE-HOLDING &c., IN OHIO.

It is fortunate that the bill now before the Legislature, to prevent slave holding and kidnapping in Ohio, did not meet the eyes of any of our recent State guests—the members of our Kentucky and Tennessee Legislatures—when on their late visit to Columbus. When the guests of the State were in the Hall of the House, this bill was, and it is now, on the tables of members, and the first section of it, had the same been enacted into a law, would have operated severely on several of the gentlemen who were then here upon the invitation of our Legislature to partake of the hospitality of the State. That section contains this provision—"that if any person shall bring into the State any other person, with intent to hold or control, or to sell or assist in holding or controlling, directly or indirectly, within this State, any other person as a slave, such person so offending shall be deemed guilty of false imprisonment, and upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment in the county jail, not less than three nor more than nine months, and by fine not less than two hundred nor more than five hundred dollars; and every person coming into this State otherwise than as a person held to service in another State under the laws thereof, and occupying in this State, shall be deemed and held in all courts as absolutely free." Had this Republican measure been enacted into a law, such of the guests (and there was a number of them) as brought their servants with them, instead of drinking sparkling Catawba and making Union speeches, might have been assigned quarters in the jail of the county and undergone the punishment this bill inflicts, and lost their negroes into the bargain! It is surprising that a legislature harboring the idea of passing such a law, should invite slaveholders to a banquet; and the members thereof drink bumper about with their guests, until between them, numbering not more than three hundred men, some thousand bottles of champagne were in a couple of hours imbibed to the Union and the equality and fraternity of the States! If this law be now passed, after all that has happened, the Republican Legislature of Ohio will stand before the country as the most perfect sample of gross inconsistency and dishonesty on record. What shall be done with the bill? Will the Senator from Lorain answer.—*Statesman.*

**FROM THE GALVESTON (TEXAS) NEWS.
A NEGRO MINSTREL SOLD INTO SLAVERY.**

An affidavit made before Justice W. P. Griffiths, by Deputy Sheriff Hudgins, that a free negro had come into this State, contrary to our laws, calling himself Joseph Vincent Suarez, and passing himself for a white man. Thereupon said Suarez was brought before Justice Truheart, and upon examination by doctors Friedmont and Banks, they stated on oath as medical men, that said Suarez was a person of color, and had over one-eighth African blood. It being proven to the satisfaction of the Court that he was such a person of color as is prohibited by our laws from coming within the limits of the State, it was therefore ordered that the Sheriff take said Suarez in charge, and hire him for the term of six months to the highest bidder, at the Court House of the county, giving notice of the hiring by advertisement, posted up at two or more public places in the county. The law says that the proceeds of the hire of a free person of color thus coming into our State, as proven, in this case, shall be collected by the Sheriff, and after deducting expenses, the remainder shall be paid over to said person of color to enable him to leave the State, and that the Sheriff shall notify him to leave within thirty days. Should he fail to leave the state as required, the Sheriff is directed to arrest him again, to be hired again at public outcry for cash, for a term of five years, &c. It is proper to remark that this Suarez came to this city as a negro minstrel, and he has, therefore, the merit of passing himself off in his professional character for precisely what he is.

PERSONAL LIBERTY BILL IN NEW YORK.

[We find the following notice of the character of a bill introduced into the Legislature at Albany.]

It is intended to meet the constitutional objections of the usual bills of that character. The first section disavows all laws of Congress exercising powers not conferred by the federal constitution upon that body, nor prohibited by it to the states or the people. The second section forbids all exercise of judicial powers, by other than Judges of the Supreme Court, and of such other inferior courts as Congress shall from time to time by law establish. The third requires in case of claim of service due from persons alleged to be held to service or labor by the laws of another state, coming to this state under circumstances which do not exonerate them from such service or labor, that the claimant shall prove that the alleged fugitive owes him service or labor by the express statute laws of such other state. No act, record, or other judicial proceeding in the court of any other state shall be taken in evidence, except the defendant shall have been by due process of law a party to such act, record, or proceeding. The right to habeas corpus and trial by jury are affirmed; and all persons violating this law are declared guilty of kidnapping, and made liable to all its pains and penalties. All sheriffs, constables, policemen, &c., taking part in these proceedings forfeit office.

ACT IT OUT.

The following declaration of sentiment was adopted by a Christian Anti-Slavery Society recently formed at Pittsburgh. How many churches are willing to prove they believe it?

- I. The rights of man, as man, sacred and inalienable, without distinction of blood or race.
- II. Property in man impossible, as being contrary to the will of the Creator, and equally contrary to natural justice and to revealed religion.
- III. The system of American slavery and the practice of slave-holding essentially sinful and anti-Christian, and to be dealt with, therefore, as such, by Christian churches and ministers.
- IV. The utter inadequacy and utter impossibility of any remedy for or relief from slavery, but one that insists upon its inherent wrongfulness, its total intrinsic badness, and denies absolutely the wild and glib fantasy that man can have property in man.
- V. The duty of one family or section of the Christian Church to rebuke and refuse fellowship to another section of the visible church, that denies the rights of man and the common brotherhood of humanity, by defending slavery and folding its bosom to human slave-sellers, slave-buyers and slave-holders.

VI. No compromise with slavery allowable, but its total extinction to be demanded at once, in the name of God, who has commanded 'to loose the bonds of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that you break every yoke.'

VII. The total abolition of the vast system of American slavery to be accepted as a special providential mission and duty of the American clergy and the American churches of this generation.

VIII. The Church and the Ministry to form the conscience of the nation in respect to slavery, and to make it loyal to the law of God, against all unjust judgments of Courts, and unrighteous legislation of Congress.

IX. The Word of God our charter for freedom and our armor against slavery; and any assertion that the Lord God sanctions slavery practical infidelity.

X. Ultimate success sure, in the warfare with oppression, to a faithful Ministry and winning Church.

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.

"PROVIDENCE HAS MADE ME AN ACTOR, AND SLAVERY AN OUTLAW."—John Brown of Ossawatimie.

SALEM, OHIO, FEBRUARY 18, 1860.

A CONVERSION.

In a report of the proceedings of the late meeting of the Massachusetts A. S. Society, is the following passage:—

"Stephen S. Foster of Worcester said he had recently been studying the Constitution of the United States;—he had never before given it a thorough examination—and his views of it had undergone a great change. He was now convinced that the Constitution is an Anti-Slavery instrument, and the views to which he had arrived had met the entire concurrence, in regard to their legal correctness, of some of the ablest lawyers in the city of Worcester. Hence he desired to organize an Anti-Slavery Political Party, to carry out and enforce this interpretation of the Constitution."

We should have noticed the above last week, only for the fact that not unfrequently within the last two or three years, our friend Foster has complained of being misunderstood and consequently misrepresented in some of his public speeches. We felt that such was probably the case in the above, for it placed the speaker in such an absurd position, that it was not until we had the most positive assurance from a reliable source that it was no misrepresentation, that we were willing to receive it as correct. And even with this assurance we are utterly unable to understand how such a man as Stephen S. Foster could have lectured for almost a score of years, assuming that the Constitution, and the Union, which legitimately springs from it, to be pro-slavery in theory and in practice, when he had not even "given the Constitution a thorough examination." As there has never been before, so we trust there will never be again a Disunion anti-slavery lecturer who will press upon his auditors the guilt of their compromises under the Constitution; urging a dissolution of the Union as the only means by which they could individually wash their hands in innocency, and release themselves from the political support of slavery, and after having taught this doctrine for twenty years, turn around and coolly say, "I never gave the Constitution a thorough examination."

A change of opinion is not to be reprehended, let it come when and how it may; but it seems hardly right for a speaker to publicly advocate measures year after year, without having first satisfied himself by a thorough examination of the character of the foundation upon which he built. It seems very strange to us, and very unlike the Stephen S. Foster we used to know, to have him fortify himself in his change of views, by the declaration that the legal correctness of his opinions was "endorsed by some of the ablest lawyers in the city of Worcester." If the question of the character of the Constitution is to be determined by the counting of lawyers' noses, and the weighing of their ability, it is most unquestionably a pro-slavery document, "some of the ablest lawyers in the city of Worcester" to the contrary notwithstanding.

We should like to recommend to our friend the investigation of a portion of the Constitution to which it is possible his recent examination has not yet extended, and concerning which we have never known any other than the one interpretation. We refer to that clause which constituted the Supreme Court of the U. S. the final arbitrator and adjudicator of all questions arising as to the constitutionality of State and National laws— which makes it the expounder of the intent and meaning of the instrument. While Stephen S. Foster and Charles O'Connor are agreed in relation to this clause, and while the records of the U. S. Court prove that it has decided the Constitution to be pro-slavery, all arguments as to its anti-slavery character are practically as worthless as argument by which the clause referred to was sought to be evaded, that reached in dignity to the character of a respectable quibble.

We have never believed that the theory of the anti-slavery character of the Constitution grew out of an honorable and candid desire to correctly ascertain the relation of its supporters to slavery, but was referable to a determination upon the part of certain abolitionists to continue the exercise of the elective franchise, and then, by torture of sentences and quibbling upon words, to justify themselves to their consciences and the world as best they could.

Our friend has been laboring for years—and with the most entire unsuccess—to form a Disunion political party under a pro-slavery Constitution. No one questioned his sincerity; and his earnestness of purpose was manifest to all. He believed that such a movement would be a combination of political with moral power; and that if a candidate of such party was elected to office, his refusal to swear to support a pro-slavery Constitution, would be a political, as well as a moral testimony of great weight. But in this measure, as we have already intimated, he utterly failed. Whether he will succeed any better in drawing to him in his present position enough to say so, is questionable. From his remarks as reported, we infer that he ignores the existence of the Gerrit Smith party, as his desire is not to go to it, and take others there, but to organize a party himself to carry out his views.

As to the rationality and feasibility of his present views as compared with those he developed in his project of a Disunion political party, we are unable to perceive but little if any difference. Both are unsound, and both impracticable. As of late years the one has absorbed much of his anti-slavery strength and effort, so in all probability will