THE LIBERATOR:
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY,
AT THE ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE, No. 25 CORNHILL.
Henry W. Williams, General Agent:
☞ To whom all remittances are to be made, and all letters addressed, relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper.
☞ TERMS.—$2 50 per annum, payable in advance; or $3 00 at the expiration of six months.
☞ Five copies will be sent to one address for ten dollars, if payment be forwarded in advance.
☞ Letters and communications must be POST PAID.
☞ ADVERTISEMENTS making less than a square will be inserted three times for 75 cts.: one square for $1 00.
Financial Committee.
FRANCIS JACKSON, ELLIS GRAY LORING, EDMUND QUINCY, SAMUEL PHILBRICK, WILLIAM BASSETT.

THE LIBERATOR

AGENTS.
MAINE.—A. Soule, Bath; W. A. Dunn, Hallowell; D. S. Grandin, Brunswick.
NEW-HAMPSHIRE.—N. P. Rogers, Concord;—William Wilbur, Dover;—Leonard Chase, Milford.
VERMONT.—John Bement, Woodstock;—Rowland T. Robinson, North Ferrisburg.
MASSACHUSETTS.—Moses Emery, West Newbury; Jno. L. Lord, Newburyport;—Luther Boutell, Groton; W. S. Wilder, Fitchburg;—J. T. Everett, Princeton; J. Church, Springfield;—John Levy, Lowell;—Josiah V. Marshall, Dorchester and vicinity;—Richard C. French, Fall River; Isaac Austin, Nantucket;—Elias Richards, Weymouth;—B. P. Rice, Worcester;—W. C. Stone, Watertown;—A. Bearse, Centreville;—Israel Perkins, Lynn;—B. Freeman, Brewster; Joseph L. Noyes, Georgetown;—John Clement, Townsend; George W. Benson, Northampton; Alvan Ward, Ashburnham.
RHODE-ISLAND.—Amarancy Paine, Providence;—Wm. Adams, Pawtucket;—Geo. S. Gould, Warwick.
[☞ For a continuation of this list, see the last page, last column.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, Editor.
OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD—OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND.
JAS. BROWN YERRINTON, Printer.

VOL. XIV.---NO. 46. BOSTON, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1844. WHOLE NO. 723.

REFUGE OF OPPRESSION.

From the Christian Herald.

A Call for the Organization of an American Church Anti-Slavery Society.

With me, next to the salvation of my fellow-men, is the emancipation of the suffering slave. But what shall I do? I cannot identify myself with a class of men who seem to be waging war against the Church and all civil governments, rather than slavery. Look at the preambles and resolutions published in the National A. S. Standard, May 16th and 23d, 1844. Is it possible that these men are sincere, and that they mean the abolition of slavery, and *nothing else*? I doubt their sincerity.

When a class of men assemble in a professedly abolition meeting, and spend three-quarters or seven-eighths of their time in magnifying all the evils they can find in the history of the Church, in proclaiming the ministry a brotherhood of thieves, adulterers, and murderers; in holding up magistrates as scoundrels and knaves; in setting forth all civil legislation as tending only to degradation and bondage; (and all this is done, year after year,) who will believe that they mean the abolition of slavery, and *nothing else*? We are told that the civil government in this country, more than any other, in legalizing human rights, is the chief agent of hell. Still, we must do all we can to reform the government. We may, indeed, abolish all human laws, but we must not put down any evil by law. We must not vote for even good men, because that will be acknowledging the supremacy of human laws. Notwithstanding the apostle's high injunction to honor and pray for kings, and to obey magistrates, we are told that we must not, in any way, countenance kings or magistrates, or human laws.

We must come out—we must introduce a new state of things. And to accomplish this, we must make our appeal to man's noble nature, and the great law of love. We must abolish all combinations of men, under whatever name they may exist, civil and religious, and then man will be free—then we shall have LIBERTY—then man will every where acknowledge the inalienable rights of his fellow-man.

This is a beautiful bubble blown into the air, to be done only until it is touched!

Their unceasing hostility to the Church and to civil governments, will never put down slavery. Many worthy citizens have been kept back from uniting with them by their opposition to these institutions. Wherever slavery has been put down, it has been put down by *law*; and if ever it is put down in America, it must be put down by *law*. In this article, however, I only intend to move for the organization of an AMERICAN CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY. I wish to see the irresistible power of Church and legislative action brought to bear upon the hideous monster, who, gnashing his bloody teeth, growls defiance to all moral suasion. Has not the time now come to bring this mighty power up, and to silence forever the monster who has hitherto only been alternately pleased and fretted?

I rejoice that so many of the northern churches are taking high and holy ground. The Church in New-England is nobly separating herself from slavery. Let all her worthy members who believe in legislative action, with every man whose heart beats true to the civil and religious institutions of our country, come up and unite their strength to the cause of equal rights.

Who will respond to the call for the organization of the AMERICAN CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY?

R. B. E.

From the Boston Morning Chronicle.

Liberty Meeting in New-Bedford.

At a meeting of the Liberty party voters of this town, held on Wednesday evening, Oct. 30, 1844, William R. Pitman was called to the chair, and Elihu Grant appointed Secretary. The following preamble and resolutions, after being fully discussed, were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, a Liberty party Convention, held in this town on the 23d instant, was disturbed, and an attempt made to break it up, aided by Frederick Douglass and Charles L. Remond, the advocates of disunion, who promulgate the doctrine that all human governments are of the devil, that all voting under the Constitution is a sin, and that the churches of the land are the synagogues of Satan; and whereas, these men called a meeting on the 24th instant, especially for the gratification of pro-slavery Whigs, to denounce those tried and faithful friends of the slave, Messrs. Birney, Leavitt, Bradburn and Stanton, by grossly and wilfully misrepresenting their views, and vilifying their characters; therefore,

Resolved, That we have full confidence in the ability and integrity of the gentlemen above named, and cannot be divided, disheartened, or deterred from doing our duty, by the slander of Whigs, or the malignant attacks of the no-government faction; and so long as a slave remains to be liberated, so long as we have a principle of our own to support, and so long as we are favored with sufficient strength, we will rally in support of that principle.

Resolved, That we view the motives of these men as mean, intriguing deceivers, in the same light as other calumniators, because their fawning sentiments were propagated for the express purpose of supporting and encouraging pro-slavery Whigs and their abettors, and consoling the milk-and-water abolitionist conscience in voting for Henry Clay.

Resolved, That we fully believe such was the case, from the fact that they received compensation for their advocacy of whig principles and measures, by a liberal collection from them, and on any other occasion, would treat them with supreme contempt.

Resolved, That we consider the efforts of such men too palpable to delude us, too outrageous to injure us, and too contemptible to merit any other consideration from us than that of pity.

Resolved, That we thus speak of the Whigs in distinction from the Democrats, not because we have any sympathies with the latter more than the former, but because the Whigs alone are concerned in the transaction above referred to.

Resolved, That we cordially approve, and heartily respond to the nomination of Gilbert Richmond as elector for No. 10, and will use our influence to increase the votes for our worthy townsman.

Voted, That the proceedings of this meeting be published in the Chronicle and Emancipator, the Beacon of Liberty, and all other Liberty papers in the State.

WILLIAM R. PITMAN, *Chairman*.
ELIHU GRANT, *Secretary*.

A Monstrous Roorback.

There is a pro-slavery Whig print published in New-York city, under the name of Anti-Slavery Standard. Not only does this mendacious concern (whose very title is a lie) endorse the infamous attacks of the Whigs upon Mr. Birney, but a writer in its columns has the impudence to assert that Mr. Morris, our candidate for the Vice-Presidency, believes that the colored people should be debarred from the exercise of the elective franchise! The name of this member of the Roorback family is James S. Gibbons, who is using the columns of the Standard in electioneering for Henry Clay, the great champion of slavery and the slave trade!—yet he affects horror at the idea that Liberty men can vote for one who is opposed to the extension of the right of suffrage. We shall be cautious about relying upon the testimony of such men, who have evidently pre-determined to lie down the Liberty party for the purpose of securing the election of a man, who has done more to extend and perpetuate slavery in this nation than any other man in it. We last week cautioned our friends to be on their guard against the falsehoods of the pro-slavery press. The ridiculous assertion alluded to above, is evidence that our warning was not uncalled for. Again we say—be on your guard. Believe nothing to the disparagement of our candidates, evidently gotten up for effect just on the eve of election.—*Hartford Christian (!) Freeman.*

James G. Birney.

Read the testimony of Judge Marshall, of Kentucky, a slaveholder and a Whig, to the character of the Liberty candidate for the Presidency. 'A man of more pure morality, more honest principles, and a warmer heart, does not exist,' is the language applied by this slaveholder to James G. Birney. It ought to call the blush of shame upon the cheek of such creatures as Quincy and Child, and other Whig maligners of this great and good man. But having thrown away conscience, they can hardly be expected to know shame.—*Hartford Freeman.*

☞ The Whigs will be laid under a lasting debt of gratitude to the Liberator and National Anti-Slavery Standard for services rendered for the campaign. No papers have labored harder to injure the Liberty party and to defame the character of Birney than they have done—while their Child, Gibbons, &c., have used the organ of the Society to electioneer for Clay the slaveholder. If Old Organization has not muddied itself in the 'dirty waters of politics' during the present contest, it is because it had before acquired a character that could not be blackened.—*Utica Liberty Press.*

The Greenfield Gazette has a wonderful sympathy for the Garrisonians that forcibly seized upon the old Anti-Slavery Society, and fraudulently perverted it from its original character and purposes. Let them carry their saddlebags, Clay on one side, and Garrison on the other—the one perverting government to the support of slavery, and the other destroying it!—*Emancipator.*

SELECTIONS.

From the National A. S. Standard.

More Marvels Yet.

In a preceding article, I have mentioned a few of the marvellous events, beyond all human belief, which have waited upon the candidate of the Third Party for the Presidency. But he is not the only leader of that party who has strange tales to tell of things, such as never befel mortal man before. Mr. Leavitt promised, some weeks ago, a fresh account of the magical process by which he finds himself the fortunate possessor of a piece of property belonging to the American Anti-Slavery Society, without purchase, without its consent—in short, of HOW HE GOT THE EMANCIPATOR. This he has not done. But as I do not think it possible that he can do it better than he has already done, I wish to make a remark or two on the pretence of poverty, under which it was done. It will be remembered that the old Executive Committee sold the Emancipator, the organ of the Society, and which had cost it more than twenty thousand dollars, *for nothing*, to a society of young men in New-York, themselves under another name, *because* they could not raise a sum less than THREE HUNDRED DOLLARS to pay its expenses for *three weeks*, until the annual meeting of the Society, when they would provide for it themselves, although they had, at that very time, assets at their disposal, amounting to ELEVEN THOUSAND, THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS, EIGHTY-SIX CENTS! This fact Mr. L. does not attempt to deny, but he says that on this amount of assets, most of it plates, publications, THEY COULD NOT RAISE ONE DOLLAR!! Here's a statement that might well astonish Ferdinand Mendez Pinto himself. On property costing SOME EIGHTEEN THOUSAND DOLLARS, not ONE DOLLAR, not to say THREE HUNDRED, could be raised!

'*Credat Judæus Apella, non ego!*' Which may be freely rendered into the vernacular, 'he may tell that to the marines!' Why, the very trunk-maker and pastry-cook would have advanced them more than three hundred dollars upon them. This was an astonishing circumstance, but nothing to what followed. At the very time when they could not raise enough to pay the expenses of the paper for *three weeks*, with assets amounting to more than eighteen thousand dollars, they found a society of young men willing to undertake it *for a year*, for NOTHING! Could not these ingenious youth have persuaded their fathers in the Anti-Slavery Israel with THREE HUNDRED DOLLARS, *for three weeks*, secured by assets amounting to EIGHTEEN THOUSAND DOLLARS, that the integrity of the Society's property might be preserved, when they were willing to assume the whole expense for A YEAR, *without any security at all*? Would they not have done it, had the design not been to strip the American Society of its property? Ten thousand dollars could have been raised in a week, in Massachusetts alone, to prevent the sacrifice of the Society's property, had the facts been truly stated, and could the money have been disbursed by persons whom the donors could trust. Of course, they could not trust that Committee with a farthing. And this the Committee knew perfectly well. So much for the pretended poverty.

Another reason, rather intimated than implied, was, that the 'Emancipator and the other property of the Society, was bought with money given by Mr. Arthur Tappan, and that, therefore, he and his Committee had a right to do what he pleased with it. Were the fact, as here implied, the last proposition does not seem to flow necessarily from the first. As was said on another occasion, if the premises had the small-pox, the conclusion would be in no danger of catching it. When the money left Mr. Tappan's pocket, and came into the treasury, it became the property of the Society, on any ordinary principles of business. But in 1836, the impression which had got abroad, to this very effect, was publicly corrected in one of the publications of the Board, by a reference to its receipts, which showed that out of a sum received in about six months, of about *eighteen thousand five hundred dollars*, Mr. Tappan's contributions amounted to but *seventeen hundred and fifty*. This was a truly honorable munificence, but it covered a very small part of the receipts of the Society for that time. That was the period of Mr. Tappan's greatest liberality. Soon afterwards, in consequence of commercial embarrassments, he was obliged to discontinue his contributions, and gave little or nothing for the three or four years previous to 1840. The treasury was filled by the donations of thousands and tens of thousands of persons, and of means of every variety of amount. So much for that argument.

But the great and astounding reason given for the doings of the committee by Mr. Leavitt, by virtue of which he finds himself in the comfortable possession of the organ of the American Society, remains yet to be told. It cannot be told too often. Though it was originally veiled in the modest obscurity of a *note*, it will stand out in letters of light. It is as follows:

☞ 'IN SELLING THE EMANCIPATOR, AND IN TRANSFERRING THE OTHER PROPERTY OF THE SOCIETY, THE COMMITTEE ACTED, NOT AS TRUSTEES, BUT AS OWNERS'!

Mr. Leavitt, if he be wise, will not attempt to amend that statement. 'The force of nature can no farther go.' It would be like gilding refined gold, and painting the lily, to try to improve upon it. 'I advise you to rest your fame upon that, sir,' as Dr. Johnson said to Boswell, when he had made a very indifferent jest. The originality of the conception can only be equalled by the felicity of the expression. Many of the financiers who have adorned this age and country, have used the property of their constituents as their own; none before, I believe, have ever had the magnanimity to claim it as their right. This discovery of this principle, if it be duly applied, will work as great a revolution in the business of life, as the discovery of the circulation of the blood did in medicine. It is the crowning glory of our time. It may well rank among the wonders of the world. The knowledge of it was cheaply purchased by the loss of our organ and of all our possessions.—Q.

From the Northampton Gazette.

Mr. Child's Reply to Joshua Leavitt.

MR. HAWLEY:

Dear Sir—The Editor of the Emancipator has published, what he intends shall pass for an answer to my letter on 'the origin and character of the Liberty party.' All that merits much notice is that which is not in this answer. There is a most masterly silence maintained in this document. Let us see how much.

Mr. Leavitt does not deny that the Executive Committee were sectarian in their administration of the affairs of the American Anti-Slavery Society; and that with sectarian feelings, and instruments, and for political purposes, they first attempted to drive women and non-resistants from the Society, and that failing in this, they seceded from the Society. That they formed new societies on anti-woman and anti-non-resistant principles. The charge of sectarianism is admitted by a strong implication. For example, he calls that secession 'the separation of the great body of the friends of religion and law from Garrisonism.' He speaks of those who formed the Massachusetts Abolition Society as 'believing in, respecting and supporting the institutions of religion, and civil society, churches, ministers, laws, ordinances and republican government,' 'the friends of social order and religious influences,' and as 'the great body of the orthodox creed, who were abolitionists.' These are valuable admissions. What right had the officers and members of the anti-slavery society to act, *within the association*, upon such principles?— Was it not directly calculated to alienate and drive off friends of the slave, when the cordial co-operation of all the friends was imperiously demanded by his interests? In the same spirit, Mr. Leavitt points with an air of triumph to some of the principal members of 'the old organization,' 'the leaders (as he says) of non-resistance,' as proof conclusive of the wisdom of either getting rid of them, or seceding from them!

Mr. Leavitt says that Garrison meant to make the anti-slavery movement subservient to his own aggrandizement. 'Set a *thief* to catch a thief.' Why did he not tell us of this at the time? He was charged, and paid $1800 a year to watch and walk a warder on the wall, and he ought to have sounded the alarm. This is a sorry subterfuge.

Mr. Leavitt does not deny that the 'woman's rights' and non-resistant abolitionists rigidly abstained from introducing their views on those subjects into anti-slavery meetings:

That he and Birney, and the sectarian and political abolitionists, their associates, attempted to impose as a test, Birney's interpretation of the constitution in respect to political action:

That he got the Emancipator as a gratuity:

That he received his salary to the amount of $75, from the funds of the Society, after he had ceased to be in their service, and had carried off their paper:

That Birney and Stanton departed for Europe at the expense and on the day before the meeting of the Society, and without its legitimate authority:

That they misrepresented the Society in the London Convention, and voted for the exclusion of our legitimate representatives:

That he would have restored the Emancipator to the Society, if they would have consented to receive him with it as its editor; and that the offer was declined:

That he has always refused to publish any statement made by the Society, of the manner in which their newspaper was transferred:

That the committee of the Society was denied the privilege of access to the list of subscribers, knowing their object to be to lay before said subscribers an account of the transaction, and to invite them to choose betwixt the Emancipator, and a new paper, which the Society immediately established in its place:

That the account books were carried off, access to them denied, and the sub-treasurer's account not audited:

That the said sub-treasurer offered *to take the trouble* of furnishing information and extracts from the books on any particular subject:

That $20,000 was charged in said sub-treasurer's account for 'Secretaries, (Birney, Leavitt and Stanton,) and agent' or agents, who were in the field or 'prepared to enter it *for six months*;' and that only $22,000 was charged under the corresponding head (supposing agent to mean agents), in previous years, when we had from 40 to 70 agents in the field *all the year round*:

That the Emancipator and the Massachusetts Abolitionist were united, and then published for some time by the Massachusetts Abolition Society:

That Mr. Birney received from the American Anti-Slavery Society $7640 in about three years as salary, and a large amount for travelling expenses, besides his outfit to Europe to represent the *Society*, when he well knew that his commission, had he delayed his embarkation a day, would have been recalled:

That he is now in possession of property to the amount of $20,000:

That all the slaves he has ever emancipated, were worth but $8480:

That Mr. Leavitt's assertion in the Emancipator, that Mr. Birney 'has never been able to reach Charles,' is incorrect:

That *Mr. Marshall's* assertion in the Emancipator, that Mr. Birney never bought or sold Charles, but 'borrowed and returned him,' is incorrect:

That Mr. Leavitt objected to the nomination of John Quincy Adams, as the Whig candidate for President.

Thus much for what is not in his answer, and now for some things that are in it.

Mr. Leavitt asserts that the property of the Society, taken and removed to their own offices by him, Mr. Birney and their colleagues of the Executive Committee, was not of the value of $5000, and if the sale had been pressed, would not have brought $1000, instead of being $11,000 as I stated. At the meeting of the Executive Committee, at which they voted to give Mr. Leavitt the Emancipator, under pretence of inability to provide for carrying it on, the following entry was made by him in the records as Recording Secretary.

Tuesday, March 26, 1844.

The publishing agent reported the amount of stock on hand, debts due to the Society, &c.	$18,350,86
Amount owing by the Society,	6,590,74
Balance in its favor,	$11,760,12

The whole $18,350,86 was carried away by the Committee, so the case is worse than I stated. I do not pretend to say what the proceeds of the sales have been. The Society has not been informed. But I do say that if the Society had been consulted at their meeting, six weeks subsequent to the above date, they would not have parted with the property, (consisting of anti-slavery works, stereotype plates, &c.,) for any consideration. It was the capture of the property, not the subsequent sacrifice of it, that the Society complained of. They found themselves, at their meeting, without an office, without publications, without anything. Mr. Leavitt calls my statement of $11,000 as the value of the property, 'a gross libel.' The public will judge.

Mr. Leavitt says he was in favor of maintaining the rights of women to their full privileges as members, yet he immediately became a member and officer of the American and Foreign (the rival) Anti-Slavery Society, where women were disqualified from acting, though not from joining. The truth was, I believe, that Mr. Leavitt meant to continue to be the editor of the Emancipator.

'I'll be the *vicar* of Bray, Sir.'

Mr. Elizur Wright, Jr., (also, says Mr. L., in favor of the women,) soon joined the Massachusetts Abolition Society, and became their editor. This Society was based upon the anti-woman principle, and upon Birney's principle of political action.

Mr. L. does not answer the argument against the latter principle, but still assumes that all the members of the Society were pledged to do every *thing* that is '*lawful*,' and therefore 'to VOTE.' The capitals are his. I think he ought to show my reasoning false, or abandon the principle. But this is too much to expect, inasmuch as it was the seminal principle of the Liberty or Birney party.

Mr. Leavitt says that my statement of Mr. Birney's nomination as a Loco, with pledges 'to support democratic men and measures,' and 'to refrain from discussing abolitionism,' 'is basely, cruelly false.' It was taken from the affidavit of W. S. DRIGGS, Esq., whose character is vouched for by the Whig Central Committee of Michigan, as perfectly unimpeachable. I know the gentleman at the head of the Committee, and believe him utterly incapable of knowingly participating in a fraud. Mr. Leavitt must have known where I got the facts, and might have spared his epithets. If I have stated any thing, either borrowed or original, that is false, he will find me as ready to correct it, as he is to accuse me and Mr. Williston of 'libels,' 'distortions,' 'evil surmisings,' 'base innuendoes,' and 'positive violations of truth.' There is but one error that I am able to discover in my letter. It is, that the Society 'limited the expenditure of the Executive Committee to $32,000.' Mr. L. pronounces this '*pure fiction*.' Not so bad as that. I thought it was true, but on referring to the record of the meeting, made by Mr. L. as Recording Secretary, I find that a resolution to that effect was proposed, but not passed. Mr. *Edmund Quincy* has lately stated in the Anti-Slavery Standard, that the Society would have passed it, except for the reclamations of the Executive Committee, and that though not passed, it was the true expression of their will. This I think is the substance of his statement, though I have not his words before me.

As to the 'P. S.' of my letter, giving an account of a meeting addressed by Mr. Birney at Albany, I intended to give the substance of what I had read in two or three newspapers. Mr. L. says the meeting was not a Loco, and Mr. Birney did not admit that he was a Loco candidate. I had read that the Locos gave him 'three cheers' when he closed, and I had not read that the whigs passed resolutions. I cheerfully make the correction, without recurring to the newspapers. Mr. L. says the Albany seceders from his party never belonged to it, except 'three or four,' and 'they left it long ago,' and that Birney did not laud J. K. Polk. On both points I must be permitted to differ from him.

Mr. Leavitt absurdly and mischievously assumes that the Hon. SAMUEL WILLISTON is the author of my letter, and utters a volley of invective, accompanied with a good deal of adroit flattery and a little ghostly advice, at *him*. Mr. Williston never saw my letter until it was published; and if he had, he would not have been in any respect responsible for it, unless he had published it.

Respectfully yours,
D. L. CHILD.

Springfield, Nov. 4, 1844.

From the Washington Globe.

Andrew Jackson and John Quincy Adams.

HERMITAGE, Oct. 24, 1844.

MY DEAR MR. BLAIR:—On the 12th instant, I had a return of hemorrhage, and two days after a chill. With the lancet to correct the first, and calomel to check the second, I am greatly debilitated. But, being aroused by John Quincy Adams's address to the young men of Boston on the 7th instant, (sent to me on the 22d instant by my friend Mr. Armstrong,) I made a concise reply thereto—all that my feeble health and the absence of my papers permitted. I sent this to the Nashville Union, and in that paper of the 23d it will reach you. I trust you will give it a place in your Globe, to meet the falsehood contained in the address.

You will observe that Mr. John Q. Adams reiterates the false statement made by him 'years ago,' in a new form; for he says: 'This very boundary of the Sabine in the Florida treaty was, before it was finally proposed to the Spanish Minister Onis, by the direction of President James Monroe, shown by me to the Hero for his opinion and advice, which was in its favor.' All this statement I pronounce now, as I did the first one, when made eight years ago, a falsehood. If Mr. Monroe wished my opinion and advice, why did he not ask it himself? He knew that I came to Washington under impressions with regard to the movement in his cabinet to arrest me, which would not allow me to have interviews, or hold communication, with either Mr. Crawford or Mr. Adams. Soon after the triumphant vote of the House of Representatives, acquitting me of all the improper conduct alleged in the resolutions of Clay and Cobb, I left the city of Washington. Having, the day after the vote, visited the representative body by invitation, I think on the next I left the city for West Point Academy. This base falsehood was, I thought, nailed to the counter, when first made by Mr. Adams, by the Globe, and there it has stuck for years; but on the eve of the presidential election, and when Mr. Adams might well have supposed me nearly dead, and so entirely enfeebled by sickness as to be incapable of reply, he produces it again with a new face upon it. Providence, kind to me, has disappointed him; and I again declare that this new-vamped statement, that I was consulted by him on the boundary of the Florida treaty before it was made, and that I agreed to the boundary proposed—the Sabine—*is positively false, his pretended diary to the contrary notwithstanding.*

What honorable or just man can repose belief on his statements, after his receiving from Dr. Mayo the copy of a letter marked *confidential*, and producing and reading it to the House of Representatives, and arguing that I meant the reverse of its express instructions, to prove me guilty of duplicity! This letter was to Judge Fulton, then acting Governor of Arkansas, in the absence of Gov. Pope. He (Adams) saw it, *marked confidential*. He also knew that it was purloined from me by his accomplice in this transaction, and, if an honorable man, would at once have returned it to me. Instead of this, he kept it, and read it to the representative branch of Congress, and totally perverted its meaning. Was there ever such dishonorable conduct practised by any man of the least pretension to respectability before? But this is an act of perfidy on the part of one once holding the elevated station of the presidency! True, he obtained it by intrigue, bargain, and corruption; but the distinction should have imparted some consideration for the public's sense of honor, if he himself had no sense of the kind. But his interest now prompts him to shield himself from the charge of giving away to Spain, by the treaty of 1819, the greater part of Louisiana as ceded by France to the United States by the treaty of 1803, extending to the Rio Grande Del Norte, and he fabricates the positive falsehood that, before submitting it to Onis, he consulted me, and I agreed to the Sabine as the boundary. In proof, he cites a diary prepared by himself to suit an emergency, and produces it eight years after it was called for by the issue made by me in regard to the fact it was referred to for the purpose of vouching. I hope he will make known to the public what his diary says as to the purloined letter taken from me, and handed to him by Dr. Mayo, *marked confidential*. Has he noted in his diary that he knew this purloined letter was stolen, and that his reading as a lawyer taught him, that in contemplation of law, the receiver of stolen goods, knowing them to be stolen, was as bad as the thief, especially if he converted them to his own use?

But the bold, daring, and unblushing falsehood in his address, where (attending to the Congressional proceeding touching my conduct in the Seminole campaign) he says my acts in Florida were condemned by the unanimous voice of both Houses of Congress, caps the climax. Who, after such a barefaced falsehood as this, pronounced in the face of the journals of Congress, which show that the House of Representatives, by a large majority, on Clay's and Cobb's resolutions, exonerated me from all censure and blame, can feel anything but contempt for such a reckless calumniator? The man must be mad, or he is lost to all sense of shame as well as truth.

I have been interrupted at least ten times since I began this letter, by company, and write with great pain; but am so anxious to bring the address of J. Q. Adams, in connection with the circumstances in my recollection, to your view, that I could not consult my ease, or allow care for health to impose restraint. I hope you will show him in his true colors to the American people.

Your friend, in haste,
ANDREW JACKSON.

F. P. BLAIR, Esq.

From the Bangor Gazette.

Freedom of Speech.

MESSRS EDITORS:

I wish to say a word about the cause of human liberty, in connection with the anti-slavery meeting held in the city of Portland on the 4th, 5th, and 6th inst. Those who held the meeting are often called 'Come-outers,' and by some are stigmatized as infidels. This I think uncharitable. Were Martin Luther, Calvin and Melancthon infidels because they were come-outers—reformers? Is not every man a free agent, who will not fellowship with any great sin, whether it be in Church or State? I think so.

But it is not my object at this time to decide upon the correctness or incorrectness of every principle advocated by those who projected the meeting referred to. Much light and truth were certainly elicited, and their right to discuss their views in public is undeniable. Our Mayor, after granting the use of the City Hall for this purpose, thought proper, for the most paltry reason, to send in a letter on the first day of the meeting, forbidding them the use of the hall. It must be well known to him that the laboring portion of the community could attend only in the evening, and the design of his letter is plainly seen. The disappointment is more easily overlooked than the principle which caused it. Has it come to this—that the Mayor shall presume to trample upon the rights of a portion of his tax-paying fellow-citizens? This smacks too much of tyranny—too much like refusing petitions in Congress. It should awaken in the breast of every free American freeman that spirit which animated our fathers in revolutionary times. Let every man who attempts to crush free discussion of the principles of American slavery tremble. There is a spirit on the hills and throughout the valleys of this land, that sympathizes with crushed humanity, and it will ere long speak out in louder thunder-tones than have ever yet been heard.

Liberty looks to the ballot-box, not to tyrants, for redress. No man who attempts to prevent free discussion on Freedom's soil should be entrusted with the execution of Freedom's laws.

Concert Hall was obtained for the two succeeding days, and the meetings were crowded to excess in the evenings. The people want light; they press for it—they will have it. And certainly there can be nothing very criminal in investigating the condition of three millions of our own citizens, who are refused their liberty, and deprived of nearly all the rights of human beings. Why is there so much apathy on this momentous subject? Has the spirit of Christianity and of patriotism fled from the bosoms of northern freemen? I hope not. Let us not forget that the cause of crushed humanity is the cause of God.

H.

Portland, Oct. 9, 1844.

Treatment of Colored Passengers.

We mentioned, in our last, the exclusion from the saloon of the Acadia steam-packet, of a colored gentleman, who, nevertheless, had been allowed to pay the full fare; and we insert to-day the remonstrance so properly addressed to the proprietors of the vessel by the passengers on board. We are sorry to learn by the American papers last received, that the Cunard line of packets has been guilty of similar disgraceful conduct, with respect to a Haytien gentleman, at Boston. In this case, it is stated that the reception of colored passengers would create great loss and confusion, and, indeed, *would not be permitted by Southern gentlemen!* We should think, on the other hand, that the way to create 'loss and confusion,' was to refuse colored passengers, not to take them. And as to the Southern gentlemen, towards whom such an ignominiously servile spirit is shown, we have no doubt the packets are of quite as much importance to them as they are to the packets. They 'will not permit it'—indeed! Who made them lords paramount in the matter? We cannot think that the British gentlemen who have the property and management of these noble vessels, will servilely bow to the dictation of so vulgar, un-Christian, and un-English a spirit as is manifested in this case by southern slaveholders.—*British and Foreign A. S. Reporter.*

The New President of Texas.

It has been asserted (says the Albany Argus,) that the new president elect of Texas (Dr. Jones) is against Annexation—and that his election may be considered as expressions of the people of Texas adverse to that measure. This is not so. The National Vindicator, published at Houston, contradicts the story, on the authority of a letter from Dr. Jones published in the Harrison Times of the 25th July, explaining his non-attendance at the political meetings of his friends during the campaign—of which the following is an extract:

'Were I to make a tour through the country, I should be either compelled to neglect my official matters or to resign. The latter would, indeed, be very easy—but in the present crisis of our negotiations, it would, perhaps, look like a desertion of my post [Secretary of State.] I am not yet without hopes of annexation, and as I have had a great deal to do in this matter, I have some pride in wishing to go through with it. The charge that I am 'inimical to further negotiations with the United States for the re-annexation of our country to that,' is wholly without foundation in fact, and a base slander.'

MORE CHRISTIANS IN PRISON. The following we find in the papers:

STATE OF KENTUCKY.
FAYETTE COUNTY, ss.
Jailer's Office, Lexington, Ky.

I, Thomas B. Megowan, jailer for the county aforesaid, do hereby certify, that a man who calls himself the Rev. Calvin Fairbank, and a woman who calls herself Delia A. Webster, are confined in jail, awaiting trial on indictments found by the grand jury for the Fayette Circuit Court, for *negro stealing*, and conveying the same to the state of Ohio. And further, I certify, that for good cause, *I have had the said Fairbank ironed*. Given under my hand, this 19th day of October, in the year of our Lord, 1844, and of the Commonwealth the fifty-second.

(Signed,) THOMAS B. MEGOWAN.

☞ Who are they who are for remaining in a political union with Southern tyrants? Can they be abolitionists—the friends of the slave?

From the Herald of Freedom.

Anti-Slavery Convention at Milford, N. H.

FRIEND ROGERS:—The glorious cause of Freedom has received a new impulse here in the town of Milford. Seldom have I seen a more triumphant meeting, than we closed on Sunday evening of last week. It commenced on the preceding Friday, and continued until a late hour on Sunday evening. The meeting was characterized by numbers, eloquence and music. The spacious hall, recently finished by the Hutchinson family, was thronged most of the time, and many left, I was told, not being able to gain admittance. As to the speaking, though I never *puff*, I must say it exceeded at times all I have ever heard. On Saturday evening, Foster spoke two hours as I had never heard him, and on Sunday forenoon, he exceeded even all that he did then. I heard several say, who are not abolitionists, 'Never man spake like this man.' Abby Kelley, too, has wrung out of the opponents of female oratory, the unwilling confession, that if education, truthfulness, refinement, power of reasoning, mildness of demeanor, and whatever pertains to true eloquence, entitle one to address public assemblies, few, either male or female, can urge a higher claim than herself. Many who came to sneer, remained to admire, and went away to commend and to *believe*.

Of the music, I have only to say, it was by the Hutchinsons, and the people from the Kennebec to the Potomac know all about it. The free use of their capacious and convenient hall was another act of theirs, worthy their generous hearts.

On Sunday morning we had a perfect crowd, from this and neighboring towns, and never have I seen such an impression as was produced by Foster's speech. At intermission, you might see little crowds of the people about the village, engaged in most earnest conversation about it, and the spirit of freedom ran like electricity from heart to heart, and from house to house. Long before the hour of assembling in the afternoon, the hall was crowded to its utmost capacity. It becoming apparent that multitudes must be kept out, if we remained there, it was proposed to adjourn to the old meeting-house. This was done—and the worshippers of sect near by, beheld our march with deep consternation. Such an assemblage of those whose only weapons are *Truth* and *Love*, was more terrible to them, than an army with banners. Abby Kelley spoke most of the afternoon, and Jane Hitchcock made the principal speech in the evening; the former vindicating the doctrine of *No Union with Slaveholders* most triumphantly against some opposition that was raised by one or two Polko Focos present, and the latter captivating her audience by sweetness of manner and acuteness of reasoning.

I wish I had time, and you had room, for some account of the addresses. The religion of the times, politics, social relations, every thing that sustains slavery, were unfolded in a surprising manner. Milford revivals, I predict, are at an end. The clergy are no longer needed, nor, as clergymen, respected—and will soon be discharged. Only the anti-slavery movement keeps them from falling foul of each other, and devouring altogether. One of the ministers, John Richardson, asserts, and undertakes to prove, that Infant Baptism has occasioned more evil in the world than slavery! But the Orthodox ministers have so much to do, to maintain their ground against the rocking earthquakes which the mighty tread of Freedom creates about them, that they can hardly give so bold an attack on one of their favorite institutions, the least consideration. Probably should they reply at all, it would be only to say, that *under water baptism* is a greater curse than slavery. Certainly, this has been the language of their practice, ever since the days of Roger Williams.

From Milford we went to Wilton, Peterborough and Hancock—dividing our forces in the two former places, and meeting again on Saturday, for a two days' Convention at Hancock. Of these meetings, I have not now time to speak much. Night before last, Foster and Abby Kelley being on their way to the Non-Resistance meeting at Boston, again addressed the people of this village, at Hutchinson Hall. The subject was Third party, and it met the treatment it deserves. Friend Livermore, the lawyer of the village, and a Third party man, came to the rescue, and spoke an hour with his usual candor and ability, and only failed to make out his case, from the extreme hardness of the case itself. Although used, by his very profession, 'to make the worse appear the better reason,' and skilful no doubt to do it, *where it can be done*, still, I think that for once, *he must admit a failure*, though he did all that the cause would allow. I hope he will soon be found in better company.

But I must say a word about a Third party caucus held in the Congregational vestry last evening. The party in this place, consists mainly of members of the pro-slavery churches, officered of course by deacons and ministers. Anxious to make James G. Birney's calling and election sure, they appointed a caucus, and sent to Nashua for one Barrows to come and make them an electioneering speech. From his stupidity and self-conceited impudence, he could easily be detected as a minister in the Methodist battallion. The evening was dark, but not rainy, though the little vestry was not more than half full. There was about a *political* thousand; though in *honest* number, there were just sixty-three, as I counted. Several of these were women and girls; and if the speech-master *could* insult any body, it seems to me he insulted them—for he made not the slightest allusion to them during the evening; but his speech was full of '*gentlemen*'—and 'gentlemen of the Liberty party'—and 'RESPECTED gentlemen.' A few anti-slavery women were in from motives of curiosity, as also some anti-slavery men; but what Third party women there were present, must pocket the insult of being utterly neglected, as they best may.

The address was a curiosity. It seems the orator sometime back, had given a sermon on slavery, that was printed. He told us all about this, and what was in it, and then gently hinted that it could be bought for four-pence, and so said he would say no more about it. If he gave us a specimen of it, I think *four-pence* high for it. He gave us the strangest bundle of reasons you ever saw, for abandoning the political parties, and staying in the 'Bulwarks of Slavery.' Then he had a mighty sweat at showing the *morality* of the ballot-box. He magnified that bit of political *housen stuff*, as the old Jews did the ark of the covenant. Thou shalt not take the name of the ballot-box in vain; for third party will not hold him guiltless, that taketh its name in vain. One would think that to speak against it, would be the 'blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.' That round hole in its top, seemed the 'strait and narrow way that leadeth unto life.' He said, 'some *Christians* seem to vote as the minister once whipped a scoundrel.' He pulled off his black coat, and threw it down, saying, 'Lie there, *minister*, while I whip this rascal.' So he said *Christians* seemed to throw off their Christianity, while they went and voted for slaveholders.

When the address was through, I rose to make a few remarks. I began by saying, I was not fully satisfied with the reasons given for remaining in the church while we abandoned the political parties—cited James G. Birney to prove *the Church*, and not the Whig or Democratic party, or both together, to be the 'Bulwark,' the strong tower, the fortress, the hiding place of slavery, and recommending to Third Party men to procure the book Birney had published, rather than the six-cent printed sermon of friend Barrows. I then went on to show that he had not told told the truth about the Methodist mongers in human flesh. I produced the Methodist Book of Discipline, telling the audience it was the 1840, and *last* edition, and read passages from it, comparing them with the resolutions of the General Conference, and the treatment of Bishop Andrew, by that body, last May, and was probably, in the opinion of Barrows, making out rather a hard case for him,—when he suddenly rose, and most solemnly

nd ministerially and magisterially wished me to stop, that he might detect a misstatement. I did so with all cheerfulness. He then began to say, that he had *often* met me, (I was not aware of it,) and that he always found me saying things that were not true. I was back in my mind over my remarks, to see what might be I was to be convicted of. The 'lake' we crossed of, the 'mountains' have taken part, blazed up before the meeting, and the people seemed to expect every moment to see me plunged in. I almost began to tremble myself. At length the charge was made, and specified, what 'room and circumstance,' was specified. It was this—I had said the edition of Methodist Discipline from which I have quoted, was 'a lawyer's answer!' whereas another, though on slavery, *exactly like mine*, had been issued since. The only other thing was, that I had made a *free* translation of a Latin phrase, and that I had read the Discipline and Resolutions right. My false inference was this: 'The Discipline declares, and has stood unchanged thirty years on the subject, that the buying and selling of men, women and children, with the intention to enslave them, shall be held an excommunicatory offence. The resolution of the Conference, which passed eight years ago, was, that '*they had no right, with or intention, to enslave*' with *leniency*. That is, said I, they have no right, with or intention to carry out the plain declarations of their own Discipline. Here were my awful mis-statements. And the whole of them. But, he added in great hurry, I think it better to close the meeting—and will close with the benediction!!! He then sprung it, in double quick time, and the face ended. I just reminded the meeting of the *brevity* of the sermon of Christian, and minister, in asking me to give way for a correction and then exploding the meeting with the quick motion of the benediction. It had occurred me of *brevity*, but the didn't lie, I suppose, when he thus pretended he only wanted to correct me. These prayers and blessings are the hardest tools the priest has to work with. And they are peculiarly his tools, especially the latter. It takes a priest to do a benediction—mere *laymen* can't do it. It was the first benediction I ever saw—it was *quite* so solemn a performance. It was fortunate that a priest was present, or the meeting might have been still this present. However, I was satisfied, if the party were.

As soon as the Amen was heard, friend Jewett, one of the slaves on friend Warner's ecclesiastical plantation, flew round as though he had the very '*brain fever in his head*,' and blew out the lights instanter. We got out as soon as we well could, several of the Whig Party from adjacent parts, greeting great dissatisfaction that a stranger should thus, in so mean and dishonest a manner, rudely break up the meeting, though he was the appointed for the evening. I hope no Abolitionist would have done it, though politicians, especially during politicians, sometimes play desperate games. Politics, to be totally depraved, must be politicians, and Whigs, and ordained.

After all, the meeting did the cause of genuine anti-slavery much good. Many saw the baseness and meanness of Third Party, and left it for ever. Much interest is awakened in the cause. Never has this State stood in so favorable an attitude to truth, as now. Religious fury and fanaticism have subsided, priestly despotism is broken down and destroyed, politics, (Third Party excepted) have ceased to bewitch and make drunk, as they have been wont to do, and there is a real hungering and thirsting after truth and liberty.

The days of slavery are numbered. No sun goes down, leaving it as strong as it found it in the morning. Every day it is growing weaker and weaker. Not much longer will even its 'Bulwarks' be able to defend it. Yours, as ever,

PARKER PILLSBURY.

Milford, 30th October, 1844.

DISUNION!

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!

Motto of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

Review of Gerrit Smith's Constitutional Argument. By Alfin Bellou.

(CONCLUDED.)

But what have you to say concerning that most nefarious and heaven-daring clause of the Constitution, which prohibits the abolition of the slave trade for twenty years—which must not even be amended till the twenty years had run out? I am amazed at your language. 'Before the Colonies came into under the Federal Constitution, they were independent of each other and the world.' Very well. Then of course it behooved them to make a bargain, if any of them wished such, not to enter into a league with the unprincipled to commit iniquity. But they made a league and compacted themselves into a nation. 'Well, what is perfect right and wrong in a person or nation, to prosecute the African slave trade, and to prosecute it, too, forever? And this was just *no right* at all. 'But we both agreed with the partners under the 'her' compact—not that it would continue this trade for nineteen years, (that would have been a pro-slavery agreement,) but that it would continue it, 'if, in the meantime, Christianity is after nineteen years, and that makes it an anti-slavery agreement.' Do you affirm that the slaveholding States agreed in the Constitution, that Christianity would be in force nineteen years? Even if they *had* thus agreed, their anti-slavery would have been of a most dividing kind, at best! An agreement with the slave-dealers, that the most outrageous crimes against humanity twenty years hence! Are you gradualist enough to call such an agreement anti-slavery? Is there in it no compromising of conscience? The Constitution. They never agreed on a time to leave off their piracy. For aught in the Constitution, the slave trade might be prosecuted forever; and each State had, in your opinion, a right to do. For aught it contains, that infernal trade may be resumed and legalized under the laws of Congress as a very moderate, if not the real and only agreement was, that Congress should be prohibited from passing any law against the slave trade prior to the year 1808. It is filled by the hands of what little anti-slavery might get into Congress, or exist among the people for the next twenty years, and made kidnapping the'African a law of the Constitution. Is this business as the whole nation must endorse and make common cause in defending. It is astonishing that a man of your intellectual acuteness should make such a representation of this matter. Then, your comparison of the partnership with a drunkard, in which he agrees to leave off drinking at the end of twenty years, is absolutely nonsense. You ought to have stated it thus: ☞ 'I enter into a partnership with a corporation of Whiskey Distillers, and pledge myself not to drink, but to make whole property, and even my life, to sustain them in their business for twenty years *certainly*, and as much longer as the majority of the corporation may determine—allowing each member weight on every vote in the ratio of *three-fifths* of all the drunkards he may prove himself to have made. This I do as a Christian gentleman, and man, without the least assurance, but still in the fond hope that they will all abandon the wicked business of their own accord, at the end of the twenty years.' Not quite so. This would prove you as good a temperance man, as the framers of the Federal Constitution were anti-slavery men.

You attach to the provisions in the Constitution for suppressing insurrections and domestic violence. Under these provisions, the whole nation binds itself to suppress, by force, the arms of the oppression. Not only *insurrections*, properly so called, but all *domestic violence*, occasioned by attempts of the slaves to obtain their freedom. Is it strange that these provisions are neither *pro-slavery nor anti-slavery*. The powers which they convey are indispensable to prevent and arrest lawlessness and bloodshed—and indispensable to the upholding of civil government. According to the common notions of civil government, this 'is true in the *abstract*,' (as some people say.) But it must be remembered that the Federal Constitution had before them distinctly the following facts: 1. There were between seven and eight hundred thousand slaves in the country. 2. These slaves were to be continually augmented by the activity of the slave trade for the next twenty years, besides their natural increase. 3. That a slave population had proved in all ages of the world prone to *domestic violence*, for the regaining of that natural liberty taken and withheld from them by *violence*. And 4, that the slaveholders demanded and expected the national protection against this kind of domestic violence. Now! I will ask you, friend Smith, whether you and the Liberty party abolitionists were prepared now sitting in general Convention to re-consider the Federal Constitution, would agree to just such provisions as these without making any exceptions, and without any grant or discretionary power to emancipate the slave population, in case it should be deemed necessary to suppress any of domestic violence? As the matter now stands, the general government are bound to suppress all slave insurrections of whatsoever nature and extent, and for the benefit, at the common expense, without the least grant of power from the States to emancipate—either the slaves in question, or any portion of them, however necessary it may be to prevent future domestic violence. The slaveholders may drive their slaves to desperation, and when they have driven them to most desperate crimes, the general government is bound, if need be, to put the whole nation in deadly array against the insurgents until subdued—then, hurrying the slaves back under more circumspect and aggravated tyranny, to march off and pay up their own bill of expense. If this is not practical *pro-slavery*, what is? If you and your political friends were in convention, assent to, and swear to carry out such *provisions* as these, Heaven save human rights from your anti-slavery protection!

Finally, you take up the clause of the Constitution which provides for the delivery of fugitive slaves to their masters. This clause prohibits any State from passing laws to secure fugitive slaves their freedom, and binds the whole of the free States to deliver up all such fugitives to any person claiming them under the laws of the State from which they may have escaped. This is the only clause in the slave code of the southern States supreme over the whole land. Any person declared to be a slave in any one of those States, must be returned to his master, without any trial, if he make an attempt to regain his natural freedom by flight, he shall find no place of Constitutional refuge within the United States, for any Christian soul. Not even the Constitution can deliver up the unfortunate wretch to his *pretended owner*. This was the intent of the clause. This is the construction put on it by the Southern States. This is the meaning attached to it by the great mass of the people. And this will be the practical operation of it, until a new public sentiment, sufficiently strong to enforce a section, shall render it null and void. The clause, as thus intended, construed and acted upon, is in perfect accordance with the declared object of the Constitution. A Convention of professed republicans, who could not recommend even the most gradual and remote abolition of slavery, but who could give a bounty of twenty years for twenty years, who could offer a bounty of superior political power on slaveholding, who could agree to put down slave insurrections and domestic violence, at cost of blood and treasure, without retaining the least discretionary power to emancipate the slaves under any circumstances, could very consistently and very naturally agree to make the slaveholder's title equally good to his slaves in all parts of the Union. If he had the right to them in Carolina or Georgia, he must have a right to them in Massachusetts and Vermont. If they run away from their rightful owners, those owners ought to be able to reclaim them, any where within the limits of the U. S. It would be absurd to the last degree for the general government to foster the slave trade, to make ownership in slaves the basis of political power, to put down slave insurrections at the suppression of all slave rebellions, and yet leave an open door for the slaves to run away, from one State to another, and there find refuge. If a man be a slaveholder in one State, they must be so in all; and it would be back handed robbery for any one of the States to enact laws to protect the property of slaveholders against the will of their masters. Indeed, there could be no union with slaveholders, except on condition that their property in slaves should be put on equal footing in slaves the basis of political power, and that the slaveholders enter into a union with masses of people who regarded them as thieves and robbers, and who would use every opportunity to rescue their stolen property from their hands, and away, or encourage them to escape their bonds by flight, under the assurance of finding at once freedom and a refuge in the free States. Can you defend the Federal Union for the sake of greater security in the possession of their slaves, and yet say, 'Great is the power of truth!' Can you affirm that the Constitution is pro-slavery; and the arguments drawn from it to prove that immeasurably more embarrassing to the Liberty party than those which you allege against it, 'Great is truth!' Can you affirm that the Constitution is pro-slavery; and the arguments drawn from it to prove that immeasurably more embarrassing to the Liberty party than those which you allege against it, 'Great is truth!' Can you affirm that this is a very strong statement. I am glad to know that the *party* are susceptible of all this embarrassment! It argues that their reason and conscience are still awake. But for my own part, I consider the other clause already noticed, especially that which invests the slaveholder in a union with superior political power, the general government on account of the slave population, more difficult to explain away than this—more embarrassing to Liberty party principles.

You undertake to say that 'even under the provisions of Constitution of this provision, it can, constitutionally, operate but in favor of the slavery.' Why? For the fugitive from the District of Columbia, or the territory of Florida, or from any slave State, which is not one of the original thirteen States, 'by which, at first, the slaves were to be counted in them; and no fugitive from any one of those thirteen States, who has ever been permitted to go beyond its present, or its original limits, under any declaratory clause of those States, can, in the eye of the Constitution, be a slave.' Now, respected friend, is there any proof in all this? Is it true, or false, or what sound. In the eye of the Constitution, a slave in one part of the Union is a slave in every part of it, reclaimable on demand of the master. So far as that instrument declares any thing in regarding this question, it recognizes the master as the rightful proprietor of his slave's person, and empowers him to carry his property wherever he pleases. Dred Scott, in Common law has been called in to justify the liberation of slaves voluntarily brought into the free States by their masters, and the Constitution has been introduced into the propriety of even such a proceeding. The principle, that all laws abridging the natural rights of human beings, are to be construed as severely as possible, has been called in to justify the unfortunate sufferer, if backed up by a healthy anti-slavery public sentiment, can do something to outrail the provisions of the Constitution of the Federal Union. For this, no credit to that instrument; which contains not one positive provision for the delivery, or even relief of the fugitive, under any circumstances whatever; whilst on the other hand it contains sweeping provisions, clothing the slaveholder with advantage, honor and power—as justly entitled to hold and claim his property, wherever he may be. If by any means a lynx-eyed anti-slavery public sentiment can continue, by the help of common law, to creep in among the rubbish of the Constitution, and rescue now and then a captive from the prison house, let no credit be claimed for the instrument on account of the exploits of the Liberty party. Let no credit be claimed for the intention was, to have made escape or rescue impossible. You would have it believed that the Constitution proclaims freedom either unqualified or qualified in the fugitive slave, from the District of Columbia, the territory of Florida, and all the new States, not formerly included in any one of the original thirteen States. But there is nothing of this in the Constitution. No such results can be obtained, except by some artifice of the common law taking advantage of verbal omissions in the instrument.

Again, you argue from the fact of northern anti-slavery sentiment having become so powerful, that comparatively few fugitives now reach a free State or are urged into slavery. Does the Constitution deserve any credit for the operation of causes which are not only out of itself, but operate in favor of freedom against the intentions of the Union? Surely not. Again, you plead that if, at worst, this clause of the Constitution is pro-slavery, it may be amended. Certainly it may be. It ought to be rejected and enforced by public opinion. Until then, it remains a part of the supreme law of the land; and the question is—Can a true abolitionist endorse it as it now stands, and swear to support it? The American A. S. Society answers emphatically, no. Does Liberty party answer, yes?

But then you deny that the clause is fairly capable of a pro-slavery construction. 1. Because such a meaning is not expressed in the provision. 2. Because the framers and adopters of the Constitution would not suffer it to be expressed. Why is not such a meaning expressed in the provision? Your answer is: 1st. The provision speaks of 'service or labor due.' But by the definitions of the southern slave codes, the slave is a chattel; and hence to predicate indebtedness of a slave is, in the light of those definitions, as absurd as to predicate it of a horse or a stone.' Right! Southern and southern slave codes declare that the labor of the chattel slave is due to his master—that it as rightfully belongs to him as the labor of his chattel horse. Not that it is 'due' by '*indebtedness*' of either slave or horse, but that it is by '*indebtedness*' of the slave to the proprietorship. Not you see a great *absurdity* in this use of terms. What if there is an absurdity, does *that* affect the meaning of the Constitution? Southern slaveholders use the language of every class of people according to the settled use of the terms employed, and not according to the meaning of those terms, produced *absurdity* from the received forms of expression. If we are never to understand the language of lawyers and statesmen in any sense which interferes with, or, in the light of high and moral principle, we can very easily resolve the most iniquitous laws on earth into harmony with the divine law. Such special pleadings are the very stuff of which the Constitution is in unworthy of the source whence it comes. But you proceed: '2d. The Madison Papers inform us, to one that is not prejudiced against it—'On motion of Mr. Randolph, the word *servitude* was struck out (by the Convention, from Art. 1. Sec. 2,) and 'service' unanimously put in, the former being thought too expressive of the condition of the slaves, and the latter the obligations of free persons.' Reply. The Madison Papers afford the most conclusive proof that the Federal Convention were ashamed to use the naked terms, *slave, slavery*, &c. and that they were also afraid of prejudicing a portion of the people against the Constitution, if they should insert them. The Madison papers also afford conclusive proof, if indeed any were needed, that the Convention compromised liberty for slavery, and sacrificed the rights of man, secured to the slaveholding interest all that the common judicial construction of the Constitution allows. Here is the difference between '*servitude*' and '*service*,' or even the word '*slave*' and the words '*needle-doe* and *tweedle-dum*.' Yet it satisfies you that no pro-slavery meaning is expressed in the provision. You conclude from this circumstance in your favor way. To me the substitution of the word *service* for *servitude* is a mere rhetorical gloss, designed to express the same dark meaning one shade lighter to the fastidious eye.

'The meaning is plain;
To mistake it costs the time and pain.'

But you further affirm in your second general reason, that the framers and adopters of the Constitution would not suffer it to be expressed. How does this appear? You again appeal to the Madison Papers, and you say—'Who can read the Madison Papers, and in other ways ascertain himself the mind of the Convention which framed the Constitution, and yet believe that the Convention, would have suffered the word '*slave*' to be inserted in the Constitution, which would not suffer the word '*slave*,' or the word '*slavery*,' or even the word '*servitude*' to have a place in it? Mr. Madison, in speaking with Mr. Gerry, that it, 'ought to be careful not to give any sanction to slavery'; (!) and which, to use the very words of its leading member, Mr. Madison, on the floor of the Convention, 'thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man'—who, I say, can believe that this Convention would have deliberately sanctioned slavery in plain, unequivocal terms, the right of the slaveholder, to chase down, and to chase down unhindered, the poor innocent fugitive from their hands? More difficult, however, it would be for any one who has informed himself of the strong anti-slavery sentiment which was existed in almost every part of our country, to believe that the Constitution would have been adopted, had it so spoken.'

Most wonderful reasoning. To cap the climax, my friend, your reasoning has grown more and more high-toned, and affirmed that this most exquisitely scrupulous anti-slavery Convention completely abolished slavery, and that the whole nation unanimously responded AMEN, and that the legislators and jurists of those days all governed themselves accordingly. For, to do that has informed himself of the mind of the Convention, and of the strong anti-slavery public sentiment of almost the entire people of those days, can be so wilfully sceptical as to believe that the Convention would have recognized and sanctioned slavery! The question is settled, and slavery is dead and buried. The *Federal Convention* and the people were too wise and good to sanction and recognize such an all. If any body believes or imagines that slavery exists by any *sanction* or countenance of the U. S. Constitution, its framers or adopters, let him be written down an ass. Let him be written down a fool. For proof of all this, read the following extracts from the Madison Papers.

Mr. Madison said:—

'The States were divided into different interests, not by their extent, or other circumstances, but between the southern and eastern States on the question of slavery. This question was attended with all the circumstances that made it most embarrassing to the Liberty party than those which you allege against it. Great is truth!' Great is truth! This is a very strong statement. I am glad to know that the *party* are susceptible of all this embarrassment! It argues that their reason and conscience are still awake. But for my own part, I consider the other clause already noticed, especially that which invests the slaveholder in a union with superior political power, on the general government on account of the slave population, more difficult to explain away than this—more embarrassing to Liberty party principles.

You undertake to say that 'even under the provisions of Constitution of this provision, it can, constitutionally, operate but in favor of the slavery.' Why? For the fugitive from the District of Columbia, or the territory of Florida, or from any slave State, which is not one of the original thirteen States, by which, at first, the slaves were to be counted in them; and no fugitive from any one of those thirteen States, who has ever been permitted to go beyond its present, or its original limits, under any declaratory clause of those States, can, in the eye of the Constitution, be a slave.' Now, respected friend, is there any proof in all this? Is it true, or false, or what sound. In the eye of the Constitution, a slave in one part of the Union is a slave in every part of it, reclaimable on demand of the master. So far as that instrument declares any thing in regarding this question, it recognizes the master as the rightful proprietor of his slave's person, and empowers him to carry his property wherever he pleases. Dred Scott, in Common law has been called in to justify the liberation of slaves voluntarily brought into the free States by their masters. But the Constitution has been introduced into the propriety of even such a proceeding. The principle, that all laws abridging the natural rights of human beings, are to be construed as severely as possible, has been called in to justify the unfortunate sufferer, if backed up by a healthy anti-slavery public sentiment, can do something to outrail the provisions of the Constitution of the Union. For this, no credit to that instrument; which contains not one positive provision for the delivery, or even relief of the fugitive, under any circumstances whatever; whilst on the other hand it contains sweeping provisions, clothing the slaveholder with advantage, honor and power—as justly entitled to hold and claim his property, wherever he may be. If by any means a lynx-eyed anti-slavery public sentiment can continue, by the help of common law, to creep in among the rubbish of the Constitution, and rescue now and then a captive from the prison house, let no credit be claimed for the instrument on account of the exploits of the Liberty party. Let no credit be claimed for the intention was, to have made escape or rescue impossible. You would have it believed that the Constitution proclaims freedom either unqualified or qualified in the fugitive slave, from the District of Columbia, the territory of Florida, and all the new States, not formerly included in any one of the original thirteen States. But there is nothing of this in the Constitution. No such results can be obtained, except by some artifice of the common law taking advantage of verbal omissions in the instrument.

Again, you argue from the fact of northern anti-slavery sentiment having become so powerful, that comparatively few fugitives now reach a free State or are urged into slavery. Does the Constitution deserve any credit for the operation of causes which are not only out of itself, but operate in favor of freedom against the intentions of the Union? Surely not. Again, you plead that if, at worst, this clause of the Constitution is pro-slavery, it may be amended. Certainly it may be. It ought to be rejected and enforced by public opinion. Until then, it remains a part of the supreme law of the land; and the question is—Can a true abolitionist endorse it as it now stands, and swear to support it? The American A. S. Society answers emphatically, no. Does Liberty party answer, yes?

But then you deny that the clause is fairly capable of a pro-slavery construction. 1. Because such a meaning is not expressed in the provision. 2. Because the framers and adopters of the Constitution would not suffer it to be expressed. Why is not such a meaning expressed in the provision? Your answer is: 1st. The provision speaks of 'service or labor due.' But by the definitions of the southern slave codes, the slave is a chattel; and hence to predicate indebtedness of a slave is, in the light of those definitions, as absurd as to predicate it of a horse or a stone.' Right! Southern and southern slave codes declare that the labor of the chattel slave is due to his master—that it as rightfully belongs to him as the labor of his chattel horse. Not that it is 'due' by '*indebtedness*' of either slave or horse, but that it is by '*indebtedness*' of the slave to the proprietorship. Not you see a great *absurdity* in this use of terms. What if there is an absurdity, does *that* affect the meaning of the Constitution? Southern slaveholders use the language of every class of people according to the settled use of the terms employed, and not according to the meaning of those terms, produced *absurdity* from the received forms of expression. If we are never to understand the language of lawyers and statesmen in any sense which interferes with, or, in the light of high and moral principle, we can very easily resolve the most iniquitous laws on earth into harmony with the divine law. Such special pleadings are the very stuff of which the Constitution is in unworthy of the source whence it comes. But you proceed: '2d. The Madison Papers inform us, to one that is not prejudiced against it—'On motion of Mr. Randolph, the word *servitude* was struck out (by the Convention, from Art. 1. Sec. 2,) and 'service' unanimously put in, the former being thought too expressive of the condition of the slaves, and the latter the obligations of free persons.' Reply. The Madison Papers afford the most conclusive proof that the Federal Convention were ashamed to use the naked terms, *slave, slavery*, &c. and that they were also afraid of prejudicing a portion of the people against the Constitution, if they should insert them. The Madison papers also afford conclusive proof, if indeed any were needed, that the Convention compromised liberty for slavery, and sacrificed the rights of man, secured to the slaveholding interest all that the common judicial construction of the Constitution allows. Here is the difference between '*servitude*' and '*service*,' or even the word '*slave*' and the words '*needle-doe* and *tweedle-dum*.' Yet it satisfies you that no pro-slavery meaning is expressed in the provision. You conclude from this circumstance in your favor way. To me the substitution of the word *service* for *servitude* is a mere rhetorical gloss, designed to express the same dark meaning one shade lighter to the fastidious eye.

'The meaning is plain;
To mistake it costs the time and pain.'

But you further affirm in your second general reason, that the framers and adopters of the Constitution would not suffer it to be expressed. How does this appear? You again appeal to the Madison Papers, and you say—'Who can read the Madison Papers, and in other ways ascertain himself the mind of the Convention which framed the Constitution, and yet believe that the Convention, would have suffered the word '*slave*' to be inserted in the Constitution, which would not suffer the word '*slave*,' or the word '*slavery*,' or even the word '*servitude*' to have a place in it? Mr. Madison, in speaking with Mr. Gerry, that it, 'ought to be careful not to give any sanction to slavery'; (!) and which, to use the very words of its leading member, Mr. Madison, on the floor of the Convention, 'thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man'—who, I say, can believe that this Convention would have deliberately sanctioned slavery in plain, unequivocal terms, the right of the slaveholder, to chase down, and to chase down unhindered, the poor innocent fugitive from their hands? More difficult, however, it would be for any one who has informed himself of the strong anti-slavery sentiment which was existed in almost every part of our country, to believe that the Constitution would have been adopted, had it so spoken.'

Most wonderful reasoning. To cap the climax, my friend, your reasoning has grown more and more high-toned, and affirmed that this most exquisitely scrupulous anti-slavery Convention completely abolished slavery, and that the whole nation unanimously responded AMEN, and that the legislators and jurists of those days all governed themselves accordingly. For, to do that has informed himself of the mind of the Convention, and of the strong public anti-slavery public sentiment of almost the entire people of those days, can be so wilfully sceptical as to believe that the Convention would have recognized and sanctioned slavery! The question is settled, and slavery is dead and buried. The *Federal Convention* and the people were too wise and good to sanction and recognize such an all. If any body believes or imagines that slavery exists by any *sanction* or countenance of the U. S. Constitution, its framers or adopters, let him be written down an ass. Let him be written down a fool. For proof of all this, read the following extracts from the Madison Papers.

Mr. Madison said:—

'The States were divided into different interests, not by their extent, or other circumstances, but between the southern and eastern States on the question of slavery. This question was attended with all the circumstances that made it most embarrassing to the Liberty party than those which you allege against it. Great is truth!' Great is truth! This is a very strong statement. I am glad to know that the *party* are susceptible of all this embarrassment! It argues that their reason and conscience are still awake. But for my own part, I consider the other clause already noticed, especially that which invests the slaveholder in a union with superior political power, on the general government on account of the slave population, more difficult to explain away than this—more embarrassing to Liberty party principles.

You undertake to say that 'even under the provisions of Constitution of this provision, it can, constitutionally, operate but in favor of the slavery.' Why? For the fugitive from the District of Columbia, or the territory of Florida, or from any slave State, which is not one of the original thirteen States, by which, at first, the slaves were to be counted in them; and no fugitive from any one of those thirteen States, who has ever been permitted to go beyond its present, or its original limits, under any declaratory clause of those States, can, in the eye of the Constitution, be a slave.' Now, respected friend, is there any proof in all this? Is it true, or false, or what sound. In the eye of the Constitution, a slave in one part of the Union is a slave in every part of it, reclaimable on demand of the master. So far as that instrument declares any thing in regarding this question, it recognizes the master as the rightful proprietor of his slave's person, and empowers him to carry his property wherever he pleases. Dred Scott, in Common law has been called in to justify the liberation of slaves voluntarily brought into the free States by their masters. But the Constitution has been introduced into the propriety of even such a proceeding. The principle, that all laws abridging the natural rights of human beings, are to be construed as severely as possible, has been called in to justify the unfortunate sufferer, if backed up by a healthy anti-slavery public sentiment, can do something to outrail the provisions of the Constitution of the Union. For this, no credit to that instrument; which contains not one positive provision for the delivery, or even relief of the fugitive, under any circumstances whatever; whilst on the other hand it contains sweeping provisions, clothing the slaveholder with advantage, honor and power—as justly entitled to hold and claim his property, wherever he may be. If by any means a lynx-eyed anti-slavery public sentiment can continue, by the help of common law, to creep in among the rubbish of the Constitution, and rescue now and then a captive from the prison house, let no credit be claimed for the instrument on account of the exploits of the Liberty party. Let no credit be claimed for the intention was, to have made escape or rescue impossible. You would have it believed that the Constitution proclaims freedom either unqualified or qualified in the fugitive slave, from the District of Columbia, the territory of Florida, and all the new States, not formerly included in any one of the original thirteen States. But there is nothing of this in the Constitution. No such results can be obtained, except by some artifice of the common law taking advantage of verbal omissions in the instrument.

Again, you argue from the fact of northern anti-slavery sentiment having become so powerful, that comparatively few fugitives now reach a free State or are urged into slavery. Does the Constitution deserve any credit for the operation of causes which are not only out of itself, but operate in favor of freedom against the intentions of the Union? Surely not. Again, you plead that if, at worst, this clause of the Constitution is pro-slavery, it may be amended. Certainly it may be. It ought to be rejected and enforced by public opinion. Until then, it remains a part of the supreme law of the land; and the question is—Can a true abolitionist endorse it as it now stands, and swear to support it? The American A. S. Society answers emphatically, no. Does Liberty party answer, yes?

But then you deny that the clause is fairly capable of a pro-slavery construction. 1. Because such a meaning is not expressed in the provision. 2. Because the framers and adopters of the Constitution would not suffer it to be expressed. Why is not such a meaning expressed in the provision? Your answer is: 1st. The provision speaks of 'service or labor due.' But by the definitions of the southern slave codes, the slave is a chattel; and hence to predicate indebtedness of a slave is, in the light of those definitions, as absurd as to predicate it of a horse or a stone.' Right! Southern and southern slave codes declare that the labor of the chattel slave is due to his master—that it as rightfully belongs to him as the labor of his chattel horse. Not that it is 'due' by '*indebtedness*' of either slave or horse, but that it is by '*indebtedness*' of the slave to the proprietorship. Not you see a great *absurdity* in this use of terms. What if there is an absurdity, does *that* affect the meaning of the Constitution? Southern slaveholders use the language of every class of people according to the settled use of the terms employed, and not according to the meaning of those terms, produced *absurdity* from the received forms of expression. If we are never to understand the language of lawyers and statesmen in any sense which interferes with, or, in the light of high and moral principle, we can very easily resolve the most iniquitous laws on earth into harmony with the divine law. Such special pleadings are the very stuff of which the Constitution is in unworthy of the source whence it comes. But you proceed: '2d. The Madison Papers inform us, to one that is not prejudiced against it—'On motion of Mr. Randolph, the word *servitude* was struck out (by the Convention, from Art. 1. Sec. 2,) and 'service' unanimously put in, the former being thought too expressive of the condition of the slaves, and the latter the obligations of free persons.' Reply. The Madison Papers afford the most conclusive proof that the Federal Convention were ashamed to use the naked terms, *slave, slavery*, &c. and that they were also afraid of prejudicing a portion of the people against the Constitution, if they should insert them. The Madison papers also afford conclusive proof, if indeed any were needed, that the Convention compromised liberty for slavery, and sacrificed the rights of man, secured to the slaveholding interest all that the common judicial construction of the Constitution allows. Here is the difference between '*servitude*' and '*service*,' or even the word '*slave*' and the words '*needle-doe* and *tweedle-dum*.' Yet it satisfies you that no pro-slavery meaning is expressed in the provision. You conclude from this circumstance in your favor way. To me the substitution of the word *service* for *servitude* is a mere rhetorical gloss, designed to express the same dark meaning one shade lighter to the fastidious eye.

'The meaning is plain;
To mistake it costs the time and pain.'

But you further affirm in your second general reason, that the framers and adopters of the Constitution would not suffer it to be expressed. How does this appear? You again appeal to the Madison Papers, and you say—'Who can read the Madison Papers, and in other ways ascertain himself the mind of the Convention which framed the Constitution, and yet believe that the Convention, would have suffered the word '*slave*' to be inserted in the Constitution, which would not suffer the word '*slave*,' or the word '*slavery*,' or even the word '*servitude*' to have a place in it? Mr. Madison, in speaking with Mr. Gerry, that it, 'ought to be careful not to give any sanction to slavery'; (!) and which, to use the very words of its leading member, Mr. Madison, on the floor of the Convention, 'thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man'—who, I say, can believe that this Convention would have deliberately sanctioned slavery in plain, unequivocal terms, the right of the slaveholder, to chase down, and to chase down unhindered, the poor innocent fugitive from their hands? More difficult, however, it would be for any one who has informed himself of the strong anti-slavery sentiment which was existed in almost every part of our country, to believe that the Constitution would have been adopted, had it so spoken.'

Most wonderful reasoning. To cap the climax, my friend, your reasoning has grown more and more high-toned, and affirmed that this most exquisitely scrupulous anti-slavery Convention completely abolished slavery, and that the whole nation unanimously responded AMEN, and that the legislators and jurists of those days all governed themselves accordingly. For, to do that has informed himself of the mind of the Convention, and of the strong public anti-slavery public sentiment of almost the entire people of those days, can be so wilfully sceptical as to believe that the Convention would have recognized and sanctioned slavery! The question is settled, and slavery is dead and buried. The *Federal Convention* and the people were too wise and good to sanction and recognize such an all. If any body believes or imagines that slavery exists by any *sanction* or countenance of the U. S. Constitution, its framers or adopters, let him be written down an ass. Let him be written down a fool. For proof of all this, read the following extracts from the Madison Papers.

Mr. Madison said:—

'The States were divided into different interests, not by their extent, or other circumstances, but between the southern and eastern States on the question of slavery. This question was attended with all the circumstances that made it most embarrassing to the Liberty party than those which you allege against it. Great is truth!' Great is truth! This is a very strong statement. I am glad to know that the *party* are susceptible of all this embarrassment! It argues that their reason and conscience are still awake. But for my own part, I consider the other clause already noticed, especially that which invests the slaveholder in a union with superior political power, on the general government on account of the slave population, more difficult to explain away than this—more embarrassing to Liberty party principles.

You undertake to say that 'even under the provisions of Constitution of this provision, it can, constitutionally, operate but in favor of the slavery.' Why? For the fugitive from the District of Columbia, or the territory of Florida, or from any slave State, which is not one of the original thirteen States, by which, at first, the slaves were to be counted in them; and no fugitive from any one of those thirteen States, who has ever been permitted to go beyond its present, or its original limits, under any declaratory clause of those States, can, in the eye of the Constitution, be a slave.' Now, respected friend, is there any proof in all this? Is it true, or false, or what sound. In the eye of the Constitution, a slave in one part of the Union is a slave in every part of it, reclaimable on demand of the master. So far as that instrument declares any thing in regarding this question, it recognizes the master as the rightful proprietor of his slave's person, and empowers him to carry his property wherever he pleases. Dred Scott, in Common law has been called in to justify the liberation of slaves voluntarily brought into the free States by their masters. But the Constitution has been introduced into the propriety of even such a proceeding. The principle, that all laws abridging the natural rights of human beings, are to be construed as severely as possible, has been called in to justify the unfortunate sufferer, if backed up by a healthy anti-slavery public sentiment, can do something to outrail the provisions of the Constitution of the Union. For this, no credit to that instrument; which contains not one positive provision for the delivery, or even relief of the fugitive, under any circumstances whatever; whilst on the other hand it contains sweeping provisions, clothing the slaveholder with advantage, honor and power—as justly entitled to hold and claim his property, wherever he may be. If by any means a lynx-eyed anti-slavery public sentiment can continue, by the help of common law, to creep in among the rubbish of the Constitution, and rescue now and then a captive from the prison house, let no credit be claimed for the instrument on account of the exploits of the Liberty party. Let no credit be claimed for the intention was, to have made escape or rescue impossible. You would have it believed that the Constitution proclaims freedom either unqualified or qualified in the fugitive slave, from the District of Columbia, the territory of Florida, and all the new States, not formerly included in any one of the original thirteen States. But there is nothing of this in the Constitution. No such results can be obtained, except by some artifice of the common law taking advantage of verbal omissions in the instrument.

Again, you argue from the fact of northern anti-slavery sentiment having become so powerful, that comparatively few fugitives now reach a free State or are urged into slavery. Does the Constitution deserve any credit for the operation of causes which are not only out of itself, but operate in favor of freedom against the intentions of the Union? Surely not. Again, you plead that if, at worst, this clause of the Constitution is pro-slavery, it may be amended. Certainly it may be. It ought to be rejected and enforced by public opinion. Until then, it remains a part of the supreme law of the land; and the question is—Can a true abolitionist endorse it as it now stands, and swear to support it? The American A. S. Society answers emphatically, no. Does Liberty party answer, yes?

But then you deny that the clause is fairly capable of a pro-slavery construction. 1. Because such a meaning is not expressed in the provision. 2. Because the framers and adopters of the Constitution would not suffer it to be expressed. Why is not such a meaning expressed in the provision? Your answer is: 1st. The provision speaks of 'service or labor due.' But by the definitions of the southern slave codes, the slave is a chattel; and hence to predicate indebtedness of a slave is, in the light of those definitions, as absurd as to predicate it of a horse or a stone.' Right! Southern and southern slave codes declare that the labor of the chattel slave is due to his

whole Union. The more slaves, the more produce to employ the carrying trade: the more consumption of slave and the more of this, the more money for the common treasury.'

'Mr. Gerry thought we had nothing to do with the conduct of the States as to slaves, but ought to be careful not to give any sanction to it.'

'Mr. Dickinson considered it as indamissible on every principle of honor and safety, that the importation of slaves should be authorized to the States by the Constitution.'

'Mr. Rutlege.—If the Convention thinks that North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, will ever agree to the plan, unless their property in slaves be secured, or touched, the expectation is vain. The people of those States will never be such fools, as to give up so important a property.'

Mercupon

'Mr. Morris wished the whole subject to be committed, including the clauses relating to taxes on exports, and to a navigation act. *These things may yet prevent* a SANGUINE meeting the *Northern and Southern States.*'

The committal was made, the *bargain consummated*, and, the present Constitution recommended to the people. So much for the Madison Papers. Now, I appeal for proof they afford that the Constitution is not, and was not meant to be a *pro-slavery* Constitution.

I will not pursue the subject further. I have already multiplied words in vain. You pronounce the Constitution 'an anti-slavery instrument.' I pronounce it pro-slavery. I have, in vain, given you arguments, not only without conviction of their truth and pertinently, but with pain and mortification, as an abolitionist, to see a Liberty party man, a Christian man in a bad cause. I have given you the foregoing desultory views on the slave side. If they are to themselves entitled to any weight, I trust you will respect them, without any prejudice on account of the source from whence they come. And, respected friend, permit me to hope that the day is not distant when you will be willing to take a stand with the present position to that most righteous, though much slandered doctrine of the American Anti-Slavery Society, ☞ 'NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.'

Your unworthy friend,

ADIN BALLOU.

John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson.

Extract from a powerful speech delivered by John Quincy Adams, at a large meeting of his constituents at North Bridgewater, on Wednesday, Nov. 6, 1844. After reading a letter from Andrew Jackson to Gen. Robert Armstrong, in which 'the hero' accuses Mr. Adams of being 'a traitor to his country,' of occupying several months 'in preparing a tissue of deception for the public,' and, in fact, of forging a portion of his diary,' Mr. Adams calmly but impressively says:

Fellow-cit

we believe such union can exist only by the exercise of prayer and integrity.

Resolved, That we give no sympathy nor encouragement to either of the three political parties, regarding all are to the support of a pro-slavery Constitution, and supporting as they do for their leaders and candidates, men who are either slaveholders, or betrayers of the anti-slavery movement.

Resolved, That we very seriously recommend to our members, and to all who sympathize in our principles, to consider the relation they may sustain to the various ecclesiastical establishments of this country, and to act as, were they in the slave's condition, they would wish others to act.

Resolved, That we will make arrangements for public anti-slavery meetings, to be held quarterly in different parts of the town and vicinity through the year, the procuring of suitable places and lecturers to be left to the Board.

Resolved, That the assessors of the Rev. Mr. Peirce's Parish, in refusing the use of their meeting-house to us, and granting it to the three political parties to be used for electioneering purposes, have rendered themselves the enemies of free discussion, and *we do hereby* so be. They fear to shut out political opposition, though against their lectures the most popular outcry may have been raised against them, lest it should too materially affect the parish taxes, but we do not hesitate to exclude a small minority like ourselves, representing only the interests of a cause, in the success or failure of which the political interests of the country are involved.

HANNAH PIERCE, *President.*

MARY WESTON, *Rec. Secretary.*

THE LIBERATOR

BOSTON:

FRIDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 15, 1844.

The Grand Result.

The following States are already heard from, to an extent sufficient to ascertain the result in each, and the figures denote the number of Electoral votes to which they are respectively entitled:

	Clay.	Polk.
Pennsylvania,	26	
Ohio,	23	
Connecticut,	6	
R. Island,	4	
New-Hampshire,	6	
Maine,	9	
Massachusetts,	12	
Maryland,	8	
New-York,	36	
Virginia,	17	
N. Jersey,		7
North Carolina,		11
Michigan,		5
Georgia,		10
	71	109

Total number of Electoral votes 275. A majority is 138. The election of James K. Polk, as President of the United States, by an overwhelming majority, is beyond all doubt.

Polk's majority in Pennsylvania, is about 5000 in New-York, 6000—in Virginia, nearly 5000.

Massachusetts Election.

The result of the election in this State, on Monday last, has doubtless surprised all parties. The Whigs went into it under the most depressing circumstances. Their hopes, raised at one time to the highest degree of assurance of victory, in regard to their Presidential candidates, had been suddenly and utterly prostrated, and new energy and spirit infused into the bosoms of their opponents. But, defeat elsewhere, it appears, only served to increase their courage and determination in this new field of battle. The result is, beyond all astonishing triumph. They have chosen their Presidential Electors, their Governor and Lieutenant Governor, (last year there was no choice by the people,) seven Representatives in Congress, twenty-seven State Senators, (their opponents not one,) and one hundred and seven members of the House of Representatives, to only fifty-five democratic! Their clear nett gain in the State, since the last election, is not less than TEN THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED!

The Atlas of Tuesday morning, (by an arrangement, which, for precision and despatch, fills one with amazement, even in these times of swift conveyance and unparalleled enterprise,) presented to its readers FIFTY RETURNS OF VOTES IN THE WHOLE STATE—from Barnstable to Berkshire, from Boston to the Western, with the exception of six small towns, viz. —Hull, in Plymouth county—Shutesbury and Whately, in Franklin county—Wales, in Hampden county —and Egremont and Mount Washington, in Berkshire county.

For President, Clay has received 67,418; Polk, 12,846; Birney, 10,860. Hence, the Whig Electoral Ticket is chosen by a majority of 3,712, over the other two.

For Governor, the vote stands for Briggs, 69,038; for Bancroft, 54,189; for Swall, (Liberty party,) and all others, 9,664. Majority for Briggs over all others, 5,185. Last year, Briggs, 57,879; Morton, 54,242; Swall, at 8,911. Increase of the Whig vote this year, 11,159; decrease of the Democratic vote, 53; increase of the Liberty vote, 753. Briggs has received 1020 votes more than Clay; Bancroft, 1331 more than Polk; Swall 1106 *less* than Birney;—indicating, in the aggregate, a disregard of strict party discipline to the number of 4157 votes.

RECAPITULATION.

OF PRESIDENTIAL AND GUBERNATORIAL VOTES.

Clay. Polk. Birney. Briggs. Bancroft. Swall.					
Suffolk,	8778	4850	509	8778	4659	609
Essex,	9145	5259	1837	9670	5361	1757
Middlesex,	9581	9124	1713	9814	9343	1454
Worcester,	9359	7562	2147	9874	7696	1852
Hampshire,	3725	1605	626	3898	1676	595
Hamden,	3416	3593	451	3470	3625	413
Franklin,	2725	2947	423	2796	2107	341
Berkshire,	3636	3450	437	3750	3276	376
Norfolk,	5217	4287	838	5364	4383	765
Bristol,	4872	4903	644	4987	5155	555
Plymouth,	4440	3315	805	4603	3505	702
Barnstable,	2000	1415	254	2288	1422	243
Dukes,	292	265	24	306	261	27
Nantucket,	633	237	41	743	256	39
Total,	67,418	12,846	10,860	69,038	54,189	9,664

The whole State complete, except six towns—Clay 67,418, Polk 59,846, Birney 10,860, Briggs 69,038, Bancroft 54,189, Swall 9664.

CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION.

First District—Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, (Whig,) is re-elected by a majority of more than 3000 over all others.

Second District—Hon. Daniel P. King, (Whig,) is elected, says the Atlas. Other accounts say he lacks 50 votes.

Third District—Hon. Amos Abbott, (Whig,) is re-elected by 556 majority over all others.

Fourth District—No choice. Fisher, the present Democratic incumbent, has 6,463 votes; Thompson, (Whig,) 6,890; Scattering, 1,273.

Fifth District—No choice. Hudson, the present Whig incumbent, lacks about 400 votes of an election.

Sixth District—Hon. George Ashmun, (Whig,) is elected by about 600 majority over all others.

Seventh District—Hon. Julius Rockwell, (Whig,) is re-elected by about 550 majority over all others.

Eighth District—Hon. John Quincy Adams is re-elected by 1,832 votes over all others.

Ninth District—Hon. Marcus Morton, the present Democratic incumbent, has 6,179 votes; Hale (Whig) 5,606; Scattering, 1,070.

Tenth District—Hon. Joseph Grinnell, (Whig,) is re-elected by 1,764 majority over all others.

STATE SENATE. Whig Senators have been chosen in Suffolk, Essex, Worcester, Hampshire, Norfolk, Plymouth, Barnstable, Nantucket, Dukes counties. No choice in Bristol, Middlesex, Hampden, Berkshire.

CITY OF BOSTON. Briggs 8406, Bancroft 4430, Schilling 517.

Gov. Briggs' majority in the city of Boston over all others is 3459.

Gov. Briggs' majority in the city, last year, over all others, was 1945.

The net Whig gain, over last year, in the city of Boston, 1513.

Although mere lookers on, in regard to this election, we cannot refrain from expressing our gratification at the strong verdict which Massachusetts has given by it against the annexation of Texas. In this State more, perhaps, than in any other, the main issue between the two great political parties was on the tremendous question of annexing that stolen and slave-cursed republic to this Union. Notwithstanding the Democratic party, through their senators and representatives in the Legislature, had repeatedly, emphatically and unanimously denounced the project as highly dangerous, unconstitutional, and subversive of the integrity of the Union,—as soon as their idol, Martin Van Buren, was thrown overboard by the Baltimore Convention, and James K. Polk placed at the helm of American Democracy, they, with unexampled heroicity, astounding prodigacy and unblushing hardihood, at once hoisted the 'Lone Star,' and in all their processions, and on all other occasions, made it the symbol of their faith, and the grand object of their efforts. Awfully corrupt as is the political history of this country, no act of party hypocrisy and tergiversation can be found to match that. The overwhelming defeat which they have experienced is a righteous retribution upon them, for bowing the knee so basely to 'the dark spirit of slavery.' How have they polluted their lips with falsehood, and made their democratic pretensions a hissing, and covered themselves with shame! But let them repent, and become as zealous in the cause of liberty, as they have been in the service of southern tyrants.

The Liberty party, it will be seen, in despite of its great swelling speeches, its lofty pretensions, its sanguine predictions, its expensive and laborious efforts, has made no progress in this Commonwealth, in numbers, wealth, since the election last year. In November, 1843, the whole number of votes cast for Governor was 121,278; of which Liberty party had 8,911. At the recent election, the whole number given for Governor was 132,681, being an increase of 11,403 over that of last year; of which that party obtained 9,664. Relatively, therefore, it stands about where it stood in 1843. It has scarcely held its own in the other States. There must be a great deal of mortification felt, if very little be exhibited, by its leaders, especially by Messrs. Birney and Leavitt.

Liberty Party in Connecticut.

It is a trite adage, that there is but one step from the sublime to the ridiculous; but we have never seen it illustrated more palpably than in the pretensions of the Liberty party, as the rival of the Whig and Democratic parties, in constituting, as it does, a drop to the ocean, in comparison. We have been amused in reading some of the letters in the last number of the Hartford Freeman, announcing the result of the election in sundry towns in Connecticut. Thus:—'There are 6 Liberty voters in Waterford last spring 4.' Astonishing and unprecedented increase! Again:—'Westport, Nov. 4. Result—Liberty 4, Whigs 217, Democratic 190.' Formidable enough! Once more:—'The Liberty party in this town (So. Norwalk) is a fixed fact.' We have polled 26 votes.' Why, that is as many as there are States in the Union! Finally:—'Newtown, Nov. 4. Result—Liberty 5, Whig 219, Democratic 307.' The vote in Norwich stood, Liberty 86, Whig 875, Democratic 586; in Hartford, L. 44, W. 1500, D. 1052; in New Haven, L. 24, W. 1753, D. 1267; &c. &c. In the whole State, Liberty vote 1844, (last April 1971,) Whig 30,852, Democratic 27,786. [The reader will remember the fable of the frog endeavoring to inflate himself to the size of an ox.] The editor of the Freeman complacently says—'Our vote in this county has increased 5 from last spring. In New London county, our gain is 47, in Tolland county 10; in Fairfield county 3; in New Haven county 2. We have lost 62 votes in Windham county, 15 in Litchfield county, and 15 in Middlesex county.' Tremendous political progress! In view of which he says—'The Liberty party has most nobly sustained its position as an independent party;—we are full of hope and courage!' This is what is called advancing backward.

If this party movement were strictly a moral one, we should not speak of it as ridiculous in regard to its precisions—for, in that case, 'one could chase a thousand.' But as it is altogether a brute force, flesh and blood affair, dependant on numbers for its success, and scoffing as it does at 'moral suasion,' and at those who do not or will not use the blood-stained election franchise,—its importance is a proper subject for satire. The Liberty party began its career five years ago; and with the anti-slavery capital of fourteen years' accumulation, has not yet obtained more than 60,000 votes in the whole country.

Very Cool!

The following paragraph is from the Anti-Slavery Reporter, edited by Justin Tappan:

'Certain adherents of the old Anti-Slavery Society are laboring hard to make people believe that several members of the Executive Committee—before the separation took place—were guilty of a GRAND WRONG in regard to the disposal of the *Emancipator*, the disposal of the property, &c. when it is well known that the paper was valueless as a money affair, that the property was all sold towards paying the debts of the Society, and that the persons slandered paid the deficiency, several thousands of dollars, out of their own pockets.

It is not merely 'certain adherents' of the American Anti-Slavery Society, who impeach the trustworthiness of the old Executive Committee, but the Society itself, and its official organ. Whether the Emancipator was valueless, or not, as a matter of *sale*, is the gravamen of the charge against the Committee, in respect to the sum of great value; and its transfer, under the circumstances, was a mean, unwarrantable and dishonest act, cooting the Society thousands of dollars to establish another paper in its stead. If 'the persons slandered' have actually paid several thousands of dollars out of their own pockets, then all we have to say is—

I, it may be so—but where is the evidence? One who engaged in the conspiracy asks us to believe his unsupported, unofficial, unauthenticated, individual assertion, on this point! Why have the old Committees never submitted their accounts to the public? Let us see how much has been paid, and by whom, in a definite and authentic form. This is a reasonable demand, and until it be complied with, we are not bound to receive implicitly a statement so loosely made as that alleged to.

2. If it be so, it is no real justification of the conduct of the Committee, in transferring the property of the Society.

3. If 'the property was all sold,' how did it happen that, valued as it was by the conspirators at $18,350, 86, and the debts only at $6,580,74, it became necessary to pay several thousands of dollars in addition, to liquidate said debt?

4. If the conspirators 'caught a Tartar' in this transfer, and had to pay 'dear for their whistle,' *they had no idea that this would be the case*—not they! For, could they have seen the end from the beginning, they would not have done the deed. Hence, for them to parade the statement before the public, as indicative of their disinterested and generous conduct, that they had to pay something 'out of pocket,' is indeed to add insult to injury. It is not the first time that the cunning have been caught in their own craftiness, and the biters been bitten.

VERMONT. The following is the official count of the votes at the late election in Vermont, for Governor:

Slade, Whig,	28,265	
Kellog, Dem.	20,930	
Shaller, Lib.	5,618	
Slade's majority,	2,717	

'All Lies,' &c. The Boston Post says of Jas. K. Polk, in whose hands stolen human beings are found, and who is the presidential incarnation of slavery:

'He unites the capacity of a statesman to the *weightiness of the true christian!* Again, speaking to the rival candidates, it says—'People of Massachusetts, you must choose one of these two statesmen. Shall it be THE CHRISTIAN, [Polk!] or the declined [Clay?] Shall it be *the man of principle,* (!) or the political profligate?' The organ of the Democracy does not wear a mask, it is brazen his face, being *branded*, is incapable of being tinged with a blush of shame. They can read and swallow such panegyrics on the despoiler of the weak, the robber of the poor, the slave-owner and slave-driver, the buyer-kidnapper, the friend of the pirate, the friend of foot—a true emblem of the war-making divinity that is adored by nearly all Christendom—miscalled. It is not the Christian's God, but a God that delights in blood, and must go up and down accompanied by armed and bloody warriors. All around the church are brazen figures of saints, and of Christ and of Mary, and pictures of all kinds and classes of saints. Here and there confessional boxes. I feel much like breaking in upon them, and telling them what dupes the priests make of them; but they would not understand me, and most likely would take it as a mere ruse. I am writing on a kind of railing, a foot wide, near the priest, my cap lying beside me, my neck and bosom open, no handkerchief about my neck, and a large loose blouse on. The people seem to regard me as a hopeless case, and let me alone.

I am now standing in the spot where John Capistran stood and preached a crusade against the Turks, in 1451. He aroused the people, and the Emperor led tens of thousands down the Danube, over the Black sea, across to Palestine, to perish there. But why more of this delusion? It is right to take up arms at all, the Crusaders and the Mormons are right in saying they are to be used to convert this world to Christ.

Now looking at the monument of Frederick III Emperor, ornamented with numberless figures and coats of arms, built in 1467. On a scroll, under one of the sceptre in the hand of the effigy, is the device of the Emperor, a proud and haughty prince, meaning, '*It is for Austria to rule the earth.*' This Cathedral is said to be the most imposing specimen of Gothic architecture in the world. The building is 350 feet long and 220 wide. Some parts of the cathedral bear the date of 1147, but the greater part of it was completed in 1480. The tower, or steeple, was completed in 1433, and is 465 feet high from its base to its summit, all of stone. The Turks besieged Vienna in 1683, but they were repulsed by the assistance of Poland. The great bell in the tower, weighs 357 cwt. was made of 180 pieces of cannon, taken from the Turks at that time.

This immense steeple is of use for one purpose, and only one. About half way up it is a station for the *fire watch*, who tracks the whole city and suburbs. It is so constructed, that the exact spot where a fire breaks out may be made known to the watch below, and thence to the fire offices in a few minutes. Some use in this; but as to its being an offering acceptable to God, a cob-house of a little child is more acceptable. Under the cathedral are extensive charnel-houses, full of the bones of the dead of many generations. But none are now admitted to it, and properly. The bones of rich and poor, of prince and peasant, of king and beggar, are there thrown together. What a pleasant prospect for the rich and lifted and luxurious, who, Dives-like, pass sumptuously every day to dance and fare them to the sympathy of dogs? There are no distinctions of title, rank or wealth, among dead men's bones in a charnel-house. When any of the imperial family dies, the *bowels* are buried in St. Stephen's Cathedral, the *heart* in the Augustine, and the *body* in the vault of the Capuchins. Mark the meaning of this, unless it be the feeling among the people that the bowels, hearts and bodies of emperors and kings, those wholesale plunderers and butchers of the people, impart a glory and sanctity to the places of their deposit. Some years ago, a tribute them about to as many places as they can, that all may have the benefit of them. Or, it may be done to interest the priests and devotees at these different places to say prayers for the souls of the emperors, lest they should be in purgatory! If these prayers thus and there muttered over, are worth any thing, these spoilers need them above all others; for if the doctrine of purgatory be true, emperors and kings and aristocracy will find it hardest to get out, once they get in.

In a Coffee Room, 6 1-2 *o'clock.*

Have taken as much good bread and butter as I wished, and cold water in great abundance. For the whole I have paid 10 cents—as good and plentiful a breakfast as I could ever desire. I name this to show the cheapness of provisions here. All kinds of food of bread, meat and vegetables, are so abundant, and cheap; consequently, the poor, emaciated, starving men and women and children that throng the towns and cities of England, Ireland and Scotland, are unknown here. As I ate my bread and butter, a man beside me was reading in a German paper, an account of the feeling toward O'Connell in Germany, and Ireland, manifested in sending him and his fellow-prisoners provisions, and in the increase of the weekly contributions to the Repeal fund. There is a deep interest felt in O'Connell throughout Austria; and, indeed, throughout all Germany. I have seen but little of all the movements respecting him are published in all the leading newspapers. He lives more like a prince than a convicted felon. All seem to vie in expressions of sympathy for him. All feel that great injustice has been done to him personally, and that the trial by jury, in Ireland, has been made a great engine of oppression, and no surer test of guilt, than, in olden times, trial by fire, by water, or by combat.

Have just been looking at a monument near by, in a public square, with this inscription in Latin: '*Deo, Patri, Genitori.* To God, Father, and Creator.' Erecting monuments of stone to the eternal God! to that Being who is without beginning of days or end of years, and who, without change, is the same yesterday, to-day and forever! Especially, by those whose hearts are full of wrath and revenge towards men, and who are thirsting for the shedding of blood! But it matters not whether stone and brick be put together in the shape of a pillar or a church and steeple,—one emotion of love to an enemy, and of forgiveness in the heart of man, is more acceptable to Him.

9 o'clock. In a market, in an open ⌂

The articles for sale arranged along on the side walks. The sun pouring down an intense heat. On one side of the street are immense numbers of chickens, ducks, geese, pigeons, phesantes, hares and rabbits, sitting in the sunshine, by hundreds and hundreds and never did I see living creatures give such tokens of suffocation and misery. The sun pours its rays down upon them through the open work of their cages. They are trampling upon one another—the strong upon the weak—the living upon the smothered, each struggling to get their heads or their noses out, to get a breath of fresh air—the tongues of the ducks, geese, hens, pigeons, and hares, hanging out of their mouths, and they pant and moan, and seem the very picture of distress; and in every possible way trying to appeal to the stony hearts of their keepers to release them from their misery; and those keepers, instead of feeling for them, are beating them over their throat-out heads and necks, to keep them quiet. These poor, suffering creatures are brought here, and made to pass through all this, to feed man's perverted and gloated appetite for flesh and blood. But terribly are they avenged for the miseries men inflict on them, by the diseases which, arising out of these miseries, are carried into the stomachs and blood of their tormentors. When I see such things, my taste for animal food is swallowed up in my detestation for the wanton suffering inflicted to obtain it.

On the other side of the street are immense boxes of eggs; and the women are picking them over, in order to separate the good and bad; and to decide whether an egg be good or bad, they hold it up lengthwise over the eye and the sun. These market women and women are dressed in the garb of their country. They are all from Hungary, just landed. They came up the Danube in steam-boats. The men seem to have a remarkable taste for *metal buttons*, as their jackets in front are covered with them. The women have a short-gown and petticoat; the short-gown, as before and behind, like the men's jackets, abundantly supplied with metal buttons.

10 o'clock. Ambras Museum.

Formed by Ferdinand II., near the end of the 16th century (1560-70.) He obtained from his friends and contemporaries, rare manuscripts, suits of armor and other curiosities belonging to these illustrious personages, renowned in arms, attached to their courts and persons, including most of the famed knights and warriors of the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries. To many of these friends and Emperors, Ferdinand wrote autograph letters, which, with the replies, are here preserved—serving to prove that the armor and weapons actually came from the sources whence they are said to have come. This is, undoubtedly, the most authentic, extensive and interesting collection of armor' armor in the world. There are great variety of pistols, guns, rifles, cross-bows, spears, and other weapons; but what interests me is the variety of helmets, coats of mail, shields, gloves, and complete iron armor for horse and man. These suits of armor are on images arranged on horse or foot, around the rooms, and said to resemble the countenance, stature and make of those to whom they once belonged. The names of the persons are attached to the figures—their dates and country. There is no use to begin to name them. One I will name. The battle-axe, of Tomahawk, of Montezuma. From the appearance of the weapons, and the circumstances said to be connected with its being here, I see no reason to doubt that it was wielded by that Emperor of Mexico. I now hold the tomahawk in my hand, which, it may be, Montezuma wielded against Cortes when he struggled for his throne and his people. Of all the events recorded on the pages of this world's history, saving that which gives account of the birth, life, death and resurrection of Him who came to teach the world a lesson of Love and Forgiveness—who died for his enemies, and who says to all the human family, My little children, love one another—this history of wrongs committed on Mexico and Peru made the deepest impression on my youthful heart. I would, if I could, write a history of those scenes, and of the scenes enacted in New-England by the Puritans towards the Indians, as illustrative of that religion that is pelmed upon us as the true religion.

The sight of these suits of armor carries me back to the days of tilts and tournaments, of knights and squires, when profoundly holy, Christian men and women delighted their eyes with scenes of blood and mortal combat. But the same delight in blood exists in Christendom, only somewhat modified now, among priests and people, princes and peasants. Why else are bells rung, cannon fired, and thanksgivings put up for Bunker Hill, for Waterloo, and Ghuznee? But I feel melancholy, looking at these sorrowful memorials of human wrath and butchery! What ferocious giants those old fighters must have been! I can scarcely raise from the floor a suit of armor in which they performed their deeds of blood.

S. C. WHEELER, *Secy.*

THE WEYMOUTH ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR

Will be held at the WEYMOUTH LANDING, IN MIL WALES'S HALL, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Wednesday, the 19th and 20th of November. The Fair will close on Wednesday evening, 20th, with a MUSICAL ENTERTAINMENT, and a SUPPER. A large collection of very attractive, rare, low-priced, useful, and altogether desirable articles, will be exhibited. Mr. Garrison and other distinguished friends of the cause will be present.

MARY WESTON, }
SARAH H. COWING, } *Committee.*

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE RHODE ISLAND A. S. SOCIETY.

The 9th Annual Meeting of the Rhode-Island State Anti-Slavery Society will be holden at the 'New Mechanics' Hall,' in Washington Building, in Providence, commencing on the 19th and 20th, December 20, at 10 o'clock, A. M. and will continue in session two or three days.

Arrangements have been made to secure the attendance of a number of able and efficient speakers.

The Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society will furnish refreshments for those who attend the meeting. It is confidently expected that this will be a meeting of great interest, as a number of interesting and important questions will come up for consideration. Let the abolitionists of Rhode Island be there 'en masse.' To the friends in other States we say, come.

SALEM FEMALE A. S. SOCIETY.

The next lecture, in course, before this Society and the public, will be delivered on Sunday evening next by Charles Lenox Remond, in the Mechanic Hall.

ADELPHIC UNION LIBRARY ASSOCIATION.

The eighth course of Lectures before this institution will be delivered at the

TREMONT CHAPEL,
(OVER THE WASHINGTON ATHENÆUM,)

The course will commence on TUESDAY EVENING, November 19, with a Lecture from

REV. THEODORE PARKER, *of West Roxbury.*

Lectures may be expected from the following distinguished gentlemen, on the succeeding Tuesday evenings:

Wendell Phillips, Esq. Rev. John Pierpont,
Walter Channing, M. D. William Lloyd Garrison,
Rev. Samuel J. May, J. V. C. Smith, M. D.
H. I. Bowditch, M. D. Rev. Chandler Robbins,
Edmund Quincy, Esq. Paul H. Sweetser, Esq.
Rev. Caleb Stetson, Rev. James F. Clarke,
Edward Young, Esq.

To be followed by other gentlemen of talent and influence.

☞ Exercises will commence precisely at half past 7 o'clock.

Tickets for the course, admitting a gentleman and lady, 75 cents. Single tickets 50 cents—to be obtained at No. 25 Cornhill, at the Chronicle office, 7 Cornhill, and at B. H. Greene's Bookstore, 124 Washington-street, and at the door of the lecture.

WILLIAM C. NELL,
CHARLES A. BATTISTE,
ALFRED G. ELLIOT,
EDWARD B. LAWTON,
BENJAMIN WEBSTER,
WILLIAM W. RICH, } *Lecture Committee.*

TEETH—TEETH!

DR. PERKINS, SURGEON DENTIST,

WOULD inform his friends and the public that he has removed to No. 3 WINTER-STREET, corner of Washington-street, where he will be happy to attend to the calls of those who may favor him with their patronage. Dr. P. would call the attention of those wanting ARTIFICIAL TEETH to his mode of inserting them on GOLD PLATE and PALADIUM, upon the principle of ATMOSPHERIC PRESSURE, which is much the best method of filling *various teeth that ache, or that have their nerves exposed.* Those suffering from that excruciating pain (tooth ache) can be relieved in a few minutes, and then have their teeth filled and made useful for years. Dr. P. would respectfully refer to his patrons in Boston, if they will call upon him he will explain to them his mode of filling such teeth, and also refer them to many of his patrons who have been benefitted by his mode of practice.

Particular attention paid to FILLING TEETH particularly those in the front, in first and secondary during life, and also to the extracting of dead Teeth and stumps, which by their constant irritation and debilitating effects upon the constitution, produce many diseases and nervous affections, such as *Dyspepsia, Tic Doloreux, Headache, &c. &c.* All branches of the profession attended to, and all at the lowest rates.

☞ Dr. P. having had several years' experience in his profession, and *having reduced his charges from* 25 *to* 50 *per cent.* feels confident of giving entire satisfaction to those who may favor him with a call. To those unacquainted with him professionally the best of references will be given. *A liberal deduction made to those in moderate circumstances.*

Nov. 15 1y

APPEAL

OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE

ELEVENTH MASSACHUSETTS A. S. FAIR:

This Annual Bazaar deserves to be considered one of the institutions of the United States. Its object is, in the narrow sense of the word, to aid the oppressed by fostering to give our country credit accordingly. But it is to the credit of mankind at large, when any human being holds steadily to a holy purpose for eleven consecutive years, through good report and evil report; (the former often the most dangerous to holy purposes;) and, in the face of ridicule, and opposition, uninfluenced by the flow of time, which wears away so many good intentions. We therefore feel free, in asking that the Bazaar for the world's end it, and the world's benefit, to call upon all the world for aid as the time draws nigh. Especially to all abolitionists we appeal, in the words of Paul, 'I entreat you, true yoke-fellows, help those women which labored with me in the gospel, whose names are in the book of life.' For eleven years, neither treachery, nor selfish indulgence, nor vanity, nor forgetfulness, nor sinful self-distrust have had power over them to make them hold their names from the book of life and cheering existence. It is to them no self-denial now, no matter what they may once have enjoyed it, or however the novice in the work may consider it. All other emotions seem unsatisfactory, insufficient, and perversion.

Compared with those high feelings which inspire The givers of the gift of Liberty.'

What matters it to their hearts, or to the welfare of the slave, that what they do is little, if it be all they can? Is not the spirit of the giver, if it be the right spirit, still as significant of all that is good, and noble, and successful in life, as it was when the three friends of Job, assembled from the river side, drew it from the guarded well of Bethlehem, or when the Saviour bestowed his benediction upon all who offer it?

Let all, then, be up and doing. There are but about three months to pass between this time, and the week of the Fair. The prospect at present is that there will be a smaller, but more effective exhibition than on any former occasion. A little zeal and diligence will remedy the deficiency in quantity, and give the amount equal to the beauty of the contributions. We heartily thank each and all, 'Jointly and severally' of the friends who are delighted interest in the anti-slavery enterprise. It is not a sect, but a UNION: not a creed, but a PRINCIPLE: not a party, but a CAUSE. Address, Mrs. Chapman, 140 Nassau-st. New-York, Office of the American Anti-Slavery Society; or 25 Cornhill, Boston, Office of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.

☞ The LIBERTY BELL, our little Anti-Slavery annual, will be published as usual, at the time of the Fair. All of whom we have promise of contributions for it, either Literary or Pecuniary, (if who feel moved to aid it in either way, are requested to write or send *immediately*, to Mrs. Chapman, 29 Summer-street, Boston, as only an early preparation can ensure a satisfactory completion. ☞ The names of writers are indispensable.

MIDDLESEX COUNTY.

The annual meeting of the Middlesex County A. S. Society will be holden at the Town Hall in Cambridgeport, on Tuesday, the 26th instant, at 10 o'clock, A. M. and will continue in session during the day and evening. It is hoped that the friends of the cause in the slaves' welfare, or regard the honor and prosperity of their country, will be present.

S. C. WHEELER, *Secy.*

ANTI-SLAVERY LECTURE.

'GARRISONIAN ABOLITIONISM.' Mr. Leavitt has an editorial article in the Emancipator of this inst. with this caption, which commences thus:—Hon. Daniel P. King is the Whig candidate for re-election to Congress in district number two. The only acts relating to slavery which he is known to have done since he was first elected, are to give $5 to the Massachusetts Society for Promoting the Gospel among the Wild, a slaveholder, for speaker.' This is not the first nor the second time that Mr. Leavitt has made this contemptible and malignant fling at Mr. King and the Mass. A. S. Society, for an evil purpose. What foundation has he for the charge, now, more than before? Read the letter, addressed to Mr. Leavitt, and put into his hands on the very day of the publication of his article, but which, after promising that he would give it an insertion, he has meanly suppressed up to the present hour. But this is immaterial to the course.—We shall notice Mr. L's article in all its points in another number—silly as it is.

HON. DANIEL P. KING, and that $5.

MR. LEAVITT:

In August of last year, the Treasurer of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society acknowledged, in his regular monthly receipts, five dollars from DANIEL P. KING, which was received among the money.

One would suppose that so simple a fact as this would not have been seized upon, on anniversary occasions, in disparagement of that Society, and of the Liberator, or as evidence of a coalition between them and the Whig party. As circumstances often have an important influence in making up our judgment of facts, I will state them in reference to this very trifling affair, which, I think, cannot but alter the construction which you have put on it.

In the course of my travels to obtain subscriptions and donations for the Liberator, I called on Mr. Abner Sanger, of Danvers, a well-known friend of the cause. Among other persons whose names were given me by Mr. S. as one who would, if I should call upon him, I did not know, and whom I should never have thought of in this connexion. Being some distance from his house, Mr. S. kindly took me into his carriage, and rode with me to Mr. King's farm; calling on some mutual friends on our way. By stating my business to him, *Mr. King immediately expressed a strong dislike to the Liberator and to Mr. Garrison*, the main cause of which was his having recommended the abolitionists in District No. 2, not to vote for the Whig candidate; and declared he would give nothing for Liberty purposes. On the contrary, he was so decidedly hostile to the Liberator, that I gave up all hope of obtaining any thing from him, and regretted that I had named the subject in his presence. The conversation turned on other points, in which Mr. Sanger took the principal part. As we were about separating, Mr. King, who was sitting in his carriage, said, in persisting in his determination to give nothing *to the Liberator*, handed Mr. S. a bill, remarking, '*If you want five dollars for the cause, and it will do any good, you are welcome to it!*' Mr. S. handed it to me, and, as a manner of conversation, mentioned the sum to be entered to the Massachusetts A. S. Society. But Mr. King gave it *to the cause*, without any other mention of the purposes to which it should be devoted. Mr. Sanger will, I think, attest to the truth of this statement.

E. SMITH.

Boston, Nov. 7, 1844.

FIRE. About half past 1 o'clock on Tuesday morning, a fire broke out in the extensive Drug Store of Mr. Bartholomew, in Faneuil Hall Market, on the east side of Faneuil Hall, which in a few minutes was in a blaze, and sent its light all over the city. The building, with its contents, was entirely lost in the cellar, was consumed. The stock we have heard estimated at $25,000, and probably this is below its value. We have not learned the extent of insurance. The grain. The story run through the city that Faneuil Hall had been set on fire, and a vast number of people were on the ground. We did not learn how the fire originated.—*Boston Daily Mail, Tuesday.*

A FORGERY. James G. Birney has declared, under his own signature, that the letter, said to have been sent by him to A. Garland, is a base forgery.

☞ Remember the Fair at Weymouth on Tuesday and Wednesday next. Also the meeting of the R. I. Anti-Slavery Society at Providence on Wednesday.

POETRY.

[The following are metrical translations of the prayer of PLACIDO, the extraordinary young colored poet of Havana, written by him in prison, and recited by him in passing from the prison to the place of execution, the last stanza having been pronounced immediately before he expired. He was shot on a charge of having engaged in a slave conspiracy.]

From the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter.

TO GOD.

A PRAYER. *Translated from the Spanish.*

Almighty God, whose goodness known to bound,
To thee I flee in my severe distress:
O let thy potent arm my wrongs redress,
And rend the odious veil by slander wound
About my brow. The base world's arm confound,
Who on my front would now the seal of shame impress.

God of my sires, to whom all kings must yield,
Be thou alone my shield; protect me now!
All power is His, to whom the sea doth owe
His countless stores; who clothed with light heaven's field,
And made the sun and air, and polar seas congeal'd,
All plants with life endow'd, and made the rivers flow.

All power is thine: 'Twas thy creative might,
This goodly frame of things from chaos brought,
Which unsustain'd by thee would still be nought,
As erst it lay deep in the womb of night,
Era thy dread word first called it into light;
Obedient to thy call it lived, and moved, and thought.

Thou know'st my heart, O God, expressly wise,
Tho'ne'ye all-seeing cannot be deceived;
By these my innocent soul is clear perceived,
As objects gross are through transparent skies
By mortal ken. Thy mercy exercise,
Lest slander foul exalt o'er innocence aggrieved.

But, if 'tis fixed by thy decree divine
That I must bear the pain of guilt and shame,
And that my foes this cold and senseless frame
Shall rudely rent with scorn and shouts malign;
Give thou the word, and I my breath resign,
Obedient to thy will. Blest be thy holy name!
Leominister. A. P.

Another Translation.

Being of boundless pity! God of mighty power!
To thee my plaint I breathe in agonizing hour.
O'er me thine arm omnipotent, O God, extend;
From calumny's vile face the veil of justice rend;
Nor let the odious brand of infamy remain,
With which the world desires my hated brow to stain.

O King of kings! and my forefathers' God! attend;
For thou alone, my God, my honor canst defend.
All power is thine, who to the shaded sea hast given
Fishes and floods; currents to air; to vaulted heaven
Its flight; front to the North; warmth to the sunny beams;
Life to the teeming earth, and motion to the streams.

Thou canst do all things. For the whole creation
dies,
Or quick revives again, at mandate from the skies.
Out of these all things, Lord, reduced to naught would be,
Engulphed in the abyss of vast eternity!
Yet non-existence, if by thy sovereign will obeys,
Since from its empty bosom sprang the human race.

Thou know'st I can't deceive thee, God of clemency!
And, since thy wisdom infinite, thy searching eye,
Piercing my mortal flesh, my inmost soul can see,
Which, to thy view, shows the clear air's transparency,
Forbid that, while o'er limbled innocence she stands,
Accursed calumny should clap her bloody hands.

But, should thy sovereign will, supremely wise, ordain,
That I, as victim of unrighteous wrath, be slain,
And that with frantic joy malign, my eager foes
My cold and mangled corpse to infamy expose,
Pronounce the awful word, and bid them shed my blood!
Fully in me thy will accomplish, O my God!
London. H.

MISCELLANY

☞ The following vindication is to be regarded as entirely satisfactory on the specific charges referred to, which have been brought against Mr. Himes.

From the Boston Morning Post.

TO CHARLES G. GREENE, Esq.:

SIR—The following article was prepared originally for the Advent Herald, but as you have generously offered me the use of it place in the Post, I thankfully avail myself of the opportunity. The insertion of it in your columns will truly make the *amende honorable.* Perhaps it may be the means of preventing gross and secular press, who have given circulation to the slanderous reports relative to my character, will be as prompt and honorable in doing me the same justice.

Respectfully yours, &c., JOSHUA V. HIMES.

Boston, Oct. 31, 1844.

Second Advent — Mr. Himes's Statement.

TO THE PUBLIC:

I have been unwilling to obtrude my private affairs upon the attention of my fellow-citizens, but having been grossly assailed by some of the presses of this city, and suffering in my reputation by the going out which is falsely and maliciously published, and ing that all good and candid citizens will be disposed to give their attention to the testimony I may present; and that, upon the strength of my religious faith may be, they will award me the same justice they would ask for themselves under the same circumstances.

The Boston Post, speaking of us, says—

'We have attended their meetings, and owe it to truth to say, that we sincerely believe the Principal agents in producing this excitement are unprincipled men; men who care little for the feelings or the opinions they inculcate, and entirely reckless of the injury they inflict, if they can only turn the evil to their pecuniary advantage.'

By similar unjust statements, in some of the other papers, and by the more private falsehoods which have been busily circulated, the populace have been excited, so that we were denied the privilege of meeting in our own house of worship, according to the dictates of our conscieuces, without being interrupted by some of the far-famed lovers of good order who inhabit this city.

At first, I was not inclined to give any heed to the slanders and gossip in circulation; but these rumors have become so magnified, and it appears so though

'Every one who heard them had added something new,
And every one who told them, made additions too—
On every ear they spread; on every tongue they grew.'

I have been represented as dishonest, speculating out of the fears of the unbelieving, a disturber of the peace, as duping the unsuspecting, and obtaining money under false pretences,—soliciting it for public purposes, and appropriating it to private uses. I have been reported as having absconded, not only to England, but also both to Canada and Texas; and also as being liable to arrest under warrants already issued; as having been arrested in Lowell, and in Leverett-street jail, and as having committed suicide; and it has also been said that I have accumulated great wealth, by my speculations in jewelry, and possess farms and hold money at interest. Such and similar stories have been very industriously put in circulation to blast my character, vilify my motives, and falsify my actions.

To all this I would say, that if I have wronged or defrauded any man, I will restore him four-fold; and if any have been thus defrauded, let my property which I have solicited from them, or if I have ever advised them, in public or in private, to any course by which they have been unnecessarily exposed, be appropriated to make their case known to the public. And those who may have embarrassed themselves by acting contrary to my advice, in purchasing and trading, cannot reflect upon me. Also, if I have made any thing which is not consecrated to the advent cause, the public shall be welcome to it. All 'registers of deeds' are therefore requested to enter my real estate on record at their respective offices; and all holders of any goods from me, at interest, are requested to report the same to the public. The friends of this cause have been very generous in their assistance, and my books at the office are kept by faithful and tried men, who have the management of my affairs, and the manner in which I have conducted my business. The receipts from donations, and disbursements of the same, are recorded with the same care, as they are at the Missionary rooms, or at the offices of the Tract and Bible Societies, &c. My books, which belong to the opposition in spirit of all proper or interested persons, show that not only the donations to the cause have been faithfully disbursed, in accordance with the wishes of the donors, but that also the very earnings of my office, which belong to the Advent Herald, and of the publication and sale of books, have been appropriated to the advancement of the advent cause.

My deposits have been made at the Merchants' Bank, and if I have had money deposited there in a large amount, or due me, it cost me more money and than the regular transaction of my business would naturally render necessary, the officers of that bank are requested to make it public. My printers, bookbinders, stereotypers, lithographers, paper makers, &c., are none of them connected with the advent cause, and are among the most respectable business men in Boston, and to the public they can, in truth, vouch, as Messrs. Grant & Daniels, Dow & Jackson, Geo. Curtis, Wm. H. Hill, Thayer & Co., Georgia Good, &c., to ascertain if my business transactions, with each and all of them, have not been of the most upright and honorable character, and whether, in all their intercourse with me, I have manifested a character like that which these slanders, if true, would fasten upon me. And I also wish to refer the public to my agents and friends in Rochester and Buffalo, N. Y., Cincinnati, Ohio, and, in this city, in all of which places are depots of our publications, the proceeds of which, to the amount of some thousands of dollars, it is well known have been appropriated to the advancement of the cause, and not to my personal benefit.

In relation to the reports so generally circulated by the 'press' and rumors, as the 'Fruits of Millerism'—of insanity, suicides, and the breaking up of families, with poverty, distress, &c., as a general thing, we know, from personal observation and extensive correspondence, that they are, most of them, unfounded; and those which have any semblance of truth, are greatly distorted and exaggerated. That there have been cases of extravagance, as in all great movements, no one will deny; but these have been caused by influences over which we had no control, and which, if they had, we have ever entered our most solemn protest. And although in this late movement, many have left their secular callings, yet it is well known to the adventists that this course has been contrary to our whole advice and our teachings while we have been engaged in this cause. When we have found those who thought they could not consistently continue their business, that they might the better prepare for the coming of the Lord, we advised them to make the most judicious arrangements, and have themselves been embarrassed by the cares of the world, but in all cases we exhorted them to fulfil every obligation to their fellowmen, as well as to their God. And should there be found cases of poverty or distress among us, provision has been made in the respective towns and cities for the supply of their wants, by our advent friends, who will not permit such to be dependant upon the scorners of our hope. I thus throw open my whole heart to the severest scrutiny, and shrink from no investigation, before any tribunal, human or divine.

As a specimen of the statements which are in circulation, I give the following article, which appeared as editorial in the Boston Post of Saturday morning, Oct. 26th:

"*Brother Himes.*"—A correspondent has furnished us with some facts illustrating the selfishness of the leaders of the Millerite delusion. The wife of an aged colored man has given $2000 to the cause, and left her family poor. A grocer on Pleasant-street disposed of about $500 in the same way, and a carpenter on the Tremont road gave a like amount—all be had. Himes, it is said, has disposed of considerable quantities of old jewelry and silver "on purchase," at different stores in the city where they deal in such articles. Several women who kept boarding-houses have been induced to dismiss their former lodgers and take in second adventists, free of cost, and have thereby greatly embarrassed, if not completely ruined themselves, in a pecuniary point of view. It is said that Himes preached somewhere in the city last Sunday; but he and his followers are very secret about their places of meeting. The public indignation is so much excited against Himes, that we think it would not be prudent for him to give a general notice of his movements.'

The above article contains two sets of dark charges, viz:

1. That the wife of a colored man has given to the cause $2000, and left his family poor.

2. That a grocer on Pleasant-street disposed of $500 in the same way.

3. That a carpenter on Tremont road had given a like amount, and left his family.

4. That I have disposed of considerable quantities of old jewelry, &c., at different stores.

5. That several women who had boarding-houses have been solicited to dismiss their lodgers, to their embarrassment, if not ruin. And,

6. That we are secret about our places of meeting.

We wish to use no hard language respecting those who speak ill of us, but we do think it entirely unjustifiable in any way; we only ask of them simple JUSTICE. We cannot believe that Mr. Greene, the editor of the Boston Post, would knowingly publish falsehoods respecting us; and we still believe that when he shall see the truth in the case, he will be prompt to make the '*amende honorable.*'

In order to the refutation of these respective charges, I will present the following correspondence and testimony:

Dear Bro. Himes—On reading the above article in the Boston Morning Post, I determined, as I supposed you would have no time or disposition to notice the reports in circulation, being continually engaged in the discharge of your responsible duties, to ferret out and ascertain the truth of the charges therein made. I informed Mr. Greene that they were false, who kindly offered to publish a correction. In ascertaining the truth of these charges, I have learned that certain individuals, whose names need not be made public at this time, have conspired against you, and are endeavoring to find cases of disaffection among those who have professed to be friendly, or have aided the cause by their means or influence. I find, that the conspirators intended individuals to testify against you, that they might sustain a criminal action on the charge of your having obtained their property by false pretences. But they have failed; and those importuned are indignant at such a vile and malignant conspiracy to destroy your reputation. As a witness of a portion of this account, I will lay before you the following correspondence, which you are at liberty to use as you please.

Yours, &c., S. BLISS.

Boston, Oct. 30, 1844.

FIRST CHARGE.

The case of the colored man who has been impoverished.

Bro. Wm. Riley—A report has been busily circulated that you have left your family poor, by giving to the advent cause, a large sum of money. The 'Congregational Journal,' of Oct. 17, publishes it as of one 'engaged in purchasing new and hand clothing, and in repairing and selling it.'

The 'Boston Post,' of Saturday morning, October 26th, says, that 'the wife of an aged colored man has given $2000 to the cause, and left her family poor.' I therefore wish to inquire whether you know of any one among your colored brethren, being in such a 'pecuniary' condition, as those stories can have reference? Also, have you ever contributed any of the adventists for money? Have you ever given, of late, any thing or money, any amount of money? And, also, how much have you given to them?

Yours, &c., S. BLISS.

Boston, October 28, 1844.

Bro. Bliss—I know of no one else to whom these stories can have reference, unless it be myself, because quite a number have been to me to inquire about it, and wanted I should go to the Mayor. Bro. Himes, nor any of the adventists ever came to me for money. I had, four years ago, about $1800, which my wife had the care of. Since that we have had sickness, and five deaths in our family, and, as a family, we have not been as prudent as we might have been in our expenses, so that it is now gone; but I own my house, worth, with the lot, $1400, and have a stock of goods at 22 Brattle-street, and don't owe a dollar on them, and am not suffering. My wife and I gave three dollars and twenty-five cents, and since then all we have given to any of the adventists, or the cause, is occasionally a little in the penny collections. I am sorry that I have not been able to give as little; I have paid more for other religious causes. As we cannot write, our daughter has written this for us as we have directed her, but we have felt willed to write our names to this, and we will sign our marks.

WM. RILEY. ✕
ELIZABETH RILEY. ✕

I have written the above as my parents directed.
SARAH JACKSON.

I am witness to the above.
JAMES NELSON.

BOSTON, OCT. 28, 1844.

His wife's daughter by a former husband.

If there is any other colored man about whom such stories are current, will any responsible man give the *facts* over his own name, to the public.

SECOND CHARGE.

The Case of a Grocer in Pleasant-street.

Bro. J. Buffum—In the 'Boston Morning Post' of the 26th instant, an allusion is made to 'a grocer on Pleasant-street,' who disposed of about $500 to the advent cause, and which is published as a fact illustrating the selfishness of the leaders of the second adventists. As you closed your store for a few days, as such a story is current respecting yourself, and as you are the only one on Pleasant-street to whom allusion can be made, will you inform me whether any of the 'leading adventists' have solicited any thing from you, or whether they have received any thing, to any amount, from you, without giving you an equivalent? Will you also inform me whether you know of any one in your street besides yourself, to whom that allusion can apply?

Yours respectfully, S. BLISS.

Boston, Oct. 28, 1844.

Bro. Bliss—In reply to yours of the 26th instant, I remark, that the grocer alluded to in the 'Post' must be myself, as I am the only grocer in this street who is, to my knowledge, an adventist. I have never given for the advent cause, nor do I always give for religious purposes before I was an adventist. I have never been solicited by them for money or any thing else. I have never, since I have been an adventist, except on one occasion, 'when I handed him 50 cents for bro. Jones; nor have I suffered at all, in myself or family, by my connexion with the advent faith.

JOSHUA BUFFUM.

Boston, Oct. 28, 1844.

THIRD CHARGE.

The case of a Carpenter on the Tremont Road.

Bro. J. Evans—The 'Post' of the 26th instant asserts that 'a carpenter on the 'Tremont road' has given away $500,' all he had, to the advent cause. As you are doubtless the one referred to—being the only carpenter on that road who has been particularly interested in the advent cause—permit me to inquire if the 'leaders' of this cause have ever solicited any donations from you, or whether they have ever received such from you? If so, whether there is any one else to whom that allusion can be made?

Respectfully yours, S. BLISS.

Boston, Oct. 28, 1844.

Bro. Bliss—In reply to your inquiries, I would say that the reference in the 'Post' is doubtless to myself, and I have no reason to inquire about it; but I have never given any large sum, for any advent cause—not twenty dollars a year for the last five years, and never have given for religious purposes; and the story is not true. The leaders of the cause have never solicited me for money. JOHN EVANS.

Boston, Oct. 28, 1844.

FOURTH CHARGE.

The disposal of old jewelry at 'different stores.'

Messrs. Davis, Palmer & Co.—Sirs:—In the 'Boston Post' of Saturday morning, I see a article headed '*Brother Himes*,' in the following paragraph:

'Himes, it is said, has disposed of considerable quantities of old jewelry and silver "on purchase" at different stores in the city where they deal in such articles.'

As I also currently reported in this city, that Bro. Himes has disposed of immense quantities of jewelry,—

As in the advent cause, as well as in the missionary, Bible, and all other religious causes, some old articles of jewelry have occasionally been given in, and as all which has been purchased in this city of the Advent Herald, or by Bro. Himes, has been disposed of at your stores, will you have the goodness to inform me of the probable amount which you have purchased of him, or from his office, during the past six months, or even during the last five years? And also whether such purchases have been greater than you are in the habit of making of other persons?

Yours respectfully, S. BLISS.

Boston, October 28, 1844.

Mr. S. Bliss: Sir—In reference to the purchase by us of old jewelry, &c., from yourself or Mr. Himes, we can only say that we are almost daily in the practice of buying small quantities which do not appear on our books, unless we have open accounts with the parties who bring it in. Never having kept any account of purchases made from you, it is impossible to state precisely how much you have sold us during the time specified; but we have no recollection of having bought a single lot during the past six months, and do not believe that the amount of two hundred dollars' worth has been offered us by Mr. Himes, yourself or your friends, during the past five years.

Respectfully yours,
DAVIS, PALMER & CO.

Boston, Oct. 28, 1844.

If there are any other dealers in jewelry who have made purchases of me, they are requested to state the facts to the public.

FIFTH CHARGE.

Inducing 'several women' to relinquish their boarders, to their pecuniary embarrassment.

Sister Hedge—The 'Post' of Saturday morning, the 26th instant, published that 'several women, who kept boarding houses, have been induced to dismiss their former lodgers, free of cost, and have thereby greatly embarrassed, if not completely ruined themselves in a pecuniary point of view.'

As you are the only adventist in the city who, to my knowledge, has dismissed her boarders, will you inform me whether any of the 'leaders' have ever persuaded, or attempted to persuade, you to any such course, and if you have been actuated by the advice of others? Will you also inform me, if you have been in any way 'embarrassed' by the 'inducements' of 'adventists?'

Respectfully yours, &c., S. BLISS.

Boston, Oct. 28, 1844.

Bro. Bliss—As you are doubtless correct in supposing me the only lady in the city who has seen fit to dismiss her boarders, and received no pecuniary aid of the advent, I must be the person referred to in the 'Post.'

In reply to your questions, I have never, in any instance, thought it necessary to inquire of the public whether I had the right or ability to take boarders or introduce into my family, or whether I should do them. Nor have I been solicited or influenced by the leaders, or any other person, but have in this matter acted independently of any one.

It will be time to say I am embarrassed by so doing when I fail to meet my bills, or pay my rent.

Yours, respectfully,
ELIZABETH G. HEDGE.

Boston, Oct. 28, 1844.

If there are any other ladies to whom the statement in the 'Post' has reference, will they inform the public of the true state of the case?

SIXTH CHARGE.

That we are secret in our places of meeting.

To this I would reply, that since our meetings at the Tabernacle have been disturbed, we have held meetings in our own dwellings, at different places; but that they are secret is as true as all the other charges in the foregoing article. Thus the chapter of '*facts*,' illustrating the selfishness of the leading adventists, vanishes into thin air. And if these *facts* are demonstrated to be thus groundless, what must their *fancies* be? Let the candid public judge.

I should gladly have given the testimony here been published in the Olive Branch, and the Times, of this city, and in the Congregational Journal, of Concord, N. H., and also in several other papers, which we have on file; but I fear that they will be disposed to make due and seasonable reparation.

The papers have endeavored to make considerable out of a case of sickness in this city, referred to in the following correspondence:

Sister Holbrook—As various rumors are afloat, in the papers and elsewhere, respecting your husband's having been injured by his 'Millerite' principles, as they term it, will you inform me whether his derangement has been caused by it? the report having been circulated to the injury of Mr. Himes and others.

Yours, &c., S. BLISS.

Boston, Oct. 28, 1844.

Bro. Bliss—Yours of to-day is received. In reply to yours, respecting my husband, I would say that his illness cannot be justly attributed to the doctrine of the advent. For several years he has had turns of partial derangement, and at times very violent, which he has never been particularly excited in reference to the advent, but has been a believer in it for some years. He has not been particularly interested in the advent meetings since the end of 1843. He attended a Methodist campmeeting at Eastham in August, and came home somewhat excited; but it is not unusual for his derangement, greatly troubled lest he should be called to pay for the use of the tent, which he was weakly willing to take him again; and his business, *white lead* painting, has been very prejudicial to his health,—all of which, I think, have been the cause of his presentiths one present, and which have nothing to do with the doctrine of the advent, as has been published in the papers. My husband is not a member of the church, nor attends with me in certifying to the same.

Yours, &c., SUSAN HOLBROOK.

I concur in the above statement of my daughter.
HUGH F. LOUGE.

Boston, Oct. 28, 1844.

A bro. Williamson, in Medford, has been reported as having committed suicide, and left his family destitute:—He informs us that ten ship carpenters board at his house, who would not, if the family were very destitute, leave it; that Mr. Williamson, on whose body the coroner went *twice* to sit, is still very happy in looking for the Lord. Bro. Wyatt, of Dover, who has been reported to have poisoned his dead child, is also still well. Every other case of suicide and death that we have been able to trace—not excepting the two children which froze to death one night near Philadelphia—are equally false, and also every story about ascension robes, etc.

We have not thought best to notice, as yet, much of the foregoing which has appeared in the Boston papers: but one respecting a large package of bills received from Adams & Co., may mislead some. We will therefore present the following:

Messrs. Adams & Co.:—As there are various rumors in the city, respecting a large package of bank bills you received from Philadelphia, Sunday morning, the 20th inst., addressed to J. V. Himes, and which you deposited in the Boston Bank for safe keeping: will you have the kindness to give me the particulars of that case, that the public may better judge respecting its truth?

Respectfully yours, &c., S. BLISS.

Boston, Oct. 28, 1844.

Mr. S. Bliss—We received the package to which you refer, at the time specified. We supposed it was valuable, as it was sealed with a gold seal, and opened it with our other valuable packages in the bank for safe keeping, as is our custom, on the Sabbath. On Monday morning we delivered it to Mr. Himes, as you opened it in our presence, and it contained nothing but a single letter and a few newspapers.

ADAMS & CO.
C. HASKELL.

Boston, October 28th, 1844.

The above refers only to a small portion of the slander circulated against myself and other adventists. I have no time to notice them all now; but if any responsible person, knowing to any *facts* respecting them, will first inform me of the same, or cause over their own signatures, they will oblige myself and the public. Men always judge from a knowledge of facts; or, they judge out of their own hearts; and because we are selfish, they think we are *selfish* motives which would prompt themselves to embark in an unpopular cause, they judge that others must be actuated by the same. Those, therefore, who will be instrumental in circulating slanders respecting others, without endeavoring to ascertain the truth, only show to the world the true state of their own hearts.

I have seen fit, in the fear of God, to embark in the Advent cause. I am entitled to the same rights as are all peceeable citizens. I have published the several papers published by myself during the last four years, are open to the inspection of all; and if a sentiment is there found which reflects on myself, at variance with the welfare of my fellow-men, I bow to the sentence a just God may pass. It is for 'the hope and resurrection of the dead that I am called in question' and because I have continued 'unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses do say should come.' I have been assailed by the vilest slanders the father of lies could invent. But when men are found to resort to falsehood to oppose the truth, they show an utter absence of argument; and only strengthen the position they thus assail. In this whole movement, I have never expected to avoid calumny. My Master has told me that the world will hate you; 'and the that will life godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.' But he has also said, 'Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you, *falsely*, for my sake; rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven.' I shall therefore consider it an honor from God, if I am counted worthy to suffer shame for his name; and whatever trials He may have in store for me, He has said, 'My grace is sufficient for thee.'

In behalf of myself and associates,
JOSHUA V. HIMES.

Boston, Nov. 1, 1844.

From the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter.

The Martyr Poet Placido.

We have to express our obligations to our friends in different parts of the country, for kindly furnishing us with metrical translations of the Spanish verses inserted in our last—the prayer of Placido. The version which occupied the last honor, and almost the last breath, of this condemned man, are now transfused into the English language, and will, we have no doubt, be read with interest by many. The *Heraldo*, a Madrid paper, in giving an account of his execution, styles him 'the celebrated poet, Placido;' and adds, 'this young man, with great natural genius, and was beloved and appreciated by the most respectable young men of Havana, who united to purchase his release from slavery. After accomplishing all with ambitious projects, and saying that, in the last conspiracy, he was intended for king, the *Heraldo* proceeds:—'The poet Placido was apprehended, and after a long hearing, was conducted to the condemned chapel. He manifested in it a serenity truly admirable. In his solitary interests, he composed the prayer which we copy below. In passing from his prison to execution, he walked, reciting with a plaintive yet firm voice, these sorrowful verses; and, according to persons who write to us, he was so resigned at his death, the last stanza was pronounced immediately before he expired. His last words were, 'Adios, mondo, adios, Habana, adios, Cuba, adios, Cruz, Adios, O world! here is no pity for me. Soldiers, fire!'

He suffered the pains of death at 6 o'clock in the morning. The persons executed were—Gabriel de la Concepcion Valdes, known by the name of Placido; Jorge Lopez Santiago Pimienta, Jose Miguel Roman, Andres Dodge, Pedro Torres, Manuel Columon, Francisco Javier, Jose de la O, (the initial only given,) Bruno, and Miguel.

It may be interesting to our readers to know, that Placido, from his early acquaintance with, and a poet with whom, and his writings, they are in some degree familiar. He was, we believe, the author of the compositions published a few years ago under the title of *Poems by a Cuban Slave*, and edited by Dr. Madden. The volume contains some interesting particulars of his life. The Spanish papers, of course, endeavor to cover him with infamy as a 'convicted conspirator,' and as one of the principal instigators of the late revolt; but we are not bound to believe any man guilty upon such evidence. Whether it were so or not, however, we may be allowed to express our regret that so gifted a man, whose gellius threw a ray of hope upon the dark lot of his oppressed race, should have been brought to so premature and tragical an end.

The letter which we copied into our last from the correspondent of the *Morning Herald*, contained a direct charge against Mr. Turnbull, of having, while he was consul in Cuba, intentionally sown the seeds of the conspiracy. We have inquired about this in the last number, we refer to it again for the sake of more distinctly and closely connecting together the charge and the contradiction.

BOOKS.

MIGHT AND RIGHT, by a Black Islander, This work gives a faithful History of troubles in Rhode Island, and is emphatically what it purports to be.
Dr. Child's Letters from New-York.
Do. Mother's Book.
Life of Fellen.
Selections from Fenelon, by Mrs Follen.
Criminal History of the English Government
Whitehead's life of Wesley.
American Chemist.
Bible Quadrupeds.
American Constitutions.
Dr. Shurtleff on Water Cure.
Dr. Alcott's Works.
The Physiological and Phrenological Works of Fowler.
Pictorial Bible.
Dr. Bunning's Common Sensecon Chronic Diseases.
The Works of Brisbane, Godwin, Boyle and others, on Social Reform.
The Pishaun, Special Reformer, and Constitution and By-Laws of Brook-Farm Association.
For sale by BELA MARSH.
Oct. 1d. No. 25 Cornhill.

SONGS OF THE HUTCHINSONS.

THE Old Granite State, The Bereaved Sister of Mother, Get off the Track, and all the other popular Hutchinson Family—set to music for piano-forte. For sale by BELA MARSH.
Oct. 18. No. 25 Cornhill.

RESPIRATORS,

as used in
BREATH-WARMING INSTRUMENTS

THE subscriber continues to have Respirators manufactured under his immediate direction, and supports on the strength of the experience of five years has more than confirmed the anticipations he had formed from the philosophical construction of the instrument, that it would be useful in all pulmonary complaints where exposure to cold produces serious evil consequences. During the past winter, several hundred persons have used them with exceeding comfort when travelling in the cars or wagons, and without any subsequent injury to themselves. The instrument is now prepared at 17 Bedford-street, at his agent's, Theodore Metcalf's, The Apothecary, and at several of the Druggist stores of this city and of the country.

H. I. BOWDITCH, M. D.

Boston, Oct. 12, 1844.

NEW PORTRAIT OF O'CONNELL!

PROCURED for the first time for the benefit of those who have not the opportunity of seeing him, and for sale at the Anti-Slavery office, 25 Cornhill. Oct. 11

NOTICE.

GEORGE BROOKS respectfully informs his friends and the public, that he has taken shop No. 128 Ann street, with a large and well assorted assortment of clothing, for seamen and landsmen, of the best fashions, and at the lowest cash prices. Clothing cut, made, repaired and cleaned, in superior style. Please give him a call, if you wish to get the worth of your money. tf. Sept. 12.

TO LET.

ONE large room and bedroom, furnished or unfurnished, with privilege in kitchen and washroom together with equedect water, in house No. 14 Dorpress-street. Rent low. Inquire of GEO. BROOKS, No. 191 Ann-street. tf. Sept. 12

J. P. BISHOP,

ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR,
No 10, COURT-STREET, Boston,
(South side of the street, first door from Washington street.)

Practices in LAW and EQUITY in all the Courts of the Commonwealth, in this and the adjoining counties. Will attend to any business entrusted to his care, with every description of office business.

DR. CH. FREDERICK GEIST,

JOHN-STREET,
HOMŒOPATHIC PHYSICIAN,
NESMITH'S BUILDING,
LOWELL.

To Abolitionists AND FRIENDS in GENERAL.

JOHN P. COBURN

INFORMS his friends and customers, that he has removed from No. 8 Brattle-street, to

51 Cornhill and 2 Brattle-street.

Where he continues his same line of business, with an addition, viz:

CLOTHING,

Cut and made in the neatest and most fashionable style. He has also taken considerable pains to select A FIRST RATE CUTTER, who will give his attention to cutting only. He has selected an assortment of the most fashionable CLOTHS, viz: Broadcloths, Cassimeres, Satinets, Tweeds, &c. Also VESTINGS of the latest style, all of which is to make up in the most fashionable style, and on reasonable terms, and will take "GENTLEMEN'S OFF-CAST GARMENTS in pay, or part pay."

Please give him a call, if you wish to be cool well and get the worth of your money.

☞ J. P. COBURN would furthermore inform the public, that he has made arrangements whereby he is prepared to execute any amount of Clothing in the above line. March 22.

REMOVAL.

SEWING SILK.

THE Office of the SOUTHAMPTON ASSOCIATION has been removed from 2 1-2 Hanover-street, to

228 WASHINGTON-STREET,

TWO DOORS SOUTH OF SUMMER-STREET,

where may be had, at wholesale or retail,

SEWING SILK,

of every variety of size and color manufactured by the above Association, from the best stock, and is the best manner. J. A. STETSON, *Agent.*

Orders for goods addressed to Northampton, Mass. for any kind of Sewing Silk, which will be promptly attended. 3m. Sept. 12.

DR. B. T. PRESCOTT,

DENTIST,

GRANITE BUILDING, No. 14 HOWARD-ST.

Directly opposite the Old "Pemberton House," and a few doors West of "Concert Hall."

DR. PRESCOTT would inform his friends and the public generally, that he continues to perform all the operations appertaining to the Teeth, both for their beauty and preservation. Particular attention paid to cleansing and filling carious teeth with gold, thereby arresting the progress of decay, and rendering them useful for many years.

Mineral teeth of superior quality inserted on the most reasonable terms.

N. B. Having furnished his apartments with gas lights, Dr. Prescott is now enabled to carry on operations in Dentistry in the evening. All operations, both in filling and inserting Teeth, warranted to give complete satisfaction. Office from the country promptly answered. 6m May 31.

AGENTS OF THE LIBERATOR.

CONNECTICUT.—S. S. Cowles, *Hartford*; Calvin S. Pease, *Hartford*; Isaac Brown, *Canterbury.*
New-YORK.—Isaac T. Hopper, *New-York City*; Charles S. Morton, *Albany*;—James C. Fuller, *Aurora*; Thomas Hunter, *Auburn*; Lewis Ferris, *Auburn*; John B. Barker, *Peru*; R. D. H. Yardley, *Rushville*; Isaac Hartshorn, *Penn Yan.*
PENNSYLVANIA.—H. C. Howell, *Allegheny*;—J. B. Vashon, *Pittsburg*;—M. Preston, *West Grove*; James Fulton, *Jr., McWilliamstown*; Joseph Bailey, *Pittsburg*; Joseph Fulton, *Sadsbury.*
OHIO.—Charles Olcott, *Medina*;—James Austin, *Atwater*;—Lot Holmes, *Homogatchie*;—Jos. A. Dugdale, *Cortesville*;—A. Brooks, *Oakland.*

[SEE FIRST PAGE.]

FROM THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Remittances by Mail.—A Postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter if written by himself.

☞ Persons who do not remove money should always note the occasion whom it is to be applied.