THE LIBERATOR.

VOL. VI. OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD—OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND. NO. 33.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.] [SATURDAY, AUGUST 6, 1836.

THE LIBERATOR
IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT
NO. 46. WASHINGTON-STREET, BY
ISAAC KNAPP.
WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

TERMS.

*** TWO DOLLARS per annum, always payable in advance.
All letters and communications must be post paid. The rule is inserted in order to shield us from the frequent impositions of our enemies.—Those, therefore, who wish their letters to be taken from the Post Office by us, will be careful to pay their postage.

*** An advertisement making one square, or a space of equal length and breadth, will be inserted three times for one dollar.

COMMUNICATIONS.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE HANOVER ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The first anniversary of the Hanover Anti-Slavery Society was held at the Congregational meeting-house, in Hanover, July 4th. After prayer by the President of the Society, the Board of Managers presented the following

REPORT.

This Society was formed at the time when the country was in commotion; and when destruction brooded over our heaven-born civil and religious privileges. The opposers to the cause of the abolition of slavery, tearlessly stood forth in various parts of our land (highly famed for liberty of speech and of the press,) in outrageous mobs to crush free discussion on the subject of American Slavery. The evening on which the members of this Society were convened, to adopt their present articles, they were much annoyed with the sound of tin drums and other instruments of noise, all of which indicated the lawless condition of our neighbors, and fellow citizens.

It will be urged by many, as a palliation of their crimes, that they desired to prevent a foreigner from interfering with our political institutions. Did Thompson cross the Atlantic to abrogate our laws? or to make new ones for us? True, he did not attempt this directly, but the course which he was taking would eventually secure the same thing, so far as slavery is concerned. Either we, the people of the United States make the laws, or some Monarch makes them: and these laws are either liable to be altered when the good of the people require it, or they are like the laws of the Medes and Persians unalterable. If the people make the laws, and if they are the protectors of the laws, they should know what is right and what is wrong concerning them. How will they know without discussion? And how will they have discussion without one to discuss? But it may be said, we do not want a foreigner to lecture us. Perhaps if this foreigner had been a man of inferior talents and influence there would not have been so many objections to him. If Thompson had been a Colonizationist and had gone to the South, or had remained at the North, he would have been by his opposers considered, a worthy, talented man.

If a foreigner had no right to come and lecture us on any moral subject, why do we deem it right to send lecturers on temperance to England? Are we not afraid that we shall make a commotion among the people, and indirectly effect by law a prohibition of the sale of ardent spirits. We are sending Missionaries to France and to the eastern world to discuss moral subjects: but in proportion as the light of truth through their instrumentality, shall beam upon the benighted minds of the people, in the same proportion do we expect that the people will come to an understanding of their own rights and privileges, and of course this will effect all their laws which are of an unjust and oppressive character. If it be not right to suffer sin upon a brother, then Thompson did nothing more than his duty by coming to this country to point out to his brethren, the dreadful sin of slavery: if it be right to do to others as we desire them to do to us, then our Friend from another country did his duty in showing us our sins against God and man, which sooner or later must bring down upon our happy country the most tremendous curses that ever were known. If he had been wrong, the means employed to put him down were unfair and contemptible. It was soon discovered that his course was too good to be overcome by fair argument, and his talents too mighty to be met in the open field, so the only way by which they could prevent his voice being raised to declare to them their sins was to mob him. How disgraceful! How inconsistent for Republicans to boast in one breath of their liberties and their right to free discussion on any subject whatever, and the next moment to crowd together for the purpose of mobbing the men and women who are pleading the cause of the oppressed and down trodden slave of our own land.

It becomes us as Christians, Philanthropists, and Patriots, to set our faces against mobs, against whatever they may be directed. If mobs rule, we shall be in a state of anarchy and without law, we shall be in a worse condition than we would be if we were under the reign of a Monarch, whose will is a law. If a mob be justified, thought it be directed against persons who may be in the fault, it may be in turn directed against us, whom others may think guilty, and so on from one to another, until the law shall be established, that the most unprincipled and strongest man shall become the tyrant.

It also becomes us as Christians, Philanthropists and Patriots, to preserve among ourselves the right of free discussion. Efforts have been attempted to take from us this right. If the right to discuss the subject of American Slavery be taken from us, who can tell how soon the time may arrive, when our houses of worship may be closed against us, and a heavy fine or imprisonment become the portion of that man who will dare to defend the doctrines and precepts of the Holy Bible. Ah! who can tell how soon we, whose skins are paler than the forsaken, despised African, may become slaves too? Will we not, in proportion as we are denied the liberty of speech and the press, be slaves? The constitution of our country gives us the right to discuss any subject we please. The southerners acknowledge this to be our privilege as well as their own in the constitution. But when we would prove our right to free discussion, we will go farther than the constitution of any people on the face of the earth, or any who have ever lived on it; we look to our Creator who has placed all men upon his footstool with equal rights and privileges. Therefore, he who aims to deprive his fellow being of the opportunity of giving his views of any subject that may come up before him, makes an effort to enslave him. Then if we would preserve our liberty, let us not lose the liberty of speech and of the press.

This Society was formed Sept. 29, 1835, consisting of 135 members. The Society has not been as energetic as the cause demands. It is to be regretted that individuals do not feel their personal responsibility as they should. Too much is rolled upon the officers of societies generally; consequently, if they do not what should be done through the pressure of other business, it goes undone. Let us for the time to come, feel that each person has something to do in the great work of emancipation. If any person sees something that should be accomplished, let him not wait for another one to do it, but let him arise immediately and perform it. Though we have not done all we ought to have done, yet we have accomplished a little. Upwards of $80 have been paid by the Society, to the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, to urge forward the great work of emancipating our colored brethren.

Your Committee firmly believe that all the money paid into their hands, has been appropriated to the objects for which it was given; namely, the support of agents, the circulation of tracts and other publications on the subject of American Slavery. The Committee would urge upon the heart of every one the importance of contributing liberally for the support of the abolition cause. Money is wanted and will continue to be needed to carry forward the work of emancipation. Lectures must be delivered through the length and breadth of our land, the press must exert its influence on the millions which compose our nation. Arguments are not needed to make this clear. No great moral revolution has ever been brought about without these means, neither can we expect that any will take place without the persevering use of them. But the lectures cannot be delivered, nor the burning thoughts of the friends of the slave, cannot come from the press without money. Now the enemies of Abolition will not give of their worldly substance for the purpose, therefore, the friends of Abolition must be liberal in their contributions, or the cause of course will be retarded.

Finally, your Committee are encouraged in view of the fact that slavery will sooner or later cease to have a place in America, or in any other part of the world. The cause of emancipation is gaining strength and will triumph. For the Saviour came into the world to proclaim liberty to the captive and the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound. This blessed gospel is to be known, and the influence of it will be felt in a greater degree than has been the case at any period since its first promulgation. No one who knows the nature of Christ's gospel and the influence which it exerts over the immortal mind, can for a moment suppose that slavery can exist in the millennium. We have then the promise of the most high to encourage us, and what more can we desire? As certainly as the church has outlived every storm of persecution and is destined to come off conqueror and more than conqueror through him that loved her, so certainly will the cause of the abolition of slavery over the whole globe, outlive every mob, every shower of brick bats and every unlawful means to crush it.

The report was unanimously accepted, after which the Society proceeded to the choice of officers for the ensuing year. The following persons were chosen:

Rev. A. G. Duncan, *President.*
Rev. Samuel Appleton, *Vice President.*
N. B. Dickie, *Secretary.*
A. Woods, Esq. *Treasurer.*
John Curtis, Elisha Bass, J. M. Welden, Justus Whiting, *Managers.*

Voted, That the report of the committee and the following resolutions, with other proceedings of the Society, be published in the Liberator.

1. *Resolved*, That we consider the slaves in the United States, as belonging to the human family, descendants of one common Father.

2. *Resolved*, That we consider all mankind, irrespective of color, nation, or clime, as endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable, inherent rights, of which American Slavery is utterly subversive.

3. *Resolved*, That we consider the slaveholders and slaves, as neighbors, whom we are bound by the law of good will to benefit, by endeavoring to emancipate from their respective bondage; the former from the lust of avarice, licentious indulgence and irresponsible power; the latter from involuntary bodily servitude, and from mental and moral thraldom.

4. *Resolved*, That we consider immediate and unconditional emancipation, to be attended with no insuperable difficulties, not found in the domineering lust and the obstinate wills of the slaveholders.

5. *Resolved*, That the present state of the abolition question involves not only the interests of the slaves at the South; but the liberties of the freemen at the North, who are required by the South to surrender rights, guaranteed by the constitution of the United States for the safety and perpetuity of slavery.

6. *Resolved*, That we consider the message of Gov. Everett to the late Legislature touching Abolitionists, as unworthy the ruler of a free people; insulting in its suggestions and alarming in its tendency; inasmuch as it styles the exercise of a right guaranteed by the constitution, a misdemeanor punishable at common laws; and appeals to our patriotism to induce us to sacrifice our rights as freemen on the altar of slavery.

7. *Resolved*, That the conduct of Senator Lunt as chairman of the Committee, to report on the subject of Abolition, to the late general assembly; and his treatment of respectable citizens in the exercise of their rights, make him worthy of the severest rebuke of the citizens of Massachusetts.

8. *Resolved*, That we consider Southern interference with Northern legislation as ominous of great evil, which, unless promptly met and rebuked, will endanger and destroy our chartered rights.

9. *Resolved*, That the reckless, unconstitutional encroachments made by slaveholders on the rights of the citizens of the free States, by prices put on their heads, by demands made for their deliverance to tribunals, to which they are in no sense accountable, by lynchings and imprisonments, is deserving of universal censure and is a virtual dissolution of the Union, as it respects all who will not bow down to the Moloch of slavery.

10. *Resolved*, That the state of our country demands increased zeal and efforts on the part of all who love liberty and our country, in the mighty cause of Abolition, and that we cordially approve of the resolutions of the American Anti-Slavery Society to raise $100,000 and of the Mass. Anti-Slavery Society to raise $10,000 the present year, and that we will raise $100 to be paid to the latter in aid of the cause.

11. *Resolved*, That we have unabated confidence in the rectitude and wisdom of the men who are styled by the enemies of the cause of abolition, the leaders. And that Abolitionists generally have no reason to be dissatisfied with them, though their foes reproach them.

N. B. DICKIE, *Secretary.*

Hanover, July 9th, 1836.

[Extract from the letter of a Northern Lady, now residing at the South.]

'Every thing here, in domestic life, particularly, is almost totally at variance with our northern practice, and it requires no little time, to become accustomed to a system so new, and in all respects so different. In the first place, everything like industry, I might almost say exertion, is out of place here. A southern lady has no disposition to do any of the thousand trifling things, which a northern lady is constantly doing for herself; consequently, the free, independent, energetic spirit of the latter, is constantly labouring under checks and restraints, and, in most cases, soon becomes reduced to the southern standard; for *custom* is everywhere alike omnipotent. The climate, moreover, undoubtedly tends to enervate, and render us averse to *active measures*, as the politicians say: in fine, exertion of all kinds, is deemed decidedly *vulgar*; and the host of blacks, by which we are surrounded, renders it wholly unnecessary.

I will, however, give you one of a thousand instances of the inactive habits of the southern ladies. On my first arrival, my own house not being in readiness, I was persuaded to remain a short time in the family of an intimate friend of my husband, and I used often to detect the lady, in endeavoring to conceal a smile, when I saw her *magot* myself, as to cross the room for my pocket handkerchief, or stooped to adjust the cricket at my feet, or attempted to do any thing, no matter what, however trivial.

With all the habitual indolence, which climate and custom both combine to foster, the southerners possess qualities, the most noble and estimable; they are high-minded and honorable—open-hearted, hospitable and generous, to a degree bordering on the romantic. Divested of everything like meanness, though somewhat reckless, perhaps, but warm-hearted and friendly; they are ever ready to render aid and assistance, to whomsoever needs it, whether friend or stranger, and that too, without *counting the coppers*. Yet these are the people whom our northern friends, the abolitionists, would stigmatize as monsters and murderers, or occasionally grace with the softer appellatives of tyrant and barbarian. In travelling, as I have done, in nearly every slaveholding State, I have had opportunities of becoming acquainted with all classes of people, and I can safely assert that I have never met any race of beings, so free from trouble and care, so apparently happy and contented, as the slaves of the south. I do not recollect ever to have witnessed a single instance of unwarrantable severity, exercised toward them; though abuses of this description, undoubtedly exist, as do abuses of every other nature, but these are of a very rare occurrence. It is true that the discipline in which the slaves are held, is exceedingly strict, but it is not necessarily oppressive in its operations—neither is it so considered by the industrious and obedient; and those who are disposed to avail themselves of such, possess privileges and indulgencies, the relation of which would not be credited by half the people at the north.'

To the Editor of the Liberator:

The following letter was written some months since, on the appearance of the above in the 'Ladies' Magazine'—and submitted to the Editor of that Periodical for insertion. As it could not be admitted to *those* pages, I ask a place for it in *yours*.

To the Editor of the American Ladies' Magazine:

MRS. HALE,—In the last No. of the American Ladies' Magazine, my attention was powerfully arrested by a letter from a Northern Lady now resident in the South, containing some sentiments, appearing to me of so injurious a tendency, that I have felt desirous to offer a few remarks to the readers of that periodical that may tend in some measure to expose their fallacy. I have felt it my duty to do this, because many ladies who will read the article to which I refer, may, in mere thoughtlessness, accept the sentiments as just, who would be convinced by a little reflection that they are directly the reverse.

I regret, in the first place, that when speaking of the difference of habits between Ladies of the North and South, your correspondent should not have spoken with disapprobation of the indolence, that, according to her own statement, characterizes the Southern females, an indolence extremely culpable under any circumstances, and still more so when viewed in connexion with the remarks I am now about to make.

Your correspondent says, 'With all the habitual indolence which climate and custom both combine to foster, the Southerners possess qualities the most noble and estimable; they are high-minded and honorable—open hearted, hospitable and generous to a degree bordering on the romantic. Divested of every thing like meanness, though somewhat reckless, perhaps, but warm hearted and friendly; they are ever ready to render aid and assistance to whomsoever needs it, whether friend or stranger, and that too without counting the coppers. Yet these are the people whom our Northern friends the Abolitionists, would stigmatize as robbers and murderers, or occasionally grace with the softer appellatives of tyrant and barbarian.' She would, undoubtedly, intimate that the people in whose praises she is so warm, are slaveholders, as otherwise the allusion to the opinions of the Abolitionists is entirely irrelevant. And now for the proof. As a general rule, I deny that slaveholders can be high minded or honorable, open hearted or generous. Let us consider the meaning usually affixed to these words, and can we then think that they may be justly applied to the characters of those who retain, by the law of violence, thousands of human beings as their property, compelling them to labor in their service and for their benefit without remuneration? In what light should we regard similar conduct at the North? Suppose I had educated a child in my own family, and that, in such a manner as to have kept her ignorant of her own rights, and she were too friendless to be informed of them by others, and when she had attained an age to make her services very valuable to me, I should avail myself of them, not compensating her for the same, could any one, after a moments reflection, call me either generous or high minded? and supposing that with this unjustly acquired wealth I should make liberal presents to friends from the South who might visit me, would this at all alter the nature of the case? And is not this the state of things among our Southern friends? They may give liberally, and exercise great hospitality to strangers who come among them, but the property of which they are so lavish, is justly due to others, and the means that support this hospitality are wrung from the labors of the helpless and unrequited slaves.

'Divested of every thing like meanness!' Why the very 'handkerchief' and 'cricket' service to which this Northern Lady alludes, is probably rendered by the slaves of her Southern friend for no better reason than that they are completely in that friends' power and cannot do otherwise. To avail ourselves of the exertions of another, because that individual is wholly in our power, appears to me as the *essence* of meanness, and I cannot therefore but esteem it as mean for a Southern Lady to offer, or a Northern Lady to accept services to which neither can prefer a just claim. 'They are ever ready to render aid and assistance to whomsoever may need it.' I know not how much 'aid and assistance' the slaveholders of the South may render to their white friends and neighbors, but I deny that they render either to their slave population, therefore the word 'whomsoever' is utterly inapplicable. Your correspondent might, perchance, reply to this by stating individual acts of kindness, by telling of various schemes of 'oral instruction' &c. all of which things are principally useful as tending to shew that there is still a living conscience at the South on this subject, and that, of course, the appeals of the Abolitionists may not be wholly in vain. The aid, the assistance that the slaveholders are bound to render to the slaves is 'Immediate Emancipation,' and all else that they may render is only a trifling homage to the power of Truth on their own minds.

Lastly, your correspondent proceeds to speak of the 'happy and contented state' in which the slaves are. I can only adopt in answer, the sentiment of Edmund Burke, and say that if she has seen 'happy slaves' she has seen 'degraded men.' Does she really think that men and women held in slavery, recognized only as property, can be 'contented and happy,' unless every generous and noble impulse has been previously crushed and withered? She degrades human nature by a different supposition. She cannot surely think that she should be 'contented and happy' in such a situation, and if she could not, why should those who share a common nature with her be so? She allows that the 'discipline' in which the slaves are held is 'exceedingly strict,' but couples it with the declaration that they possess 'privileges and indulgencies, the relation of which would not be credited by half the people of the North.' I feel no disposition to discredit her testimony, though I am constrained to think that with her views on the subject, she could not judge fairly of the small portion of the system of slavery that has been presented to her observation. I say 'small portion,' because her situation as an invalid and a woman would preclude a full survey. Allowing however the existence of all the 'privileges and indulgencies' spoken of, I remark, that these are not what the friends of the slave claim for him. All that they seek is a matter of *right* and not of *favor*. The simple admission that a man's person is his own property, is what is asked for, and still this is granted it is mockery to talk of 'privileges and indulgencies.'

The question is not whether it is the duty of slaveholders to be *generous*, but whether they ought not to be *just*. It is far from my wish and intention to condemn any class of men by assertion alone. I would merely ask your readers to ascertain from approved sources what American slavery really is, to learn it from the slave codes of the various states, and from the testimony of intelligent travellers. Then let them consult the word of God and the unsophisticated teachings of their own hearts, and in the light thus afforded they will be enabled to estimate, at its real value, the worth of character of the men and women who administer and uphold this system.

I have written this only from a sense of duty. I fear lest the sentiments on which I have commented, should become common in the mouths and hearts of New England women, and that forgetful of the heavy responsibilities connected with this subject that rest upon them, they may perform the office of apologists instead of reformers. Such a deterioration of female character would be so fraught with evil that I feel that these remarks cannot be inappropriate to the pages of a periodical devoted solely to the mental, moral and religious improvement of women.

In your late Prospectus you refer to the maintenance of Freedom in our country. It is in the hope of rendering you a trifling assistance in this holy work, that I submit this to your candor and that of your readers.

AN AMERICAN LADY.

MR. CALHOUN'S INCENDIARY BILL.

MR. EDITOR:—It has been contended that the Bill of Mr. Calhoun respecting incendiary publications 'touching slavery,' is strictly constitutional, and does not violate that provision of the United States Constitution which says, 'Congress shall pass no laws abridging the freedom of the press.' It is said that each State has a right to make what provisions they please in their own Constitutions, respecting 'the freedom of the press,' and make what laws they please respecting it, and that it is for them alone to determine whether these laws are in conformity with such constitutional provisions. And having this right, Congress is called, to bound to exercise its powers respecting Post Offices and the mail, in such a manner that these State laws shall not be violated, which, it is said, must be the case, if the publications prohibited by State laws are transmitted in the mail. It is said also that Mr. Calhoun's incendiary bill, is not intended to apply in its provisions to any but the slaveholding States, and that the mails and post offices in the non-slaveholding States, are yet as entirely exempt from all restrictions upon the transmission of publications, as they ever have been. And that as these latter States are concerned only with what takes place within their own jurisdiction and boundaries, therefore, their constitutional rights in this respect are not violated, and they have no cause of complaint. This, I believe, is a fair statement of the argument urged in favor of the constitutionality of Mr. Calhoun's Bill.

This argument I consider unsound, and I will endeavor to show that it is so, by the following course of reasoning. In the first place, I say that the slaveholding States have no right to pass laws restricting the liberty of the press by their own Constitutions.—There are the same provisions upon this subject in their own Constitutions, as in the national Constitution, and that of the non-slaveholding States. Their own laws, therefore, are a violation of their own Constitution. But it is said, that they alone have the right of determining whether their own laws are agreeable to their own Constitution, and that it is not for Congress to settle this point. This position I deny. Congress are called upon co-operate with the State Governments, in the enforcement and execution of State laws, and for this purpose, to pass laws putting restrictions upon the mail and the post-offices within these States—to abridge their own power respecting the regulation of the mail, so as to conform to this local legislation. Now before Congress can decide that it ought to pursue this course, it must necessarily inquire and determine whether these State laws are agreeable to their own Constitutions, or a violation of the same, for if they be a violation, they are void, and any act of Congress in conformity to them, would be also unconstitutional and void. If Congress in legislating upon this subject, are bound to respect the laws of the States, they are a fortiori, bound also to respect the Constitution of those States, which are the source and foundation of all their laws. Here are two powers which are supposed to clash, the power of Congress over the mail, and the power of States to regulate the press, and the circulation of publications within their boundaries. If this be the case, Congress are certainly bound to determine what is the extent of the power of those States, before they can be called upon to abridge the exercise of their own constitutional powers upon this subject.

But, in the second place, suppose the laws of the southern States, putting these restrictions upon the press, are constitutional, and not a violation of their own Constitutions, would the National Government in this case, have a right to prevent the transmission of such publications through the mail into those States, and the distribution of them there. It has been admitted by Mr. Calhoun himself, that the distribution of publications is essential to the freedom of the press, since mere publication without distribution is of no use—and it has further been admitted by him, that there is no way of making this distribution generally and extensively through the country, except through the mail, since individuals are prohibited by law from establishing a mail conveyance. The abridgement, therefore, of the conveyance of publications through the mail, is therefore an abridgement of the 'freedom of the press,' and so admitted by this gentleman himself. The question, then, to be considered, resolves itself now into this—when the laws of a state, and the provisions of the national Constitution relating to the same subject matter, are at variance, which shall be considered of paramount authority? And I think there can be no doubt upon this subject. If there were no especial provision, as there is, upon this subject in the national Constitution, making the Constitutions and laws of the other several States subordinate in their provisions to those of the national Constitution, yet the very nature of the compact would of itself be sufficient for this purpose. A national Constitution is a compact between a number of individual parties, by which they enter into certain agreements respecting the powers to be conferred upon this National Government, and putting certain restrictions upon those powers. Now it is clearly evident, that such an agreement proceeding from them in their associated character, cannot be violated by any agreement which the parties to it may separately make in their State Constitutions. The provisions of the Constitution of the United States, therefore, must be considered of paramount authority to the laws of any of the individual States relating to the freedom of the press, when they clash with each other, and if one of the other must fail to go into official operation, it must be the laws of the State, and not the provisions of the National Constitution.

Again, what was the great object intended to be secured by the provision in the National Constitution that 'Congress shall pass no laws abridging the freedom of the press.' It was undoubtedly to secure the transmission of intelligence upon every subject, throughout the whole extent of the Union—that co-

ery part of it should have the advantage of knowing the opinions which prevailed in every section of the country upon all important subjects, whether national or otherwise—that information should be generally diffused, and that every question should receive a full and fair discussion in reference to its bearing upon the nation at large, and the different sections of it. There was no doubt that the opinions which prevailed in any portion of the country, and which were considered favorable to their particular interests, would find facilities enough there for their publication and circulation. There would be no State laws restricting the expression and diffusion of such opinions. But it was those of an adverse character, those which might prevail in other sections of the Union where a different interest might exist, which would be the most likely to be burdened with such restrictions upon the press. It was important, therefore, that the diffusion of such opinions should be secured by some provision of the national Constitution, which should prevent Congress from putting any restriction upon their circulation.

This restriction of Congress contained in the Constitution upon the liberty of the press, was more particularly intended to relate to the *transmission* of publications from one State to another, since the Constitutions and laws of the States can effectually secure in almost all cases the freedom of the press within their respective limits, and Congress could have had but a very limited, if any jurisdiction over the press within these limits. It is an affair of internal State regulation, with which Congress would have had upon most subjects no right in any way to interfere. The restriction, therefore, in the national Constitution, was not so much wanted for the security of the press within the States, as for the security of the *transmission* of publications from one State to another. And if Congress pass a law preventing this *transmission*, they defeat the very object intended chiefly to be secured, and clearly and most manifestly violate this provision of the Constitution. And a State which calls upon them to do this, calls upon them to do the very thing against which the Constitution was chiefly intended to guard,—to violate their duty in relation to the whole country, to gratify the wishes of a particular section of it.

I think, therefore, it is shown that Mr. Calhoun's Bill was clearly unconstitutional. W. S. A.

SLAVE LABOR PRODUCE.

ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE,
Providence, July 7, 1836.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON:

Respected Friend,—It is so important that every thing should be done that can be done, consistent with christian principles, for the liberation of the slaves, that it is very painful to witness an unwillingness to renounce, as much as possible, the use of articles of slave produce, and a disposition on the part of any, in the least degree, to discourage others from so laudable a course. Where the path of duty appears so plain, we might suppose that every *christian*, and every *abolitionist*, would be very careful to keep aloof, as much as possible from contamination: even if it subjected him to the *total* relinquishment of certain articles usually deemed important in the family, in short that nothing but the risk of health and of life should induce him to partake. But when we reflect that substitutes can generally be procured, and often of a quality and price as favorable; that *Free Produce* stores have been established in some of the larger cities, and that others would immediately be established if the patronage would authorise, there is no longer any reasonable excuse.

I have been informed this day of a man in Burrillville, in this State, who refused to sign any paper to promote African emancipation, because he was apprehensive it would raise the price of molasses! He acted on the principle that it was better to perpetuate the bondage of two and a half millions of his fellow men, than that he should be subjected to the expense of a few cents extra on the gallon for the molasses he might want to use in his family! How far from this principle do those differ, who, rather than incur any additional expense and trouble for the articles they consume in their families, give all their patronage to those who traffic in the bodies and souls of men?

I look upon this as a very important part of that system of means now happily in use for the attainment of your great object. I have been impressed with this sentiment for more than 16 years, and I am ashamed to say, and it should lead me to the deepest repentance, that during this long period, I have but occasionally and partially, lived up to the ground which I knew to be right. When in N. York, in May, hearing the remarks made on the resolution to which allusion has been made by Judge Jay and Gerrit Smith, Esq., I resolved that with the Divine assistance, I would endeavor to avoid, as much as possible, the use of those articles, and in so doing up to this time, I can truly say I have had that satisfaction which the world does not afford, that satisfaction which the luxurious do not enjoy.

I have copied with some slight variation for your examination, and insertion in the Liberator, if you think proper, the following from a monthly publication, published in Tennessee, in 1820, by Elihu Embree, of the Society of Friends, and which served to enlighten my mind in regard to this subject.

With much respect, WM. DROWN.

THE OBJECTION TO THE USE OF PRIZE GOODS EXAMINED.

The name of prize goods is mostly given to goods taken on the seas, by armed vessels of nations at war with each other, and sold by the captors. Some conscientious people refuse to purchase such goods, because the real owners do not receive the pay; and because it would be encouraging robbery and murder; also, becoming parties therein. All goods taken from the real owners, either by fraud, or force, are prize goods, whether it be on sea or on land. All who purchase such goods (knowing them to be prize) are parties in the business, giving it countenance and substantial support. The persons employed as captors of the human species, who drive a circumfaron their homes, and carry them to another country for sale, are guilty of the highest grade of felony, and the captives so taken are the highest grade of prize goods. To seize on a man's whole property and make prize of it, is certainly a light act of felony; but to seize on the man himself, and make prize of him, is still higher. The captive being deprived of his liberty and all the natural rights of man, is compelled to hard labor by his captor or purchaser; all the proceeds of his labor is taken from him, which is strictly prize goods. The slave being prize goods, his labor is prize goods also; he was made a slave for the sake of the proceeds of his labor, therefore the product of his labor is amongst the highest grade of prize goods. The purchaser of the goods is a party in the slave trade; his money goes to the planter, and from him to the Guinea merchant. Thus countenancing and supporting each other, linked together as in a chain, the whole business is pushed on with vigor. The greater the demand is for the produce the greater is the demand for the slaves. The commercial interest of the slave trade and the produce of the slaves labor, is linked in with the American free labor, and cotton, rice, and the produce of the free labor, is sold to the merchant, and he, in the process of commerce, and the business, is made a party, as are the merchants. The use of the slave produce encourages and upholds the slave trade, and the slave labor is supported from the same root, avarice in the merchant, and luxury in the consumer.

Vessels are sometimes taken on the seas laden with the manufactures of Europe, where every one concerned in manufacturing the cargo, has been paid for his labor, the vessel taken without the loss of any lives; yet many would refuse to purchase goods so obtained, who would not hesitate to purchase goods extorted from slavery by violence, injustice, oppression and bloodshed; which carries with it a resemblance of straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

There is but right and wrong, good and evil, in the world; yet their grades are many. To refuse purchasing acknowledged prize goods, is to refuse being a party in violence and injustice; also, to bear a testimony against it. Where are cruelty and injustice carried to the same extent that they are by the slave trade? Where is the testimony that the purchasers and consumers of the fruit of slavery do bear against it? To answer in truth, we must say they are all parties in the business, and their testimony is, for it. The beginners of the slave trade are the merchants who send their ships to Africa, to bring them across the ocean; and the finishers, are the consumers of their labor; they are the Alpha and the Omega of the business. The people employed in the Guinea ships, who drag them from their homes, the planters who purchase them, the merchants who purchase the produce of the slave labor, the retailers and *consumers* thereof, are all accessories in the business; they all assist in turning a wheel in that vast and complicated machine of iniquity. This great engine of destruction, is formed of the parts above described; they are the machine, and contain in themselves the cause of its motion; they constitute a complete whole. *Take from it the consumers, and the whole machine must stop.*

The merchant will not import an article for which there is no demand: the slaveholder will have no disposition to buy slaves, when the fruits of their labor will not sell: the Guinea ships will cease to haunt the coast of Africa in quest of slaves, when there is no demand for them on this continent. Then that fountain of human blood which hath been flowing for ages, and which hath been found to be a fountain of sorrow, and which would be dried up; and the carnage and misery attending the traffic in human flesh would cease.

This great fountain of human blood, that hath been flowing on the continent of Africa for ages, whose streams have stained the shores of America, and the West Indies, is kept in motion, and supported by the *consumers* of the produce of slavery. *They are the subscribers that furnish the fund by which the whole business is carried on.* A merchant who loads his vessel in the West Indies, or United States, with the proceeds of slavery, does nearly as much as hiring forward the slave trade, as he that loads his vessel in Africa or District of Columbia with slaves; *they are both twisting the same rope at different ends.*

The feasts of the luxurious may be called banquets of human flesh and blood; and the partakers thereof considered cannibals devouring their own species; if we take into consideration the great destruction in Africa, by the warfare carried on in taking slaves; secondly, in transporting them to America; and lastly, in seasoning them; which is seasoning them to a proof, with hunger and hard labor, which they undergo in the culture of the cane, and various other crops, the manufacture of sugar, and where they are in a few years destroyed.

How is this vast destruction of the rational creation of God, to be accounted for, to him whose justice is infinite; who will not behold the iniquity with approbation? On whom will the guilt of this great sacrifice to avarice and luxury fall? Certainly on the whole *co-partnership* who are parties in the business.

Having demonstrated that slave produce is prize goods, and the sale of those goods to be the part of the slave trade, and of consequence, the purchasers to the parties in the business; it may not be amiss to observe, that the receiver of stolen goods is said to be equal to the thief. It is something parabolic that a man should refuse to buy a stolen sheep, or to eat a piece of one that is stolen, and should not have the same scruples respecting a stolen man.

The apostle Paul, in endeavoring to remove the strong Jewish prejudices for the Mosaic Law, said, 'whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no questions for conscience' sake.' 1 Cor. 10: 25. But that were relative to clean and unclean beasts; and their manner of killing them; I have a much better opinion of Paul, than to believe he meant anything stolen, or taken by robbery and violence from its right owner. If any one, after having fully considered the slave trade, the manner of their treatment in slave countries, and the manner in which the produce of their labor is obtained; if he has no doubts about partaking thereof, any more than he would about any thing obtained by the strictest honesty, then I have nothing to say to him; but if he is fearful, and feels doubts that all is not right, I say to him in mind of what Paul says, 'He that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith, for whatsoever is not of faith is sin.'

[From the Emancipator.]

AMALGAMATION.

It is alleged by our opponents, that the abolition of slavery will lead to an amalgamation of the races. That is, the objection, if it has any force, means, that abolition will lead to more amalgamation than now exists. The following fact, communicated by a clergyman of Ohio, in a letter to a friend, will throw some light on this subject.

Extract from a letter, dated 'On board the steamboat Canton, below Pittsburgh, May 26, 1836.

My passage from Philadelphia was very pleasant. Several anti-slavery men were with us, with some slave-holders, and a numerous company of pro-slavery men. *Slavery* was the topic of discussion nearly all the way. I believe it was generally acknowledged that the abolitionists had a monopoly of argument and good temper on their side. I will state an incident that occurred. As we were discussing the subject on deck, (nearly all the passengers listening,) we came to the *amalgamation* part of the argument, just as our boat reached Lewiston, and landed. I discovered on shore an old colored woman, with a basket of apples. After purchasing some of her apples, I inquired of her if she was ever a slave—(the passengers all looking on and listening.) 'Oh yes, massa.' 'Where?' 'Norfolk, Virginia.' 'How did you get free?' 'Massa gib me free.' 'How came he to do that?' 'Me hab thirteen children by him.' Well, did he free your children also? 'Yes, he gib us all free.' I turned to my opponents and asked them what they thought of amalgamation on a scale like this? It closed the argument. The passengers gathered round the old woman and bought all her apples.'

[From the Haverhill Gazette.]

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

'We once more press the subject of petitioning Congress for the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia, upon the attention of our readers. *It is time to begin.* The petitions ought to be ready to be sent by our representative when they leave for Congress. We have blank petitions on hand, which we can send to any part of the county if required.

The ladies, also, it is hoped, will lend their aid. They petitioned in England and did much to procure the emancipation of the slaves of the West Indies. Will our American women do less than their sisters of England? Will they be deterred from their duty by a fear of the sneers and insults of the base and unprincipled? Women never look lovely—never in a more appropriate sphere—than when engaged in the exercise of benevolence and mercy. She is then indeed little lower than the angels.'

'With heart over-burdened, I cry to God for help,
Unnerved from daily duty by the sneers of the selfish,
While my spirit sinks at her's and bow down with them
Who suffer with the heartbreak—the fainting and fear.

For, though spotless herself, she can mourn with them
Who suffer with evil the spirit's pure gem.
And a sigh or a tear can the erring reprove,
And the sting of rebuke is still tempered with love.'

[From the Boston Recorder, August 4, 1836.]

Dr. Beecher's Sermon, which we have published in our paper of last week, is a most powerful production. There is no mistaking the ground he takes, nor the manner in which he maintains it. There is no equivocation in the sentiments he utters, whatever, that 'the time of our redemption' will ever be carried heathen like excessively by cherishing such an opinion. The real danger is, that they will not long be regarded as men and as brethren, but as a servile and distinct race; that, as it respects their time, labor, improvement, and political and social equality, they will be defrauded by grinding monopolies, and reduced by systematic processes; and, hence, that they will have cause for complaint, and may be driven ultimately to revolution. We do not believe that there is any class of working-men, however ignorant or depraved, who 'feel that *all* property above them is held by oppression'—but all classes *know*, and some *feel*, that there is a growing aristocracy in our land; that privileges are granted to the wealthy few, to the injury and impoverishment of the laborious many; that an equality of rights must beget an equality of conditions; that dissatisfaction arises, not because property is acquired, but on account of the manner of its acquisition; and that oppression, not wealth, excites to resistance, anarchy, and common plunder. How does it happen, that Dr. Beecher's sympathies and fears side only with the rich and the powerful? Is there no cause for anxiety, lest they may be tempted to keep back the hire of the laborers who reap down their fields, and regard the operative and mechanic as mere implements of industry? Shall they not be admonished at least as often as the poor and needy? If it is in the nature of destitution to be envious, is it not also in the nature of wealth to be extortionate? If the feeble covet strength, do not the strong incline to despotism? Our laboring population, whether white or colored, are not held in due estimation; they are generally overtasked; they are seldom adequately remunerated, according to the just rule, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,' and the other reasonable and disinterested requirement, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them'; they are valued according to the strength of their bodies, rather than to the intelligence of their minds and the improvement of their hearts. The lower they are found in degradation, the nearer they approach to starvation, (even when owing to obscurity of birth or the fate of adversity!) the less sympathy is extended to them—the less aid do they find. Man is not regarded as man—his inherent and perfect equality is not understood—his princely and indestructible dignity is not recognized—even though the heavens and the earth were created for him, and though to him is given dominion over the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air, and though he is created in the image of God, and though Jesus, the Lord of Glory, descended from heaven, and died that he might live! When the abolitionists inculcate the duty of remunerating the colored laborer for his work, the cry is raised against them of 'fanaticism!' and when the white laborer protests against unrighteous monopolies, the same proud conservatives clamor about 'agrarianism,' 'levellers,' &c. As an apology for keeping our colored population in chains, we are referred to 'the scenes of St. Domingo!' although the struggle in that island was between an army of French invaders and an emancipated people. It was the consequence of an attempt to enslave freemen, not of liberating bondmen. So, whenever the workingmen strive to effect a just reform, they are made hideous, and driven back, by a fresh delineation of the horrors of the 'French revolution.' What has that tragedy to do with justice between man and man, or with equality between the employer and the employed? And were there no causes which produced it? It is popular to speak of the Goddess of Reason, of Robespierre and his vindictive associates, of the guillotine, and of the reign of atheism. But who dwells upon the fact, that a despotic government, a false religion, and a wicked priesthood, had conspired to crush, ruin and enslave the people, so that human endurance could bear no more, and all that was associated with the name of christianity became hateful? To a kingly and priestly despotism, long imposed and borne as long, must the origin of that tragedy be ascribed. Knowing nothing either of the character or the fruits of true religion,—detesting that which the Man of Sin forced upon their observance,—perceiving that they were made the victims of superstition and tyranny,—catching some faint glimpses of the natural equality of mankind,—and maddened to desperation by the wrongs heaped upon them,—they rose to obtain not only redress, but revenge, and in their blind fury made a sacrifice of the true with the false, of liberty with despotism, of all that was virtuous with much that was vile. But they were not made proficies of impiety and cruelty in a day. They were trained to be atheists in the school of a false christianity. Yet the French revolution has been a fine windfall for the priesthood and the aristocracy in all countries. The causes of it are almost wholly forgotten—its terrible effects only are remembered. Both the aristocracy and the priesthood, however, need to be instructed by it more than the people.

Dr. Beecher proceeds:—'One of the most alarming indications of our day is, that men are too proud to be free under the law, and are beginning to turn the same glance upon the law, that they turn in Europe upon the despot . . . What is the meaning of those fearful heavings in our cities? There is already a power amongst us that can with difficulty be kept down.' Who are these men who are too proud to be free under the law, but the aristocracy and the rabble? Who composed the mob in Boston, but 'gentlemen of property and standing'? Who headed the disturbance at Utica, but officers of the law and members of Congress? Who plundered the public mail, in the open face of day, and burnt a portion of its contents, but the most respectable inhabitants of Charleston? Who have threatened the infliction of lynch law so daringly, as the southern representatives upon the floor of Congress? Who have winked at these and other violations of public order more approvingly than the great body of the clergy? And on what side is Dr. Beecher found, except on that which is supported by the lawless, the profane, the oppressive, the aristocratical? 'What is the meaning of those fearful heavings in our cities?' Let the Colonization Society answer; let the slave-holding slave-driver; let the resolutions of certain presbyteries and synods and conferences answer; let the conduct of such papers as the Boston Recorder, Vermont Chronicle, Christian Mirror, New York Observer, Philadelphia Presbyterian, and Christian Advocate and Journal, answer!

Our remarks upon his late anti-political speech, at Pittsburgh, are extending to a length which we did not originally contemplate. There are but two other points which challenge our notice. Having dwelt upon the prevalence of atheism, fatalism, and agrarianism, our land, (though the last has, in fact, no place in it,) if it has 'a name,' but is a mere 'nonentity,' Dr. Beecher says that 'a more serious danger yet remains.' Imagine, if you can, reader, what this is. Dr. Beecher will tell you:—'These allied ties, those soft but mighty bands which have held Christians of the *North* and of the *South* together, are beginning to break.' Those *silken ties* are literally the *chains of slavery*. The prospect of a purification of the northern churches and pulpits from the guilt of oppression, by excluding southern clerical slavites and man-stealers from church fellowship,—obedience to the apostolic injunction, 'Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not THE UNCLEAN THING, and I will receive you'—'But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is *called a* BROTHER be a fornicator, or *covetous*, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an EXTORTIONER; with such an one no, not to eat';—yes, this is something more deplorable than even atheism, fatalism, or agrarianism! It matters not that southern churches are cages of unclean birds—clotted with iniquity—they are full of violence, adultery and oppression—made up of traffickers in slaves and souls of men; not to be united with them is 'Christian fellowship, would be a terrible catastrophe to virtue, republicanism, religion! 'Disunion is the key of death which will open Pandemonium upon us, and let in wide-spread, universal desolation'—disunion with those who make merchandise of Christ's body! with the scourgers and violators of helpless woman! with the enemies of human rights! with the plunderers of the poor and needy! with the asserters of the divine institution of slavery! with the allies of the Man of Sin, who banish the bible, and teach the sufficiency of oral instruction! Why, this is to use the dialect of heathenism, and to 'open Pandemonium' with a vengeance!

'Wherefore hear the word of the Lord, ye scornful men, that rule this people—Because ye have said, We have made a covenant with death, and with hell are we at agreement: when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, it shall not come unto us: for we have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves: Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden down by it.'

Dr. Beecher brings himself into awful condemnation, by giving the right hand of fellowship to *christian* thieves and adulterers, and by likening a separation from their vile company to 'the key of death,' the opening of Pandemonium. Most indubitably he refers to a prospective division between northern and southern churches on the ground of slavery; and he regards it as the worst of evils. Hence, he 'goes with the South,' in all its turpitude of crime, rather than peril the union between Christ and Belial!

'Will subsequent ages credit so monstrous a statement—that preachers of the gospel, eighteen hundred years after angels had sung, *on earth peace, good will to men*, were characterized as proverbially devoted participants in all the enormities and iniquity of man-stealing?

'No desire should be felt to propitiate professing Christians, while they steal souls and hands. Their guilt is equal to extinguish all right to Gospel and bishops a cargo of Africans; and it is altogether a burlesque upon every thing sacred for a man-robber to pretend to Christianity; and far more dishonorable and injurious to the church to suffer him to preach, and rule in the spiritual affairs of immortals.

'The most obdurate adherents of slavery are preachers of the gospel, and officers and members of the church. As soon as they are easily convinced—he will fare no palliative; but Christians defend man-stealing.

'Persons called *Christians*, and officers of the church, buy and sell the stolen colored people, with their wives and children, as others do horses. A preacher of the gospel ought not to be patiently listened to even, who eloquently depicts the blessing of that liberty with which Christ hath made us free, and who holds his fellow disciple, him to whom he administers the symbols of a Saviour's redeeming love, in a most dreadful and lacerating bondage.

'That man-stealers can possibly venture to preach concerning justice, mercy and pardon, upon evangelical principles; that they can unblushingly presume to serve at the table of the Lord; or that they can calmly seat themselves around the sacred board as a manifest demonstration of that obduracy of heart, which sin naturally engenders, and of that blindness of vision, which nothing but the Holy Spirit's energy can possibly remove.

'To pray, and kidnap to commune, and rob men's all! to preach justice, and steal the laborer with his recompense! to recommend mercy to others, and exhibit cruelty in our own conduct! to exhibit Christ's love duties, and yet never impede the performance of them! to propound the example of Christ and his apostles, and declare that a slaveholder imitates them! to enjoin an observance of the Lord's day, and drive slaves from the temple of God! to inculcate every social affection, and instantly exterminate them! to expatiate upon bliss eternal, and preclude sinners from obtaining it! to unfold the woes of Tophet, and not drag men from the fire! are the most preposterous delusions, and consummate mockery.

'Colored citizens, in the fulfilment of the first law of God and man, escape from their vassalage; and Christians, so called, not less than infidel scourers, will ransack every nook and corner of the republic to restore that free born citizen to their hellish captivity.

'Every slaveholder, peremptorily and without delay, must be excommunicated from the church of God. It is of no importance, what titles, what office, what station, or what rank, the slaveholder may hold, or what apparent virtues or talents he may possess and develope. To all these specious pleas, and to all this anti-christian whitewashing, there is a concise, significant and irrefutable reply—*He is a man-stealer.* But as a man-stealer is the very highest criminal in the judgment of God, and of all rational uncorrupted men, he cannot be a Christian; and, therefore, it is an insult to the Lord Jesus Christ, the head of the church, to extend to such notorious criminal as an acceptable member of the household of faith.... In these abominations church members have lived—exchanging horses for men—bartering women for pulp—scourging females in the last stage of pregnancy, until from fear of the consequences, they have transferred the lacerated creatures to their husbands, for a conditional extra price, to depend upon the health and life of the expected child.'

The foregoing is a graphic portraiture of southern churches and *christians*, drawn by the Rev. GEORGE BOURNE, (see his *Picture of Slavery*,) from actual inspection, after a residence of many years at the south. Disunion with such hypocritical monsters, on account of their infamous conduct, is regarded with alarm by Dr. Beecher! Hear him:

'Must the day come, when this our beloved church shall be rent asunder? That will be a sad day. Then all the bells of our churches may well be muffled, and toll the funeral knell of our highest glory, the final end of our civil with our religious liberties!

'Only think of it, Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, Unitarians, &c. &c. 'our civil and religious liberties' depend upon the union of 'our beloved (Presbyterian) church' with southern whoremongers and man-stealers! Dr. Beecher seems to have forgotten, that the vitality and usefulness of a church do not depend upon numbers, but upon christian integrity and purity. Whatever religious denomination shall exclude slaveholders from their fellowship, and brand slaveholding as man-stealing, will be first in real prosperity, and more perfect in union than any other.

Another alarming evil which the Dr. justly assails, is the prevalence of pollution:

'There is a systematized effort to pollute through the eye. The pencil, and the chisel, and the art of engraving, have prostituted their power to this bad end. Learning seems wickedness by pitching is too slow. We must have pictures to teach it through the eye.'

The mass of impurity which exists, both in the church and out of it, and which has recently been brought to light by a few contemptible pioneers in the holy cause of Moral Reform, is absolutely appalling. If some of it be owing to painters, sculptors and engravers, how much more is to be attributed to the criminal silence of ministers respecting the seventh commandment! And look at the shameful treatment of the noble, persecuted, self-sacrificing McDowell, and the pure-minded and fearless Whitmarsh, and the uncompromising and amiable Cotesworthy, by our *religious* journals and our aristocratical clergy! No wonder licentiousness abounds every where. But if, with all the safeguards of virtue that surround us in the North—if, with marriage made honorable and sacred, and with all our facilities and opportunities to train up our children in the nurture and ADMONITION of the Lord, lewdness is rolling in upon us like a flood—what must be the state of things at the South, where virtue is crucified by law, where two millions and a half of human beings are herded together as cattle or swine, where every barrier against pollution is prostrated, where the marriage covenant is unknown, and where bribes are given to stimulate to an unholy amalgamation! The system of slavery is essentially and necessarily full of all uncleanness, incest, and adultery, without let or hindrance, in the open face of day! Does Dr. Beecher oppose that system? Is his soul affected only in view of the profligacy which exists incidentally among our white population at the North? Is the preservation of virtue among our colored population a matter of no consequence? O that this talented individual might be led to see and hate his present inconsistency, and to forsake the company of lewd oppressors!

NOTHING STRANGE.

A correspondent of the Portland Mirror says he cannot see that it is wrong to drink alcoholic liquor, or that all defensive war is unlawful, or that it may be always wrong for Christians to engage in such war, or that all slaveholding is sin. His 'conscience cannot grasp' these propositions. Nor can the conscience of the dram-drinker, or military chieftain, or slaveholder. It is because they are all yet groping in darkness, and sold unto the world. This same bewildered individual proceeds:

'In appealing to Christians, therefore, on their DUTY as to PEACE, I do not urge the principle, that war, *offensive* and defensive, is in all circumstances wrong. *This question need not be settled by Christians.* They must look to the word of God, and to conscience, to guide them *in particular cases.*'

Particular cases, then, and not principles, not the precepts of the gospel, not the example and spirit of Christ, are to decide whether and whenever it is lawful for Christians to organize themselves into military companies, battallions, and brigades, and to lay aside the bucsade or march to the tented field, for the purpose of slaughtering their enemies, and redressing their wrongs! It is right for the followers of Him, whose command is, 'Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you—resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also'—it is right for those who are required to live as lambs in the midst of wolves, and to be harmless as doves, and to put on Christ—it is right for them, 'in particular cases,' to maim, and mutilate, and destroy their foes, and send their souls prematurely to perdition, and also right to expose themselves to be maimed, and mutilated, and destroyed in turn! How consonant is this with the song of the angels—'Glory to God in the highest; on earth peace, good will to men!' He who is disposed to make 'particular cases' the rule of action, is surely one not grounded in the faith, not taught of God, whatever may be his religious hope or profession. In 'particular cases' he will hold his fellow-man in bondage, and murder his enemy—and all the while deem himself an heir of heaven!

With singular inconsistency, this writer says—'I confess I do not see that any christians are called at this day to engage in war.' What! not 'in particular cases'? What, then, becomes of the rule of conduct, and who is to decide? 'I do not see'—no, but others may see—and as you have not made war sinful in *all* cases, they will make your '*particular cases*' answer as a justification for every resort to arms. But it is not because it would be wrong for Christians to fight—O no! The reason why they are not called to do so now, we are told, is this—'There are enough *men of the world* ready to incite its dangers, hardships and temptations, for its pomps, excitements, and rewards'! Can that which is so congenial to the appetites, passions and inclinations of the ungodly, be sinfulness in those who belong to a kingdom not of this world? If, 'in particular cases,' it is a *duty for Christians* to engage in war, why should they shrink from it, and leave it to be performed by the soldiers of the Devil?

He says to Christians—'I do not think you need to agitate the *abstract* question, whether war is in any case lawful.' Why, this is the gist of the whole matter—only settle the question in the abstract, and you settle it in all cases, whether 'particular' or general. Whatever is morally wrong in the abstract, can never be morally right in practice. 'Thou shalt not steal,' is an abstract rule—may we therefore, 'in particular cases,' steal or covet, or commit adultery?

Strange as it may seem, this writer attempts to admonish Christians of the sinful tendencies of war! Thus—

'You know, christian parents, something of the education of young men intended for military life, what a proud air they must assume, how high their heads must be held, and how often their high feelings urge them into duels. When you read the denunciations of Christ, and the letters of his apostles, and the promises of God respecting the children of believers, could you wish an approving conscience about your introduce into the military service that dear boy, whom, in infancy, you dedicated to God, and covenanted to bring up for him? You know what the spirit of rulers and military leaders is, how destitute they are of the fear of God, and of the spirit of Christ, could you then dare to put yourself under the absolute control of their consciences, or rather of their ambition? Have you no fear that they would punish disobedience beyond the bounds of necessity?'

To plead in favor of the righteousness of war 'in the abstract,' and 'in particular cases,' and then to denounce the whole system as unrighteous, is a most singular mode of advancing the cause of Peace. On the subject of slavery, this writer is not less at fault: 'Conscience,' he says, (but whose conscience?) cannot decide on the proposition, that all slaveholding is sin; but it must have *particular cases* to sit upon it and judge!' We must know the person who holds my

perfect in union than any other. evil which the Dr. justly ac- ce of pollution:

sanitized effort to pollute through- ll, and the chisel, and the art of stituted their power to this fal- , wickedness by printing is sa- re pictures to teach it through the

urity which exists, both in the , and which has recently been a few contemptible sonneers in the Reformers, absolutely appalling. ors, painters, sculptors and au- more is to be attributed to the inisters respecting the seventh nd look at the shameful treatment cuted, self-sacrificing McDowell, d and fearless Whitmarsh, poets, and amiable Colesworthy, by one nd our aristocratical clergy! No ss abounds every where. But if, rds of virtue that surround us at marriage made honorable and un- ur facilities and opportunities to in the nurture and admonition ss is rolling in upon us like a s the state of things at the South- cified by law, where two millions n beings are herded together as are every barrier against pollution the marriage covenant is un- bribes are given to stimulate to an on! The system of slavery is so arfully full of this uncleanness, in without let or hindrance, in the

Does Dr. Beecher oppose that al affected only in view of the xists incidentally among our vile orth? Is the preservation of vir- ored population a matter of no con- this talented individual might be his present inconsistency, and to ly of lewd oppressors!

HING STRANGE.

of the Portland Mirror says he s wrong to drink alcoholic liquor, war is unlawful, or that it must for Christians to engage in such wholding is sin. His conscience e propositions. Nor can the con- n-drinker, or military chieftain, or because they are all yet groping in unto the world. This same bewil- rceeds:

to Christians, therefore, on their CE, I do not urge the principle, that defensive; it is if circumstances *ation need not be settled by Christ-* t look to the word of God, and to de them *in particular cases.'*

then, and not principles, not the epel, not the example and spirit of de whether and whenever it is law- organize themselves into military tions, and brigades, and to lay in am- to the teeth, for the purpose eir enemies, and redressing their ht for the followers of Him, whose e your enemies, bless them that d to them that hate you, and pray espitefully use you, and persecute ll, but whosoever shall smite thee k, turn to him the other also"—it is o are required to live as lambs in es, and to be harmless as doves, and it is right for them, in particular nd mutilate, and destroy their fees ls prematurely to perdition, and also emselves to be maimed, and mutilat- in turn! How consonant is this the angels—' Glory to God in the peace, good will to men! He o make 'particular cases' the rule of one not grounded in the faith, not hatever may be his religious hope or particular cases' he will hold his udage, and murder his enemy—and n himself an hair of heaven!

inconsistency, this writer says—' ee that any christians are called a e in war." What! not in particu- t, then, becomes of the rule of con- to decide? *I* do not see'—no, but and as you have not made war sinful will make your '*particular cases*' fication for every resort to arms. But it would be wrong for Christians to he reason why they are not called to e told, is this—'There are enough ready to incur its dangers, hardship for its pomps, excitements, and re- st which is so congenial to the spe- d inclinations of the ungodly, be al- who belong to a kingdom not of this articular cases,' is a *study for Chris-* in war, why should they skulk from 'be performed by the soldiers of the

christians—' I do not think you need to *act* question, whether war is in any Why, this is the gist of the whole tle the question in the abstract, and ll cases, whether 'particular' or gen- is morally wrong in the abstract, can r right in practice. 'Thou shalt not fact rule—may we therefore, 'in par- eal or covet, or commit adultery? may seem, this writer attempts to ns of the sinful tendencies of war!

christian parents, something of the ol- g man intended for military life, what must assume, how jealous they must r, and how often their high hopes be duels. When you read the Scriptures, the letters of his apostles, and the respecting the children of believers, an approving conscience embraces the military service, and dear hos- you dedicated to God, and covet up for him? You know what pre- and military leaders is, how destitute fear of God, and of the spirit of Christ, dare to put yourself under the ship- their conscience, or rather of their ne- you no fear that they would push their d the bounds of necessity?'

avor of the righteousness of war 'in rd in particular cases,' and then to whole system as unrighteous, is a most ed advancing the cause of Peace. On slavery, this writer is not less at fault: he says, (but whose consistency?) 'and- he proposition, that all slaveholders in st have *particular* cases to argue in e must know the person and the ne- ing

of his fellow beings as absolute property, whether it is the Reverend Doctor Ezra Stiles Ely, for instance, or some vulgar infidel, before we can determine upon the quality of the act! 'Every tree,' says John the Baptist, 'which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire.' How unwise! Complaint may be made against the *fruit*, and some of the branches may be pruned, but to lay the axe at the root of the tree is a thing not to be tolerated! 'Property in man' is the root, the trunk of the Upas tree of slavery.

Here is a display of metaphysical argumentation:

'Here we may see the difficulty of adopting general principles. As to particular cases men may agree, for their consciences judges as to these cases, and their consciences will judge alike, for they are made to see the right and the wrong of actions, just as men's eyes are made to see the shapes and colors of bodies; but a general principle is not a *decision* of conscience, but it is an inference of the mind as to what would be the decision of conscience in supposable cases.'

So, it seems, men without any standard of judgment, or any definite rule of action, (indeed, to have either would only serve to confuse rather than aid?) will judge alike, and be made to see the right and the wrong of actions, 'in particular cases,' just as their eyes are made to see the shapes and colors of bodies! Query—'in particular cases'? Another discovery is, that 'a general principle is an *inference* of the mind'! We have hitherto supposed, that an inference is deduced from a principle, as an effect follows a cause—but, it appears that an inference is a general principle, and vice versa.

Another warlike correspondent of the Mirror, equally obtuse and benighted, maintains that war is allowable in certain cases—for,

'To suppose that men will cease to be selfish, malevolent, avaricious, *because unrevisited*, is to make license the strongest means of correction and purification.'

Then, to forgive injuries, is the surest way to provoke them; to command that when one cheek is smitten, the other shall be turned also, is to 'license' violence; to be harmless as *doves*, is just the way to be devoured! The genuine friends of Peace make no such supposition as is put into their lips by this writer. They neither believe nor proclaim, that nonresistance *alone* will cause men to give up their selfishness or malevolence; but they are sure that an habitual, hearty, prompt forgiveness of injuries, for Christ's sake, is the best preservation against them; that this is a duty, under all circumstances; that such an example will work a wider reformation, and gain more victories, than 'an army with banners'; that maiming, wounding, or killing those who trespass against us, is not forgiveness; and that no man can obtain admission into heaven who is not as willing to forgive *all* trespasses against himself, as he desires to be forgiven of God. What can be more explicit than the language of the apostle Peter?

'For this is thank-worthy, if for conscience toward God, *endure grief, suffering wrongfully.* For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your *faults*, ye shall take it patiently? but, if, when ye do *well*, and *suffer for it*, ye take it patiently, *this is acceptable with God*. For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, *leaving us an example that ye should follow his steps*: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but *committed himself to him that judgeth righteously.*'

The affecting language of Paul is—

'For we which live are *always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake*, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh. . . . For if we suffer, shall we not also reign with Christ? . . . Being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat.'

These passages as explicitly forbid Christians resorting to arms, to redress any wrongs however grievous, as the command, 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me,' forbids idolatry. To suppose that the apostles, on account of any provocations, could have been induced to resist by physical violence even an equal or inferior body of persecutors or oppressors, is shocking to every truly devout mind. Their proclamation was, 'The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual. . . For we *wrestle not against flesh and blood*, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.' These, too, are the only equipments with which Christians can lawfully furnish themselves for the warfare:

'Wherefore take you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness, and your feet shod with the *preparation of the gospel of peace;* above all, taking THE SHIELD OF FAITH, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God: praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit.'

The doctrine of non-resistance has reference exclusively to a resort to carnal weapons,—to warlike measures. Moral and spiritual resistance of evil and evildoers is at all times lawful, and constitutes the Christian's warfare. If they have enemies, they are to love, not kill them; if any curse, they must bless; if they are hated, they must do good in return; if wicked men despitefully persecute them, they must pity and pray for them; if their goods are wrested from them, they must be joyful, and not vindictive; in all things approving themselves as the children of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities and distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labors, in watchings, in fastings; by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armor of righteousness.

But, 'to suppose that men will cease to be selfish, malevolent, avaricious, because *unrevisited*,' &c.—Unresisted by the sword, and musket, and cannon—by powder and ball—by bombs and shells—by naval ships and fortifications—by infantry and artillery—by indiscriminate slaughter! But resisted by meekness and forgiveness, by pity and endurance, by returning good for evil, by rejoicing in tribulation, by abstaining from the very appearance of evil, by living as lambs in the midst of wolves! Which kind of resistance will be most likely to awe and subdue 'selfish, malevolent, avaricious men'? All history decides the question in favor of the latter mode.

'We will join heart and hand,' says the writer, 'in the work of putting down the *spirit* and *practice* of war; but when it is said that war can *never* be justifiable, we believe the assertion to be rash and *false.*' Again—' We do not claim any sort of half-license for war. '*It is altogether horrid and dreadful.*' Such glaring contradiction and crooked reasoning do not require comment. Ready to join heart and hand to put down that which is sometimes justifiable, and absolutely necessary to preserve life, liberty, and property, 'in particular cases'! Claiming a perfect license for that which ought to be banished from the earth! Insisting that Christians are obligated to engage in a strife which is '*altogether* horrid and dreadful'! What blindness—what infatuation!

SABBATH BREAKING.

It is common to see accidents that occur on the Sabbath,—whether a man breaks his leg during an excursion on land, or is drowned while sailing on the water,—ascribed to the displeasure of the Almighty for 'a desecration of his holy day,' and recorded as special judgments, sent not only immediately to punish the transgressor, but as warnings to a community or nation. A Bangor correspondent of the Portland Mirror mentions, that on Sunday, 17th ult. six young men in a sail-boat were capsized near Brewer Ferry, two of whom were drowned,—and he draws a sabbatical moral from the accident. The editor of the Mirror also moralizes thus—' We cannot but think, that more events of this character occur on the Sabbath, than on any other day of the week (?) and that the circumstances are often marked by something like a special interposition of Providence, speaking emphatically the divine disapprobation of Sabbath desecration!' Here are four positions assumed, without proof—1. That there is now a 'holy day,' as under the first covenant. 2. That it is not the seventh day, as enjoined in the fourth commandment, but the first day of the week, enjoined by no valid authority. 3. That the particular act, which results disastrously in a given case, is certainly a violation of the day. 4. That the Almighty now interferes, as he did under the old dispensation, by omnipotent physical action to punish transgressors, so that witness may be borne to the fact as exactly and infallibly as among the Israelites in the wilderness. Granting the first three, for the sake of the argument, we deny the last as too preposterous to be urged, except by ignorance or superstition. We believe in no such suspension of the laws of nature, or miraculous visitation of wrath. A boat upsets and persons are drowned—a horse takes fright, and throws his rider, breaking his neck—a steam-boat bursts its boiler, and destroys several lives—all on the Sabbath: is there any thing marvelous or miraculous in these events? Nonsense! Do not similar accidents occur on all other days of the week, when 'holy time' is not violated? And are they not all clearly owing to intemperance, or carelessness, or accident? Is a boat less safe, or a horse more vicious, or a steam-boiler less strong, on Sunday, the Sabbath of Christians, than on Saturday, the Sabbath of Jews and of certain Christian sects? But if people would avoid accidents on the Sabbath, they would neither be drowned nor cast headlong to the earth. 'Time—nor would they on any other day. But the editor of the Mirror thinks, that more accidents—no, accidents, for these are common to all, and therefore not judgments—' more events of this character [drowning] occur on the Sabbath, than on any other day of the week.' Suppose we grant the assumption—what follows? That God is so displeased as to make bare, as it were, his physical arm to chastise the guilty? This is not now his method of dealing with transgressors: he has reserved a day in which he will judge the world. Miracles of wrath, as well as of mercy, were necessary until the Messiah came, and the holy scriptures were fulfilled and completed—no longer. We believe that just as many accidents happen on one day of the week as another, in proportion to the number of liabilities and exposures, whether on the land or on the water—and no more. Physical instantaneous destruction is not needed in this age of the world, either to define what is sinful, or to manifest the displeasure of the Almighty against sinners. The natural fruits of transgression are obvious, and often dreadful; and it is sufficient to affirm, as an incontrovertible axiom, that 'the way of transgressors is hard'—that, as a man soweth, so he shall reap—and that 'the wages of sin, not in a given case, but in all cases without repentance and faith, is death.'

Mr. Cummings says, that fatal events on the Sabbath 'are often marked by something like a special interposition of Providence.' Why? Because, in striving to maintain a favorite theory however absurd, it is enough to find instances of coincidence where none exist but in the imagination. What are these marks, and how are they so infallibly known them? Take the case of the sail-boat disaster at Bangor—what 'special interposition' was manifested on that occasion? Was not this disaster plainly owing to fright? It is stated by the informant of the Mirror, that it occurred as follows:—

'Yesterday, about noon, six young men in a sail-boat, near Brewer Ferry, *were approached very suddenly by a sloop*, and they *in their fright* leaned on one side of the boat, which, *in consequence*, capsized.'

In consequence of their fright, they were capsized—a very natural consequence! And yet we conclude the editor of the Mirror and his correspondent gravely intimate, that it 'speaks emphatically the divine disapprobation of Sabbath desecration'!! Must lame and impotent conclusions—making a serious matter ridiculous, and insulting the common sense even of the ungodly!

Query—Two out of the six were drowned: did they deserve to perish more than the others—and wherefore? If it was the object of the Almighty to show his displeasure against the sabbath-breaker, would he not have taught a more impressive lesson by drowning four instead of two, or all six together?

These remarks are made, not to encourage men to do wrong at any time, but to controvert a pernicious and superstitious notion, and one that is very prevalent, that extraordinary and supernatural visitations of divine indignation upon certain transgressors, are to be looked for (almostly, and almost exclusively,) are poured out now as in the days of Moses and the prophets. Whatever claim the Sabbath may have to a strict religious observance, we are confident it cannot be strengthened, but must necessarily be weakened, by all such attempts to enforce or prove its sanctity.

Supposing the fourth commandment to be, not a Jewish provision merely, but obligatory upon all mankind, we are no where taught in the Bible that its violation is worse than that of the third, or fifth, or sixth, or seventh. But it is seldom pretended, even by the most credulous, that *special* judgments, 'speaking the divine disapprobation,' are visited upon the heads of those who commit adultery, or kill, or covet, or will not honor their father and mother. Such monopoly of punishment is given to the Sabbath, to insure its strict outward observance!

MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

At a special meeting of the Board of Directors of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, held August 3, 1836:

Resolved, That the recent tumultuous conduct of certain colored persons in the presence of the Supreme Judicial Court of this Commonwealth, on the occasion of the detention of two females, though no possible palliation as arising from ignorance and misapprehension in the persons concerned, has nevertheless occasioned the deep regret and meets the decided disapprobation of this Board, and of the friends of the anti-slavery cause in this vicinity.

Resolved, That this Board observe with grief and indignation, the attempts now made to identify the Abolitionists of this city with the late irregular proceedings, and repel the charge of being in any way concerned therein, as the basest calumny.

Resolved, That certain intimations now publicly given out, with the obvious intention of overawing a class of citizens, or preventing them by ridicule or menace from exercising their right to attend the courts of justice whenever they please, or from peaceably assembling to discuss any subject whatever, is an attack on Constitutional liberty, which should arrest the attention and call for the reprobation of all thinking men.

Resolved, That the several newspapers in the city of Boston, be requested to publish these resolutions.

C. C. BURLEIGH, Secretary.

[From the Boston Daily Times.]

RESCUE OF SLAVES.

A writ of habeas corpus was obtained on Saturday against Eldridge, of the brig Chickasaw, on behalf of two colored women, with the intention of sending them back to the South, from whence they had recently arrived as passengers. The officer who served the writ, proceeded to the Custom House, where he was at first refused, but on the officer's explaining the nature of his authority, he was admitted. On entering the cabin, the women appeared very much agitated and alarmed, but on the officer's proceeding to read the instituted for a friendly purpose, one of them a lively looking mulatto woman of about 30 years old, burst into an agony of grateful tears, saying that she had prayed God most fervently that she might not be sent back to the South. Both of the women brought free papers, Turner, the agent for their masters, on being shown the papers of one of them, pocketed it and refused to return it. They were then immediately before Judge Wilde, who, in consequence of a technical objection, did not proceed in the hearing, and the case was postponed till Monday at 9 o'clock. At the opening of the Court, this morning, Chief Justice Shaw took the Bench. J. H. Fiske, Esq. counsel for Capt Eldridge, read the Captain's answer, which stated that he had brought them as passengers in the brig, that before she arrived at the wharf, the owners sent him orders to have her anchored in the stream; that he had been applied to by Mather Turner, who acted as agent for the attorney, Colonel B. Morris, of Baltimore, who claimed the two women as his slaves, and that he has detained them at Turner's request, in order that Turner might get a warrant to carry them before one of the United States Judges. Mr. Fiske then read an affidavit of Turner in confirmation of this statement, and moved that the hearing might be postponed, in order to bring evidence from Baltimore, that they were slaves. The court was addressed by Mr. Fiske in support of his motion, and by Mr. Sewall in opposition to it. The Judge thought that under the circumstances, Capt. Eldridge had no right to detain them, as he did not bring himself within the provisions of the United States statute, and that the women must be discharged. The Judge concluded his opinion by saying, "the prisoners must therefore be discharged from all further detention," when Mr. Turner rose and intimated that he should make a fresh arrest of the women, and inquired of the Judge whether it would be necessary to have a warrant for that purpose. At the same moment a constable was sent to lock the door which led down stairs. This created instantly a tremendous excitement among the colored people, with whom the court was thronged. Under the mistaken impression that the words of the judge amounted to a discharge of the prisoners, and supposing that the claimant was about to make a fresh seizure on the spot, which might be intercepted, a general rush was made, prisoners and crowd together—down the stairs of the court distributed at the door of which the prisoners entered a carriage and were driven off, before any one could prevent it. The Judge stated that they must be brought back to be regularly discharged in open court. The counsel for the women expressed to the Judge his regret that any violation of the decorum of the court should have been committed. The colored people, however, acted on a mistake, and a delay of five minutes would have seen the prisoners at liberty, unless, indeed, they had been taken on a fresh process from some other court.

The newborn zeal in behalf of the dignity and sacredness of law, evinced by certain of our city papers in relating and commenting on the events above detailed, is truly admirable. One would judge from their loud denunciations of disorderly conduct and disrespect for the constituted authorities, that they had entirely forgotten the 4th of last October, and their own achievements in stirring up a 'property and standing' mob, to destroy an obnoxious sign, and disperse an assembly of peaceable females. It is highly gratifying surely, to see those who have in times past been so industrious in instigating riots, and apologizing for peace-breakers and lawless moderators, now manifesting such a warmth of attachment to the cause of the land, and we might perhaps be more at allowance for them, if in the first ardor of their new love they should exaggerate the injuries inflicted on its object. What though they do make the 'outrage' a great deal worse than it is! What though they do convert an instance of indecorum, unjustifiable but certainly not unpardonable, into a crime of fearful magnitude, worthy to be visited with all the thunder of editorial anathemas, and the severity of legal pains and penalties! Still we should be lenient in our judgment, remembering that they are but novices in the business of contending for the supremacy of the laws. But seriously, though the conduct of these presses on this occasion is grossly inconsistent with their behavior last fall in regard to the anti-abolition riots, they are yet, if we may so express it, consistent in their inconsistency. The same feeling toward the colored man and his action which then led them to utter a libel against them, now prompts this affectation of profound respect for the law and this pretended holy horror of disorder. The opportunity is seized, to embitter the prejudices against the poor colored people, by exaggerating their offence into a daring and intended contempt of judicial authority, and an atrocious disturbance of the peace. Now we see no evidence that they are guilty in such a high degree. Violence we do not justify, as our readers well know, and we believe that if violence was resorted to, we censure it. Resistance to the legal authorities we never hesitate to disapprove, but we see no evidence in the conduct of the accused, that they intended any disrespect to the court, or any transgression of the law. They probably supposed that the women were legally at liberty when the Judge pronounced their detention illegal, and said that they must therefore be discharged from all further detention,"—and they were very naturally in haste to remove them from the reach of the kidnapper, before on some pretext, he should again fasten his grasp upon them. Even the Transcript, which has discovered no peculiar partiality for the colored people, states that 'the Chief Justice considers the prisoners as *virtually discharged*.' There is certainly some palliation for the conduct of the colored people and their friends. By the way it may not be amiss to add here, that the rush was made, and the liberated prisoners were borne out by the colored *females* in attendance, and not by the colored men.

We hope while the 'enlightened' and 'intelligent' free and liberty loving white citizens of Boston, bestow upon these poor ignorant females all the censure their offence merits, they will be at least reasonably careful to bestow no more than it deserved. Those who can find abundant apologies for the man-stealer, who in his eager chase after his intended victims, prompted by motives utterly base and unworthy, overleaps the law and the constitution, and detains in confinement persons whom he has neither a moral nor a legal right to detain, should be very slow to condemn with severity the misconduct of those females, who at the worst, resulted from permitting a feeling in itself not only innocent, but highly commendable, a feeling of sympathy for their sisters in distress—a love of liberty for others as well as themselves, to run into excess and manifest itself in an indecorous manner.

* Some of the papers have asserted that the Judge had not concluded, but was in the midst of his remarks when the rush was made from the house, as if that were so, how happens it that these same friends of order, who are so jealous for the honor and dignity of the court, do not reprove Turner for his "rush" in breaking in with a declaration that he would have the women.

☞ Among all the doleful lamentations, and indignant exclamations of the new recruits in the ranks of law and order, over the sad 'outrage' of last Monday, we have as yet heard neither groan nor sigh, neither muttered execration nor fiery denunciation, on account of the glaring and palpable violation of the law committed by Capt. Eldridge, at the bidding of Turner, in imprisoning on board his vessel, two persons whom he had no more right to deprive of their liberty, then he had to confine the kidnapper himself. Where is the righteous indignation of our new made champions of law, at this outrage? and where are their unsparing censures of the man who assumed the responsibility of commencing it? And where is the overflowing of grief, or the outbreak of hot displeasure against the man who seized the free paper of one of the prisoners, and refused to give it up!—an act which we suppose he had just as much right to perform, as he would have had to seize a dead chicken, a pipe, or Sheriff Huggeford's pocket-book. But the law and the constitution authorize men to pursue and retake their fugitive slaves. True! very true! but do law and constitution say that men may imprison without legal process, whom they please, on suspicion of their being fugitives from slavery? Do they say that persons who have a right to be presumed free, shall be confined as slaves at the mere bidding of a man-stealer's hired agent? Do law and constitution require the sons of New-England sires to smile complacently, while kidnapping is perpetrated under the very eaves of Faneuil Hall? What says the constitution about the right of trial by jury? What about depriving men of liberty, without due process of law? And where is the section of the constitution, or the line of our statute books which denies to the slave the freely our heartfelt commiseration and abhorrence of the base wretches who will take advantage of an unrighteous law, (and who does not know that every law is unrighteous which regards human beings as property,) to track a poor fugitive from oppression, over land and sea, and for filthy lucre's sake, drag him back from almost won liberty, to the chains and the lash and the bitterness of slavery?

☞ Turner, the agent of the pretended owner of the two 'fugitives,' boasts that he is a warm friend of the Colonization Society—and wishes that the blacks were all free and colonized. Nobody, of course, will presume to doubt his sincerity, now that he has come all the way from Baltimore to carry back two poor women, who had succeeded in colonizing themselves far enough off, one would think, to have satisfied any reasonable man. Sheriff Huggeford too, who is so heartily engaged in hunting them up, is a Colonizationist, and an officer of the Boston Young Men's Colonization Society.

ANOTHER THUNDERBOLT AGAINST SLAVERY.

The Addison County (Vermont) Anti-Slavery Society held its anniversary at Middlebury on the 4th of July, on which occasion an Oration was delivered by Edward D. Barber, Esq. late editor of the Middlebury Free Press. It is a thrilling production, worthy of the day, the occasion, the theme, and the orator—worthy to be stereotyped, and scattered broadcast over the land. We shall make copious extracts hereafter. Mr. Barber has long espoused our cause, and inside the Free Press true to the name and profession. He is now a candidate for Congress, in opposition to Hon. Wm. Slade: whichever succeeds, the cause of human rights will suffer no detriment.

In this connexion, we would gratefully acknowledge the early, uniform and able advocacy of the anti-slavery cause by the Vermont State Journal at Montpelier.

[From the Transcript of Wednesday evening.]

MR. SHERIFF SUMNER'S STATEMENT.

We need not *invite* public attention, at the present time, to this document, which (independently of any opinion on the subject-matter of the argument) is of such sterling prominence in being state to furnish. As we suggested yesterday, it was due to the public, as well as to Mr. Sumner himself. All honorable persons will be ready to give at least a hearing to every man, popular or unpopular, and excitement or no excitement. Some light, it will be seen, is thrown upon the point, (and we feel confident that the Sheriff will stand prepared to give further explanation, as far as may be justly required. We shall get the whole truth by and by, and that is all we want. It is all the public want, too. It is all that Bostonians ever demanded.

To the Editor of the Evening Transcript:

The general blame has been cast upon the Sheriff, because he was not present in court at the late rescue of the two colored women, claimed to be slaves; and because he did not provide a strong force in anticipation of such an outrage. The opinions expressed by individuals, as they have been communicated to me, and the tone of the newspaper press, make it necessary for me to say something in regard to myself, lest my continued silence should be construed into an admission of the justice of the imputations which have been so freely cast upon me. Allow me, then, through your columns, to present a few plain and unvarnished statements of facts. I can hardly hope to turn aside public feeling, but, while I do not recoil from its blow, I ask to be heard in my defence—*Strike, but hear.*

On Saturday afternoon, a writ was served on me, by Chief Justice Shaw, in favor of two colored women, (alleged to be slaves) detained by Capt. Eldridge, on board the brig Chickasaw, then lying in Boston Harbor. That writ was directed to Mr. Jonathan Hagford, a deputy sheriff, and by him served. The writ of habeas corpus, according to the language of our law, is to be enjoyed in 'the most free, cheap, and ample manner,' and may be issued by a single judge of the Supreme Court, *out of term time*, in which case it is returnable before him. This course was resorted to in the unfortunate case that has just occurred. The writ was returnable to the single judge from whom it issued, and *not to the court*. On Saturday afternoon at half past 2 o'clock, Mr. Huggeford, for me to execute the writ, came to my house, on my arrival, I found him having the custody of the two colored women, and waiting till Mr. Justice Wilde could be sent for; the Chief Justice being, as was ascertained, absent from the city. Mr. Justice Wilde, on his arrival, a few minutes before 4 o'clock, read the writ, and, as it was signed by the Chief Justice, declined to take cognizance of it. Upon my inquiry if he would detain the women in custody, or committed, he distinctly replied, *that he would make no order in the case.* Under those circumstances, on my own responsibility, I conducted the women, from the Court House, to a distant hill Monday morning, a half-past 8 o'clock, when they were delivered to Mr. Huggeford, the deputy sheriff who served the writ, who still retained it in his possession. About 9 o'clock I went to the Municipal Court, which was my post of duty on that day, the regular term of that court, upon which I constantly attend, commencing at half-past 9 o'clock, and there I first learned, from Mr. Huggeford, and *offered to assume the responsibility of the service of the writ, if he declined it. This he did not.* The first intelligence I had of the occurrence, was from the assistant Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas, Mr. Cole; and I left the Municipal Court immediately upon hearing it, carrying with me the constables which I could procure, and the writs which were only two. On my arrival at the Supreme Court Room, the multitude had gone. I received no previous message from Mr. Huggeford, stating that there might be difficulty, and I did not anticipate that any would occur. I believed that the decision of the Chief Justice *under this writ*, would be none other than it was, viz: to liberate the colored women from Capt. Eldridge's detention; and I believed that their friends would be satisfied, and wait with patience for their formal discharge.

It will appear from the above statement, that the two colored females had never been committed to the custody of the Sheriff, but were still, both in point of fact and in the eye of the law, in charge of the officer who had arrested them; and that Chief Justice Shaw was not holding a term of the Court upon which it was the Sheriff's duty to attend. The proceedings on the writ of Habeas Corpus are extemporaneous and informal in their character, and it is not usual for the Sheriff, or any other officer than the one who served the writ, to attend in any case, or, indeed, at any other time specially required. The writ was in Mr. H's hands, and he was the proper officer to serve it.

To answer, then, stated distinctly the inquiries that have been cast upon me—I was not present in the late Chief Justice Shaw, because neither the Chief Justice nor any other officer called me there, and because my duty called me elsewhere. I did not provide a strong force in anticipation of the outrage, because no foresight of it was given me which an officer could act on, or be excused, and because the parties were not in my custody, but in the custody of an officer invested by law with all the powers over the matter, which are possessed by the Sheriff. It is a mistake, I suppose, that only the Sheriff is competent to raise a force to preserve the peace, or to apprehend a criminal. The powers of the Deputy by himself differ from those of the Sheriff, only in the source from which they are derived.

Another charge has been brought against me, which I can deem important, only because it has been repeated in the newspapers. It is, that I, Sheriff Mr. Sewall, counsel for the colored women, on coming into Court, that 'I wished him success in his cause!' Such was the connection in which the words, if uttered, would be understood. I said, this happened on Monday, the day of the outrage. *On that day I did not speak with Mr. Sewall.* On Saturday, however, I spoke with him. The language used by me on that occasion, is better remembered by the eye-witnesses, who have reported a private conversation, than by myself. Whether I addressed Mr. Sewall, as it is said, 'a brother of the bar,' I do not remember to myself. If I did not wish that every person claimed as a slave, might be *proved* to be a freeman; which is the purport of the words attributed to me. The language of the law, which I have enjoyed by the Clerk to prisoners charged with the highest crimes, is, 'God send you a good deliverance.'

The outrage, the blame of which has been so lavishly cast upon me, was one of those unexpected events which could not be foreseen, and which candid minds, I cannot but think, will regard without feelings of hardness or condemnation towards any one.—It is, however, no consolation for the public mind, when strongly excited, to fasten an unmerited stigma upon the innocent; and I cannot flatter myself that there is any thing in my character or standing to protect me, from the ill will and censure, which are accountable to the courts that I attend, for my error and my neglects. I have never had occasion to ask for their mercy. If any one is aggrieved by me, I hope he will make his complaint, and I believe he will not seek it in vain. The minister of the law upon others, I will never deprecate its severity upon myself.

C. P. Sumner.

☞ We are informed, on authority which we consider entitled to respect, that Chief Justice Shaw has expressed his approbation of the conduct of Mr. Sheriff Sumner during the recent disturbance concerning the colored people; that, further, he exonerates the Sheriff from all the censure cast upon him, from all blame; that he regards it as an outbreak which could not be reasonably anticipated; and moreover, that Mr. Justice Wilde is of the same opinion.

Again, we understand that the reports respecting an alleged conversation between the Chief Justice and the High Sheriff, to the effect that the law would look to the latter for the safe return of the prisoners, is incorrect,—no such, nor similar language, having been used.

We understand, also, that the Chief Justice considers the prisoners as *virtually discharged*—though, of course, it is not to be supposed that he, any more than any other person, to say the least, can look upon the general outrage committed by the black, differently from what it is regarded by the public.—We state all these things, because they may tend to bring out the truth of the case. We shall publish, with pleasure, whatever will effect this purpose, cut where it may. Nobody who has read this paper, will accuse us of being blasted with a partiality for the Sheriff, or for the Anti-Slavery Society, or to any other party concerned. We act as the editor of a newspaper, whose province it is to publish facts if we can get them, and to get them if we can.—*Transcript of Wednesday Evening.*

[From the New York Sun.]

KIDNAPPING IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

It is too bad to be told, much less to be endured. Last Saturday, 23d instant, about 12 o'clock, Mr. George Jones, a respectable free colored man, was arrested at 21 Broadway, by certain police officers, upon the pretext of his having 'committed assault and battery.' Mr. Jones, being conscious that no such charge could be sustained against him, refused to go with the officers. His employers, placing high confidence in his integrity, advised him to go and answer to the charge, promising that any assistance should be afforded to satisfy the end of justice. He proceeded with the officers, not unwilling to go with a gentleman who would have stood his bail—he was locked up in Bridewell—his friend was told that when he was wanted he could be sent for.' Between the hours of 1 and 2 o'clock, Mr. Jones was carried before the Hon. Richard Riker, Recorder of the city of New York. In the absence of his friends, and in the presence of several notorious kidnappers, who preferred and by oath sustained that he was a runaway slave, poor Jones, (having no one to utter a word in his behalf, but a boy, in his employ, who produced numerous friends who could have born testimony to his freedom,) was by the Recorder pronounced to be a slave!

In less than three hours after his arrest, he was bound in chains, dragged through the streets, like a beast to the slave pens! My depressed countrymen, or are we all liable; your wives and children are at the mercy of merciless kidnappers. We have no protection in law, because the legislators withhold justice. We must no longer depend on the interposition of Manumission or Anti-Slavery Societies, in the hope of peaceable and just protection; where such outrages are committed, peace and justice cannot dwell. While we are subject to be thus inhumanly practised upon, no man is safe; we must look to our own safety and protection from kidnappers; remembering that 'self-defence is the first law of nature.'

Let a meeting be called—let every man who has sympathy in his heart to feel—when bleeding humanity is thus stabbed afresh, attend the meeting; let a remedy be applied, and let our land be free from slavery. Whenever necessity requires, let that remedy be applied. Come what will, any thing is better than slavery.

Yours, &c. David Ruggles.

☞ CAUTION! ☜

TO THE COLORED PEOPLE.

Beware of kidnappers! Two villains from Boston visited Salem a few days since, and introduced themselves to some of the colored people there, as particular friends of Garrison & Knapp, and as being there at their request; and also desiring to see a certain person supposed to be a runaway slave.

We also understand that a certain Constable in this city, is very active in entering the dwellings of colored people, pretending to have search warrants, and ransacking their houses from cellar to garret, in search of fugitives from slavery. *Constables have no right to enter a house, without a special Warrant for that purpose from some Judge, granted for a special case.* Colored People, beware! put confidence only in such persons as you know to be your friends.

LITERARY.

[For the Liberator.]

'Cry aloud! Spare not! Lift up thy voice like a trumpet! Show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins.'

Preacher of righteousness—split thy voice
Even as a trumpet tone—to Israel show
Her deep transgressions, and her crimson sins
Spare not—for even the Church is stained with guilt,
Hugging abomination to her heart!
Justice hath fallen in the street—and truth
Is driven from the temples of our God—
Mercy grows faint with pleading long in vain—
Eternal Equity is scorned—contemned—
And the false priest—while grasping in his hand
The price of bartered souls—looks on and smiles!
Cry!—for the good man faileth—Call aloud!
If ye be dumb—the stones beneath your feet
Shall have a voice! Earth *cannot* be thus dumb—
Earth—which hath soaked the blood of innocence—
Earth—which hath hidden in her breast, the skins—
Shall call to heaven for vengeance!

Man of God!

Is this a time for folding of the hands?
A time for sleep—while darkly in the sky
Gather the judgments of an angry God?
Up! are they burst in wrath and overwhelm
The guilty people, and the guiltier priest!—
Up! ere the fiery ruin bustles down
Upon your country to consume and waste,
Until, where now is beauty, Death shall sit
Upon the smouldering ashes of your hopes,
Pointing his bony finger to a scene
Of woe and desolation and despair. H.

[For the Liberator.]

'Deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the Oppressor.' *Holy Writ.*

Woman, the work is thine—
Then go thou boldly forth,
Commissioned by a power divine
To free the groaning earth.

Uplift the drooping head—
Relieve the spirits smart—
And be the oil of comfort shed
Upon the fainting heart.

The buried hope revive—
The soul's immortal trust
Call back again to bloom and live
Upriseen from the dust.

Unveil the mental eye,
And bid the quickened ray
Scatter the thick obscurity,
That hides the heavenly day.

Stretch forth the helping hand
To all who suffer wrong—
Go forth—obey thy God's command,
And He shall make thee strong.

Strong in his power and might,
Relying on His word—
Strong—yes! omnipotent in right—
The ally of the Lord. H.

Millville, July 11th, 1836.

[For the Liberator.]

HYMN

FOR THE FOURTH OF JULY.

This is our freedom's natal day,
And on thy bloodless altar, Lord!
Our sacrifice of praise we lay
With solemn joy in one accord.

Not with the warlike pageants pomp,
Not with the sound of fife and drum,
Not with the blast of the mighty trump,
Into thy holy house we come.

No war-rent banner floats the sky
In pride above our gather'd ranks—
No red-mouthed cannon gives reply
In thunder to our solemn thanks.

The praises of our warrior sires—
The blood-bought honors of the dead,
We pour not from our tuneful lyres,
Jehovah! as thy courts we tread.

Thine are the honors which we pay,
As in thy temple-gates we stand—
Thine be the triumphs of the day—
And this, the Sabbath of our land.

We celebrate our Nations birth
Not with profane, unholy songs—
Not amid drunkenness and mirth,
But with hosannas on our tongues.

Blessing thy goodness for the past,
And trustful of thy favor still,
We hold each precious promise fast,
And humbly wait to know thy will. H.

[From the Transcript.]

ON THE DEATH OF CATALINA THORNE, BY DROWNING, AT TRENTON FALLS.

BY ISAAC C. PRAY, JR.

Never more on life's current shall rise,
Sweet Zerlina, thy form to impart
A presentment of one from the skies—
A bright angel to dwell in the heart.

Though thy form like a lily was cast
On the wave amid nature sublime,
Yet the season of life is but past
For thy bloom in eternity's prime.

On the bank of the torrent is seen
A rich record of beauty and gloom;
The wild rose tells that beauty has been,
And the wave that it went to its tomb.

O Zerlina—Zerlina! thy hour
Seemed but given to array for the grave:
Thy short life was like state of the flower,
And its close like the flow of a wave.

FAITH.

There is a flower, a holy one,
That blossoms on my path,
No seed of dew or daily sun,
Or falling showers it hath;
It blooms as brightly on the storm,
As on the cloudless day,
And roses withered its humble form,
When others fade away.

That plant is FAITH; its holy leaves
Reviving colors shed
Upon the lowly places of grief,
Or mansions of the dead.
God is its sun: his living light
In happy hours he lends,
And shining in sorrow's night
Religion's flower ascends.

Plant of my soul, be feeling things,
By other hands crush'd,
But though life's weary wanderings,
I'll bear thee in my breast;
And when the icy power shall chill
The tenantess of my breath;
Thy loveliness shall grace me still
Even in the hour of death.

SCOTLAND.

SECOND ANNUAL MEETING OF THE GLASGOW EMANCIPATION SOCIETY.

(CONCLUDED.)

The Rev. Dr. RITCHIE of Edinburgh rose to propose the next resolution. It relieved him, he find, he had said, that on this occasion he was not called on to speak a speech, nor yet to read one prepared by himself. What he had to read to them was a petition proposed to be sent to Parliament, and the Memorial addressed to Lord Melbourne. Having read these documents, Dr. Ritchie said he believed he might safely leave them to speak for themselves. They contained the sum, and even the details, of all he had to say. Nevertheless, he would address a few words to them, in the hope that, by so doing, he might forward the grand movement, for he could not help thinking, that even he, in his own place, might be useful in that cause which he had so deeply at heart—the cause of immediate and total abolition. (Cheers.) The contest was one, no doubt, of a formidable nature; but, when he considered that he spoke in Glasgow—the Geneva of the north,—when he saw before him their venerable Chairman whose hand was at every good work, and on his right their friend Mr. G. Thompson, who had not hesitated to go boldly into the lion's den.—(Cheers.) When he felt himself thus placed, how could he be afraid to speak? (Cheers.) What was the subject? He could not tell. It was called slavery; but he could not express the misery, the degradation, the consummate wretchedness, that was comprised within the meaning of that word. Could he suppose the fiends of Pandemonium assembled in council, in order to find out what was most fruitful in every crime, he would see these fiends coming forth as slaveholders. (Cheers.) He (Dr. R.) had, in early years, been convinced of the evils of slavery. His convictions had been deep dyed—they had been dyed in the wool. (Laughter.) When at the grammar school, his soul had been harrowed by the description given by Clarkson of that floating hell—a slave ship. His sleep had been harrassed by dreams of the misery of the slaves, pent up together, close as his fingers, and in apartments only two feet in height. Keenly as he had felt, however, he still knew that no one could properly estimate the miseries of slavery, but he who had been put one time himself a slave. He was a disgrace to the age, that at this time of day—in the nineteenth century—it was necessary to vindicate the rights of the slave. Had a seraph been told that in our world we had been lectured for 5000 years on the immense value of truth and honesty, and that for nearly 2000 we had been taught to do unto others as we would that they should do unto us—had a seraph been told of this, and then asked where he was likely to find an aristocracy of the skin or to hear of the right of the white man to hold his black brother in chains, he should certainly have thought any where but on this earth, for such a spectacle. Dr. R. spoke of the early advocates of negro freedom—of Granville Sharpe, of Clarkson, and of Wilberforce—but while he did this, he said he did not speak of these champions merely because they were old—he at all times liked a coin of yesterday's mint better than one of Julius Cæsar—he spoke of them because their labor of love had been great and successful; and they had been succeeded by those—by Fowell Buxton and George Thompson—(cheers) whose names would be known in household words, when those whose fame rested on the false glories of war would be totally forgotten. The Slave question had now assumed a new aspect. The friends of the negro had lately sent deputations to London to aid their cause. And why had they been so late in doing so? Because it had been formerly felt needless to petition a parliament of slave owners—a parliament bent only on enslaving ourselves. Scotmen were not the men to go on so thriveless an errand, to urge on such a parliament the rights of the negro. But now times were changed. We had effected our own emancipation, and we were resolved also to effect that of the negroes. He felt proud when he recollected his going with a simple plaintiff of 336, to wait upon Lord Althorp in Downing Street, to urge the policy of immediate emancipation. He told his Lordship that Scotland had taken up the subject on bible grounds, and he was answered by a Lillipu statesman at his Lordship's side, that he did not doubt of the Apprenticeship's leading to a satisfactory settlement. Yes, said I, continued the Rev. Doctor, it will no doubt lead to a satisfactory settlement—so will the crossing of your threshold land to Edinburgh; but the mischief is that it's a long way off. (Dr. Ritchie) considered the Apprenticeship as a system to be put an end to as speedily as possible. Liberty might be considered Elysium, slavery Tophet, and the Apprenticeship Purgatory. He could not even say as the Papist said—when jawed by a Protestant regarding Purgatory—that he might going far'er and far'er was—(laugh)—he thought that even to go the length of positive slavery, would scarcely be found worse than the Purgatory of the Apprenticeship. (Cheers.) He had heard a great deal said of the support given to the slave system by Baptist and Presbyterian Ministers; he would only say that the conduct of these men was most condemnable. It was worthy of remark, however, that Ministers of the Gospel had been called Angels, and that fallen Angels become Devils. Dr. R. then pointed out the situation in which the stipendiary magistrate was placed under the new system in the West Indian Colonies. On the one hand there came forward seeking justice the poor and degraded negro; on the other the wealthy planter approached upon his nag. The magistrate was invited into the house of the planter and there regaled with the best that the land afforded. After the feast he is called on to decide between the parties, and for the life of him, said Dr. R., he could not decide against his host. These magistrates had been also brought up in a bad school. They had served their apprenticeship in a standing army, and had been familiar from their youth with the infliction of the lash. He had heard within these few days, of an officer in the army who was so extremely humane as to superintend the infliction of the lash in person. (Cheers and laughter.) Nine out of ten of these stipendiary magistrates were in the interest of the planters. Ought this to continue? He would hand them over to the Scripture text for an answer—we be unto them who establish iniquity by law. For his part when he saw that those from whom the negroes had justly anticipated they would find protection, were in league with their oppressors, he was astonished at the patience with which they had borne their injuries. Some might say—some had said—that five years of apprenticeship was a mere trifle. Would any one consent like to suffer for five years all those miseries which experience had already proved to be identified with negro apprenticeship? The Americans endeavored to bamboozle us by saying that they get negro slavery from Britain; but he would ask them, did they hesitate to throw off the yoke of Britain when they found themselves likely to be subjected to a tax on their tea, and why not as well throw from them the disgrace of slavery? For his part, when he found a parchment law so contrary to the law of God, he would feel it to be his duty to tear it in pieces. At that day when the world would be in flames, and when the parchment itself would be crackling, the soul would stand naked before the throne of the Judge to answer for the deeds done in the body. Upon what a basis of property is the slave. He would ask to whom belonged the 800,000 negroes in the West Indies? Did they not belong to the people of Britain, who had paid for them no less a sum than £20,000,000? (Cheers.) And was it not intolerable that those who had freedom had been thus bought should still be subjected to the ignominy of the lash and the cattle chain? (Cheers.) There had also been a talk of being in advance of the spirit of the age. The people of Britain, he was aware, had always been in advance of the Government. (Cheers.) When £500,000,000 was to be borrowed, in order to carry on a war crusade against France, the Government was sure to take the lead; but in a moral crusade against iniquity the people were always to be found foremost. The people ought, therefore, to depend upon themselves. They should not look even only to Lord Melbourne. His Lordship might do much better than he had done, though he admitted that he had done wonderfully well. (Cheers.) There was another to whom they would naturally look as a leader—the great O—who had done more than any other man to advance the cause of human freedom. He could easily picture to himself that great O when a boy running about Derrynane Abbey, and conversing with the aged maid while she was working at the churn. She would doubtless explain to him the nature of the operation in which she was engaged—that without agitation she could not expect to produce butter, and he would thus be instructed in the art which he had since turned to so excellent account. He (Dr. R.) would urge upon the meeting to use the same means. He would call upon them to agitate in their respective circles in behalf of the negroes. He would address himself particularly to students, some of whom he was present, and bid them raise the minimum of Anti-Slavery agitation throughout the country.

Mr. J. M'CUNE SMITH, (colored,) of New-York, seconded the motion. The apprenticeship, he said, was wrong in principle, ruinous in practice, and dangerous as a precedent. It had been said that immediate emancipation was likely to be productive of the most pernicious results; but in refutation of this it was only necessary to turn to St. Domingo, to Columbia, and to Antigua, to prove the reverse. The apprenticeship was ruinous in practice, in as much as from the nature of the government, composed as they were wholly of slave-owners, no measure could be expected calculated to ameliorate the condition of the negro. But the dangerous precedent afforded by the apprenticeship was particularly to be regarded. The people of Britain had nobly led the way in the abolition of slavery, and other nations might be willing to follow the example; but they might be tempted by our adoption of the seven years' apprenticeship, to fold their arms and say, we shall wait to see what is the result of this experiment. Mr. S. then inculcated the propriety of calling for immediate emancipation. Let not, he said, the British Statute Book be stained with the assumption that man in any state is not fit for freedom. The horrors of the apprenticeship are more galling to the negro, than absolute slavery, as they are inflicted on them by the British people; and they are still further aggravated by the sound of the anthems heard from the neighbouring shores of Antigua, where the slave has been completely released from his bonds.

Mr. Geo. THOMPSON rose amidst universal cheering to move the next resolution. He said as there were yet several other resolutions to be moved, he would not take up a large portion of their time in reccommending one which recommended itself. A more potent instrumentality could not be employed in their cause than that cause in America, than the communication of a public declaration of the sentiments of the Christian people of this country. They were there on a firm footing; they were there on solid ground. They might assemble and express their opinions of what was correct and unjust, they might, they ought, as christians to interfere with the brethren on the other side of the Atlantic to tell them what were their opinions. This was their only interference; this was the height of their interference. They had sent their living agent, who, through the breadth of the land, had declared their sentiments, and now that he had returned they were adopting the next most powerful instrumentality to forward the cause, by sending abroad the written pronouncement in the result and demoralizing tendency of slavery. (Cheers.) Americans there were who might affect to sneer at the remonstrance of Britain and Ireland, but thousands and tens of thousands would feel strongly on the subject, and many of them in a proper feeling. Were there no other means than by writing? The newspapers went there. The 380 Abolition Societies would find out a way to make them circulate. Give them (continued Mr. T.) publicity to every syllable that you pen, to every word that you utter. Put your prayers, your wishes, your reasonings, into print; give them 'line upon line, precept upon precept,' and so will you awaken the best portion of the American community. (approbation.) He had now to advert to the clergy in America. He was happy to state that there were from twelve to fifteen hundred pledged to the cause, notwithstanding he had said so much on former occasions respecting the corruption of the church. It was true, that among the professors of religion in America, who were opposed to them, were the Ministers of the religion. Among the Presbyterians in Virginia, a great number of the ministers were not only slaveholders, but planters, and divided their duties between attending to the holy office of the ministry, and planting rice, coffee, and sugar. The highest dignities of the Methodist Connection, and the chief office bearers of the Episcopal Church, were connected with the slave trade. In South Carolina, the ministers upheld the determined, inveterate, unmitigated slavery of the South. The clergy preached what they called christianity, which sanctioned slavery. But the church was rising, and without even the aid of a State connection, would continue to rise, and the church would yet be the redemption of America. Public feeling would keep time with the voice of the sanctuary, and they would accompany each other in a final triumph. The question of slavery was to the present moment, exclusively religious, and so it would continue; but the politician would come in, and in his own place be an effective agent. In order to give a better idea of the progress of the cause in America, as he had said enough in support of the resolution, he would direct their attention to a display which was made in the State of New York, at a time when there was nothing but slaughter breathed out against the abolitionists. The efforts of the abolitionists were not however paralised. A convention was held and notwithstanding all the threatening, there were now 350 societies in the United States. The deputations to the Ministry and their myrmidon of Downing Street, had been adverted to; that circumstance occurred at the moment of highest excitement in favor of the question. Never was there such a parade of those gentlemen called black coats, seen going up Downing Street, and seldom was Lord Stanley in such juxta position. The excitement in New York was, however, of another kind. It was said if the meeting were held, it would be equal to a declaration of war, an attempt to bring about the dissolution of the Union. One thousand of the cream of the State of New York attended, however, and among them were 100 ministers of the gospel. Britain waited to second their efforts. Let the friends of liberty in Britain endorse these proceedings. Let their remonstrances against slavery come from all quarters, and wind their way through the United States of America, which one after another would join in the cause.

One word, continued Mr. T., with regard to prejudice against colour. If there was one thing more than another he delighted to hear, it was the address of a stranger who came among them, a brother who differed from them only in the colour of his skin, listened to with attention and admiration by the audience like the present. Not so was it in America. To show the state of feeling on the part of the whites towards the blacks, he would narrate an anecdote which he had learned after a lecture in Edinburgh, regarding this prejudice against colour. A lady who had been continued with an acquaintance of her own, a Virginia-eed Frenchman, now in Edinburgh, happened to ask him if he knew Mr. Thompson.—'Oh' said the Frenchman, 'that man Thompson—he be all humbug, humbug, humbug,' and in order to convince him of the reality of the charge of a Frenchman, who courted a lady the fifth removed by birth from a black family. The Frenchman said she was 'a beautiful, very beautiful lady,' but at a dinner party it being whispered that the beautiful lady was connected by birth with a black family, the company left the room, all but the French gentleman and the fine lady, and they were obliged to take dinner in a private apartment. The fine lady cried and wept, but the company went back to dinner again, after she had left the room. If I had not gone out too, continued the Frenchman, I would have lost all credit and respectability in society. Mr. Thompson then went on to mention the circumstance of a partition having been erected in Dr. Sprague's church in Albany, separating the blacks, many of whom had been members of the church for a long time under the ministration of Dr. Sprague's predecessor, from the whites of the same congregation. He also stated that the whites were not satisfied till a green curtain was put up to hide the negroes' faces, but that there was now not a colored man in the church. The learned lecturer said there was no need to guard against the evil, which professedly good men did. Where could a man look for equality of rights if it was not in the church? If a practice like this was not exposed, how could they justify the anathemas which they hurled against the system? Mr. T. went on to inveigh against the anomaly of the American constitution, holding equality of rights, freedom of conscience, and freedom of speech, and the Governor of Alabama sending to the Governor of New York for the delivery of a Mr. Williams, who was indicted for publishing in his newspaper a sentiment which had the effect that 'God commands, and nature cries aloud, against the sin of man holding property in man.' An advertisement, continued Mr. Thompson, appeared in an American paper in Charleston, offering a reward of fifty dollars, to any person who would bring to Liberty Hall, the servant of the proprietor, named Bill, who would be known by the marks of the whip on his back, and who having eloped without provocation, was said to be on the road to his wife and five children, sold to a neighboring planter, by the name of Liberty Hall.—(Laughter.) Another anecdote was told by Mr. Thompson, of a Mr. Wallace, who married in the South a lady who was governess in an institution. Sometime after the marriage, a person called on Mr. Wallace, and demanded his wife or 1,000 dollars, as she was his slave. The husband was indignant. He turned the individual out of doors, and communicated the circumstance to his wife, who, after hearing a description of the visitor, told her husband, that she was not only his slave but that he was her father. (Sensation.) As a further proof of the evils of slavery, Mr. Thompson stated as a fact that a father in Kentucky, where gambling is carried on to a great extent, had actually given, after he had lost all his money, his three children as a stake for the last game. He lost the game; the planter took the other daughter demanding the 'but she, after hearing an explanation of the matter from her husband, went into another apartment, and she and her three children were found there with their throats cut. (Oh, and shame.)—Mr. T. said, he had a right to speak freely, and intended to the recital of atrocities committed on the blacks, which were made a matter of jest to the whites. He had heard his own name branded with foul-mouthed malignity, when those who spoke of him did not know that he was present. He concluded by appealing upon the apprenticeship system, and by denouncing the stipendiary magistrates as leagued with the planters in the oppression of the negroes.

The Rev. Mr. THOMPSON, of the Methodist connection, seconded the resolution. He said, the most humbling consideration they had had before them that evening was that the professors and the ministers of religion were the main props of slavery in America. The immortal Locke had said that what was morally wrong could not be political right; and he would say that what was morally wrong could not be ecclesiastically right. Whether, therefore, the system was supported by Baptists, Presbyterians, or Methodists, it should ever meet with his unqualified reprobation.

The motion was carried unanimously.

The Rev. D. KIDSTON then proposed four resolutions of which he would shortly state the substance. The first contained a pledge that the Glasgow Emancipation Society would not give over their humble efforts, till freedom, the birthright of the species, was universal, and every vassal emancipated from the earth. The 2d contained an expression of their approbation, and, not only of their approbation, but of their admiration, of their honest and talented missionary, Mr. Geo. Thompson. The 3d was that they would do all in their power to influence public opinion in America on the subject, America presented the most monstrous anomaly in jurisprudence and in morals to be witnessed on the earth, and they would be wanting in their duty were they not to send remonstrance after remonstrance, till not a single manacled human foot was to be found on the American territory. The people of Britain were as responsible for the proper exercise of the influence they possessed, as for the money they had at their command; and they could not answer satisfactorily to their consciences, to the negro, to their country, or to God, were they to refrain from putting that influence forth for the abolition of slavery. The 4th resolution which he had to propose was one calling on their friend, Mr. Thompson, to vociferate in the ears of British christians the duty of making a long pull, a strong pull, and a pull altogether, till the secured system of slavery was altogether abolished.

Rev. D. KING seconded the resolutions without remark, and they were carried unanimously.

Mr. G. THOMPSON acknowledged the kind manner in which he had been alluded to in the resolutions just read. He felt himself unable, he said, to acknowledge their kindness as he ought. When contradicted he could occasionally reply, but when commended he could say nothing. He then read a list of names, which he would propose as the committee for the next year; and took occasion to mention the Rev. Mr. Paul, of Wilberforce Settlement, Upper Canada, as an Honorary member of the Committee, to eulogise that gentleman's Christian spirit, in enthusiastic terms.

The Committee was appointed amid acclamation.

The Rev. Dr. KIDSTON rose to move a vote of thanks to the Ladies' Auxiliary Society. In every good work, the Ladies had been found ready to take the lead, and in this case their Society had been greatly assisted by the energetic efforts of the Ladies' Auxiliary.

The motion was seconded by Mr. M'Laren, and carried amid great applause.

Thanks were then voted to the Rev. Dr. Heugh and the managers of the Chapel, and to the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw for his conduct in the Chair; after which the meeting broke up, about 1-2 past 11.

GLASGOW EMANCIPATION SOCIETY.

GLASGOW, 1st March, 1836.

This Evening, at 7 o'clock, agreeably to advertisement, the Second Annual Meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society was held in Dr. Heugh's Chapel.

In the absence of the venerable President of the Society, Robert Grahame, Esq. of Whitehill, Dr. Wardlaw, one of the Vice Presidents, was, on the motion of James Beith, Esq. called to the Chair. The Chairman, after introducing the business, called upon Mr. William Smeal, Jr., one of the Secretaries, to read an abridgement of the Annual Report. It was then

Moved by George Thompson, Esq. and seconded by the Rev. Robert Thompson, Wesleyan Methodist Minister:—

'That this meeting, in the conviction that the only means that can now be employed, by the friends of emancipation in this country, for promoting the abolition of Slavery in the United States of America, is by the Christian public remonstrating with their Christian brethren in America, on their *sin and guilt in the sight of God, as well as scandal to their profession as Christians,* and in keeping their *colored* fellow men in bondage—therefore

Resolved, That an address to the friends of slave emancipation, and to ministers of religion, especially, on the importance and duty of so remonstrating, be drawn up by the Committee of this Society, and printed and circulated as speedily as possible.'

Moved by the Rev. Dr. Heugh, and seconded by the Rev. David King, both of the United Secession Church:—

'1. That this Society, convinced of the many and enormous evils connected with this Slavery, affecting the temporal and spiritual interests, both of the enslaved, and of those who hold them in bondage, and the essential contrariety of the system to the dictates of benevolence and justice, as well as to the spirit and letter of the religion of Jesus Christ, renew their pledge to persevere in their exertions, in union with kindred Societies in Britain and in other lands, with a view to effect the abolition of Slavery and the Slave Trade, universally and forever.

2. That the Society, in compliance with the invitation of many philanthropists in America, and in connection with other Societies in this country, having deputed Mr. George Thompson as their Agent to the United States, to co-operate with the friends of the Abolition of Slavery there, in their efforts to awaken their countrymen to a sense of their duty towards more than two millions of their brethren held by them in cruel bondage, express their cordial approval, and high admiration of the power, intrepidity, and devotion, with which, in the face of formidable opposition, unexampled abuse, and great personal hazard, Mr. Thompson was enabled, by the grace of God to pursue, and in a good measure to accomplish the great object of his very arduous mission.

3. That this Society express the delight with which they have contemplated the zeal, self-denial, energy, and liberality which so many individuals and Societies, male and female, in America, have displayed in favor of the abolition of Slavery—cordially congratulate these American brethren on the auspicious prospects of success which a gracious Providence is now opening, tending to cheer and revive their exertions—and pledge themselves to employ the best means in their power to encourage these devoted friends in their great and hopeful struggle in this cause of enlightened humanity.

4. That, aware of the favorable effects which, under the blessing of God, may be produced in America, by the transmission, faithfully and affectionately, of the sentiments entertained by Christians in this country, respecting the evils of American Slavery, and their prejudice against color by which Slavery is so greatly strengthened there; and knowing the eminent fitness of Mr. Thompson, from his knowledge, experience, and proved ability and zeal, to rouse British Christians to the discharge of this duty which they owe to their American brethren, this Society feel it to be a sacred duty to request a continuance of Mr. Thompson's invaluable labors, by visiting the chief towns of British and Ireland, and delivering addresses on those topics, of such momentous interest to both countries.'

George Thompson, Esq. having spoken in reply, proposed, and it was carried by acclamation:

That the following gentlemen be the Office Bearers, and Committee of Management, for next year:—

PRESIDENT.

Robert Grahame, Esq., of Whitehill.

VICE PRESIDENTS.

Rev. Dr. Wardlaw,
Dr. Heugh,
Dr. Kidston,
Anthony Wigham, Esq., Aberdeen.
James Beith, Esq.

SECRETARIES.

Messrs. John Murray, and William Smeal, Jr.

COMMITTEE.

Rev. Wm. Anderson,	Messrs. Thos. Grahame,
Wm. Auld,	James Johnston,
Wm. Bowie,	Robert Kettle,
Patrick Brewster,	Henry Langlands,
Paisley,	Patrick Lethem,
John Duncan,	Colin Macdougall,
John Edwards,	Donald Macfarlane,
Geo. Gill Young,	Jno. Maxwell, M.D.
Alex. Harvey,	Ninian M'Gilp,
David King,	Anthony M'Kean,
William Lindsay,	John M'Leod,
James M'Tear,	John M'Leod, Ar-
James Paterson,	gyle Street,
Thomas Pullar,	Wm. P. Paton,
Robt. Thompson,	John Reid,
Michael Willis,	Robt. Sanderson,
Messrs. D. Anderson,	J. M'Cune Smith,
Hugh Brown, Jr.	David Smith,
Wm. Brown,	James Stewart,
Robt. Connel,	Patrick Thompson,
Wm. Craig,	George Thomson,
G. C. Dick,	Archd. Watson,
Wm. Ferguson,	George Watson,
John Fleming,	James Watson,
Archd. Fullarton,	Andrew Young.
George Gallie,	

HONORARY AND CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

George Thompson, Esq.
Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Boston, N. E.
Arthur Tappan, Esq., New York,
M. Victor de Tracy, } Paris,
Gerrit Wendell Lafayette, }
Rev. Thomas Roberts, Bristol,
Daniel O'Connell, Esq. M. P.
Joseph Sturge, Esq., Birmingham,
Rev. Nathaniel Paul, Wilberforce Settlement, Upper Canada.

Moved by the Rev. Dr. Kidston, and seconded by David M'Laren, Esq.:—

'That the cordial thanks of this meeting are due to the Committee of the 'Ladies Auxiliary' to the Glasgow Emancipation Society, for their unremitting and zealous exertions in aid of its funds.'

Moved by Patrick Lethem, Esq., and carried by acclamation:

'That the thanks of the meeting be given to Dr. Heugh and the Managers, for the use of their Chapel.'

Moved by the Rev. James M'Tear, and carried also by acclamation:

'That the thanks of this meeting be given to Dr. Wardlaw, for his conduct in the Chair.'

RALPH WARDLAW, Chairman.