THE LIBERATOR.
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY,
AT THE ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE, 25, CORNHILL,
BY
HENRY W. WILLIAMS, GENERAL AGENT.

☞ All remittances are to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper are to be directed, *post paid*, to the General Agent.

☞ 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.

☞ ADVERTISEMENTS making less than a square inserted three times for 75 cts: one square for $1 00.

Financial Committee.—FRANCIS JACKSON, ELLIS GRAY LORING, EDMUND QUINCY, SAMUEL PHILBRICK, WENDELL PHILLIPS. [This committee is responsible only for the financial economy of the paper.]

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

VOL. XV.—NO. 16. BOSTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 1845. WHOLE NO. 744.

THE LIBERATOR.

LETTERS FROM HENRY C. WRIGHT.

INNSBRUCK, (Tyrol,) July 12, 1845. 12 o'clock, M.

Now on the wooden bridge that crosses the river Inn, at the north side of the town. Nothing can exceed the enchantment of the view from this spot. Apparently close to me, and hanging over my head, rise up mountains 7000 feet—the Inn rushing swiftly under my feet—the town lying in full view before me—two miles across the valley, at the south, stretches a range of mountains east and west, some of the peaks rising 10,000 feet. The valley of the Inn spreads out east and west, covered with harvest fields, and thousands are gathering in the crops. One reflection detracts greatly from my enjoyment. The spot where I now stand, forty years ago, was running down with streams of human blood, and covered. Hoops upon hoops, with the dead bodies of men slain in the wrath and fury of battle. On and about this place, one of the severest battles of the war with Napoleon was fought; in which the peasants of the mountains, under the command of Hafer, completely repulsed the disciplined hosts of France, and drove them out of Innsbruck. This battle was fought August 13, 1809, between 25,000 French, under the Duke of Danzig, and 18,000 Tyrolese peasants, under the command of Hafer. This battle, for a few months, decided the fate of the Tyrol. The French were driven out of the country. On the 15th of August, Hafer, amid the shouts of the people, delirious with joy at their deliverance, made a triumphal entry into Innsbruck. Six months, lacking five days from that date, Hafer was shot at Mantua! What a change was there! But I will not be cheated out of his crowning glory in spirit, I am present at the scene which was enacted on the spot where I now stand, August 13, 1809. I am hearing the story from one who was in the bloody contest. I seem to see the rushing of brother upon brother in deadly strife—each, his heart full of wrath and death, seeking the heart's blood of the stranger. I see the sword thrust through the bodies of men—the falling rocks, the flowing blood—and I hear the *roar* of cannon, and the groans of the dying. These were brothers of the same family—children of a common Father; and priests and churches assure me that that battle, like the slaughter on Bunker Hill, was a sweet and acceptable offering unto God! Here, before heaven and earth, on this field of blood, I record my eternal hostility to a religion which sanctions such foul, unnatural deeds, and reject with horror the being that can place in my arms a brotherhood, where human brethren strive in death. He is not *the* God of love, and Father of His children, revealed in Christianity, but a demon of blood. I scorn the pretensions of that man to Christianity, who pleads for war or preparations for war. They are NEW or NO, not ministers or followers of the Prince of Peace. To a war-making and a slaveholding religion, I am an INFIDEL—to a war-making and slaveholding God, I am an ATHEIST, and must be, *in order to be a* CHRISTIAN! God hasten the day when seets and nations shall be dashed to pieces, and consumed *forever*, and HUMAN BROTHERHOOD become a watchword of mankind.

Now looking at the Golden Roof. It is a large portico, or *oriel* window, whose roof is covered with copper, gilded with thick gold! It projected in front of the former residences of the Counts of Tyrol. Tradition says that one Frederick, Count of Tyrol, was nick-named, '*Frederick of the empty Purse.*' To show that he was not poor, and to refute public report as to his poverty, he spent 30,000 ducats on this roof. This actually made him unpopular and called him. Opponents of abolitionists accuse them of slandering slaveholders in denouncing them as inhuman monsters; and then assure us that, in consequence of abolitionism, they treat their slaves with ten-fold more severity than ever.

Near the *Hofburg*, (Imperial Palace,) the former residence of several of the German Emperors. In 1532, Charles V. of Spain was residing here, sick at heart, and suffering with gout; when Maurice of Saxony, his great antagonist, with a strong force, came upon him, so suddenly and unexpectedly, that Charles hardly escaped. Maurice had vows taken him in his bed. Charles was compelled to escape on a litter, over the mountains, in the darkness of night, attempt driving into his face, and an eager enemy pressing behind. He had vainly hoped that his watchful enemy would not pursue him to this retreat valley; he trusted to the barriers of mountains around to protect him, but he found no rest. And all those wars were undertaken, as we are told, for the honor of God—Maurice the champion of Protestantism, and Charles of Romanism. Blood and carnage have tracked them both around the world. Both are alike abhorrent to Christianity.

Shooting Match.

The Tyrolese are the most famed marksmen with the rifle in Europe, and great pains is taken to perfect them in the art of shooting with this weapon. Shooting matches are here frequently, and in other parts of the country. On this occasion, the men, shelled in the use of the rifle, come together from the surrounding hills and mountains, and shoot at a mark for a wager. The first families, as to station and intelligence, go to the shooting. One of these shooting matches is now being held. The place, or shooting-house, is a little outside the town, in a lovely spot. Many are here, men, women and children, and all take a deep interest in the game. There are often sets, to a considerable amount, on different marksmen. It is curious to see the excitement, the leaping interest of the shooters and spectators—for the spectators all have some one in whom they are particularly interested. They all shoot without a rest for their rifle; and they shoot so that it would be dangerous to come within every direction of their aim in time of war. But, what an occupation! Men seeking perfect themselves in the use of the rifle, with a view to be able to shoot their fellow-men! It is abhorrent to my feelings. To see men point at a *human heart*, and shoot with a view to see what distance they can put a bullet through it! The rifle is said to be the defence, the bulwark of the Tyrol; and the rifle is what might be expected. She takes the sword, and perishes by the sword—she sheds blood, and her blood is shed by man. Many, many times has this mountain-country flowed down with the blood of her inhabitants.

Dinner Table—7 o'clock, P. M.

About forty at the table—many of whom, like myself, have their home in distant lands. They have been exploring the scenery and mountains around, and looking into whatever could interest in this town. Several Englishmen—one of whom has engaged to join us in taking a private carriage over the Tyrol Alps to Bregenz, on Lake Constance. Each guest is relating his exploits, and what he has seen and heard. Some have climbed the mountains, some have been on excursions off into the side valley and passes; some have explored the neighboring villages; some have been hunting, some fishing. Here at the table one can learn much of the localities around Innsbruck, and of the inhabitants. In one thing all agree—i. e. that they never saw a town located and looking so well for enchanting. There—we have just had another story about American slavery and the Federal Government. One of my companions—or one of the company, I should say—has lived in the slave States a long time, and is, I suspect, a slaveholder. He is loud and vociferous in his defence of slavery—now speaking in German, now in French, now in English. I have just asked him, 'Do you think all men are born free?' 'Yes,' was the surly reply. 'Who stole those 3,000,000 in America, and enslaved them?' 'They were *born* slaves,' he has replied. 'How could that be, when all men are born free?' 'But it don't mean that slaves are born free,' said he. 'But it does mean that none can be born slaves,' I said. 'A man who will speak against his country is a *traitor*, and a traitor ought not to be tolerated in any society.' 'What shall be said of the man, who, for the sake of his country, sacrifices his degradation and ruin of his *nature?* You convert man into property, and sell him as you would a dog. There is not in Europe any tyranny to be compared with that sanctioned and sustained by the Constitution and Government of the United States. There is but one slave auction in Europe, and Constantinople, under the Turk. To a slaveholding government I am an enemy, and by all bloodless and Christian means I shall seek its overthrow. I believe the United States Federal Government has done infinitely more mischief than good. It has made the name of Liberty a hiss and a bye-word throughout the world.' We have had a great storm, and all took part, directly or through interpreters.

SELECTIONS.

From the National Intelligencer.

A SPEECH

Intended to have been made in Committee of the whole House on the state of the Union, House of Representatives of the United States, on House Bill No. 328, reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, April 21, 1844.

This is a bill to benefit upon certain Spanish slave traders the sum of seventy thousand dollars of the money of the people of the United States—for what? A present of seventy thousand dollars of the money of the people of the United States to two Spanish slave traders! For so extraordinary a fact there must be extraordinary reasons. Reasons, did I say? No! mere reasons, pretexts; and these must be found, if any, where, in the Report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who reported this Bill. I call the special attention of the members of that Committee, who assented to report this bill, to the position in which they stand before the people whom they represent, as guardians of the people's money. I assume, that no member, that is a bill to give away, to squander, seventy thousand dollars of the money of our constituents, in gratuitous donation to two slave traders of the Island of Cuba; and to show how utterly destitute they are of all claim upon the people of the United States, for money for for compensation for services rendered, I propose to lay before this Committee, first, a brief narrative of the facts essential to the true understanding of the case, and then to examine some of the facts and arguments alleged in this report, in order to be pitiate the disposal of so large a sum of money of our constituents, not of our own, which it purposes to do.

On the 20th of August, 1839, Lieutenant Gedney, commanding the United States brig Washington, took possession of the schooner Amistad, called the Amistad, on the coast of Long Island, then in the lawful possession of certain self-emancipated African negroes. I pray the special notice of this Committee to the date, the 20th of August, 1839.

Lieutenant Gedney took possession of the vessel and of the negroes, some of them on the shore of Long Island, and assumed them to be his property, carried them into the port of New-London, Connecticut, where they were arraigned, first before the District Court, and afterwards before the Circuit Court of the United States, for trial, as slaves. They were charged with murder upon the high seas. Their defence was justifiable and necessary homicide, in the recovery of their personal freedom. The Circuit Court decided that it had no jurisdiction of the transaction in a foreign vessel on the high seas.

The Spanish Ministers, Calderon and Argaiz, demanded of the Executive of the United States, first, a proclamation forbidding all the judicial courts in the United States from taking any cognizance of the case; second, the delivery up to them the vessel and cargo, as Spanish property, without allowing a dollar to the captors for salvage; third, all the surviving negroes of fifty-three as assassins; and fourth, that the President of the United States should, at their expense, send all these assassins to be tried at Havana.

Mr. Chairman, I ask this Committee to pause and reflect upon these demands, and to say under what Government we should have lived if it had been in the power of the President of the United States to comply with them? It transcends Gen. Jackson's law martial, second section and all. He has family buried the country with arbitrary dealings with human life in every form. Before his time, no American could have conceived without horror the idea that a President of the United States should, in time of profound peace, hold in the balance of life and hand the lives of fifty human beings, without the intervention of any judicial tribunal, without habeas corpus, without the protection of the law of any kind! Yet this was demanded by two Spanish ministers in succession; and must I say that it was countenanced for a time by the Chief Magistrate of the United States, Martin Van Buren, and formally and officially recommended by his Attorney General, Felix Grundy, an owner of slaves.

Yes! at the demand of two Spanish ministers, the authority was then claimed for the President of the United States, of commanding a marshal of a judicial district, to seize and forcibly remove under the warrant and protection of the judicial courts, to ship them off without trial, judge or jury, to be judicially murdered in a foreign land.

When, on the 26th of August, 1839, (I pray you not to forget the date,) Lieutenant Gedney took possession of the vessel, there were on board of her the two Cuban slave traders, Ruiz and Montes, without whom the sympathy of this report lavishes so much compassion as the bill lavishes of the money of our constituents. Lieutenant Gedney supposed, at the time, as their slaves, their property, and yet to deny one cent of salvage to Lieutenant Gedney, for recovering and saving it for them.

Thus, then, stood the case before the District and Circuit Courts of the United States in Connecticut. The vessel and cargo were libelled as Spanish property; the thirty-five blacks, female children included, were charged with murder and piracy on the high seas; the Spanish Minister, Argaiz, claimed them, all as *slaves, but as assassins*, and demanded that the President of the United States should first surrender them up to him, and then ship them off to Havana for trial; Ruiz and Montes, the slave traders, claimed them all, save one, for their property. Lieutenant Gedney claimed salvage upon the vessel, cargo, and blacks, as Spanish property; but the Spanish Minister, Argaiz, and the slave traders, Ruiz and Montes, the much-abused foreigners, all protested against the allowance of one cent of salvage to Lieutenant Gedney.

You perceive, Mr. Chairman, that the claim of the Spanish Minister to the negroes as assassins was in direct collision with that of Ruiz and Montes, to the same negroes, as their slaves. The Minister demanded that the President should *prohibit* all judicial action upon the case, and, by his transcendent executive power, should ship them off to Cuba for trial. Ruiz and Montes, at the same time, demanded that the negroes should be delivered up to them as their slaves.

It was utterly impossible for the Government of the United States to comply with either of those demands; yet, so intent was the Secretary of State, Forsyth, to surrender these unfortunate wretches to their persecutors, that he actually instructed the District Attorney, Holabird, first, to take care that the court should not put the negroes beyond the jurisdiction of the executive, and then, instead of presenting to the court the prayer demanded by the Spanish Minister, that the case should be wrested entirely from the jurisdiction of the court, to present a claim, in the name of the United States, for the order of the court, that the blacks should be delivered up as Spanish property. The Spanish Minister never asked this direct violation of the Judicial Department, under instructions from the Secretary of State, did, and the court decided against it. The motive of this direct violation was apparent. The Spanish Minister denied the jurisdiction of the court. The Secretary of State saw that, if the court should disqualify itself, the blacks must be discharged; the court must be ousted of jurisdiction, in order that the President, re-instructed, therefore, the District Attorney to present this as a demand from the Spanish Minister, and, in anticipation of such an order from the court, a small schooner was secretly sent, in the dead of winter, to New-Haven, where the court was sitting, with the following order, I venture to say the most extraordinary one the Government ever signed by the President of the United States.

'The Marshal of the United States for the District of Connecticut will deliver over to Lieutenant John S. Payne, and his associates, the schooner Amistad, now in the hands of the United States, for safe keeping under his command, all the negroes, late of the Spanish schooner Amistad, in his custody, under process now pending before the Circuit Court of the United States, for the District of Connecticut. For so doing, this order will be his warrant.

Given under my hand, at the city of Washington, this 7th day of January, A. D. 1840.

By the President. M. VAN BUREN.

JOHN FORSYTH, Secretary of State.'

This order was, on its face, positive, sweeping, unconditional. No specification of persons, no number, not even their number; all the negroes, late of the Spanish schooner Amistad, in his custody, under process *now pending* before the Circuit Court of the United States, for the District of Connecticut! Is there in the history of this country where the rights of persons are words without meaning? In the kingdom of Dahomey? In the region, in some unknown part of Africa, where the rights of persons are words without meaning? In the kingdom of Dahomey? In the region, in some unknown part of Africa, where the rights of persons are words without meaning? In the land of the self-evident creation of Jefferson? In the Government of the United States! It was, of course, null and void; and if before the decision of the Court, it had been delivered to the Marshal, and he had executed it, he would have staked out the lives of fifty-three negroes, but his own head, and that of Martin Van Buren, the signer of the order, upon the event. It was, of course, null and void, but it was an order, nevertheless. The negroes in the custody of the Marshal were held under a process pending, not against them, but against the Spanish claimants, in the United States; and the District Attorney, to whom it was sent for delivery to the Marshal, sent back, by express, to have the word Circuit stricken out, and the word District inserted in its place, which was done; but whether by Mr. Forsyth, by a clerk in the Department of State, or by Mr. Van Buren himself, there is no trace of a record to show. But, although Mr. Van Buren did sign this order, he did not venture to follow the advice of his Attorney General, and violate the sanctuary of the judicial authority, by directing the Marshal to execute it, in defiance of that authority. He had been admonished against the perpetration of that outrage, by constitutional lawyers, less disciplined to the black code. The District Attorney had flattered himself and the Secretary of State, that the decision of the Court would place all the negroes, late of the Amistad, at the disposal of the President of the United States, and he was instructed, in that event, to present this order into the hands of the Marshal for execution, without allowing time, if he could help it, for the negroes to appeal, but to appeal himself, if the decree of the Court should be in favor of liberty. How a Connecticut lawyer could expect any other decision from a Connecticut Judge, is conceivable only upon a research into the case; second, to deliver up to them the vessel and cargo, as Spanish property, without allowing a dollar to the captors for salvage; third, all the surviving negroes of fifty-three as assassins; and fourth, that the President of the United States should, at their expense, send all these assassins to be tried at Havana.

Mr. Chairman, I ask this Committee to pause and reflect upon these demands, and to say under what Government we should have lived if it had been in the power of the President of the United States to comply with them? It transcends Gen. Jackson's law martial, second section and all. He has family buried the country with arbitrary dealings with human life in every form. Before his time, no American could have conceived without horror the idea that a President of the United States should, in time of profound peace, hold in the balance of life and hand the lives of fifty human beings, without the intervention of any judicial tribunal, without habeas corpus, without the protection of the law of any kind! Yet this was demanded by two Spanish ministers in succession; and must I say that it was countenanced for a time by the Chief Magistrate of the United States, Martin Van Buren, and formally and officially recommended by his Attorney General, Felix Grundy, an owner of slaves.

Yes! at the demand of two Spanish ministers, the authority was then claimed for the President of the United States, of commanding a marshal of a judicial district, under the warrant and protection of the judicial courts, to ship them off without trial, judge or jury, to be judicially murdered in a foreign land.

When, on the 26th of August, 1839, (I pray you not to forget the date,) Lieutenant Gedney took possession of the vessel, there were on board of her the two Cuban slave traders, Ruiz and Montes, without whom the sympathy of this report lavishes as much compassion as the bill lavishes of the money of our constituents. Lieutenant Gedney supposed, at the time, as their slaves, their property, and yet to deny one cent of salvage to Lieutenant Gedney, for recovering and saving it for them.

Thus, then, stood the case before the District and Circuit Courts of the United States in Connecticut. The vessel and cargo were libelled as Spanish property; the thirty-five blacks, female children included, were charged with murder and piracy on the high seas; the Spanish Minister, Argaiz, claimed them, all as *slaves, but as assassins*, and demanded that the President of the United States should first surrender them up to him, and then ship them off to Havana for trial; Ruiz and Montes, the slave traders, claimed them all, save one, for their property. Lieutenant Gedney claimed salvage upon the vessel, cargo, and blacks, as Spanish property; but the Spanish Minister, Argaiz, and the slave traders, Ruiz and Montes, the much-abused foreigners, all protested against the allowance of one cent of salvage to Lieutenant Gedney.

You perceive, Mr. Chairman, that the claim of the Spanish Minister to the negroes as assassins was in direct collision with that of Ruiz and Montes, to the same negroes, as their slaves. The Minister demanded that the President should *prohibit* all judicial action upon the case, and, by his transcendent executive power, should ship them off to Cuba for trial. Ruiz and Montes, at the same time, demanded that the negroes should be delivered up to them as their slaves.

It was utterly impossible for the Government of the United States to comply with either of those demands; yet, so intent was the Secretary of State, Forsyth, to surrender these unfortunate wretches to their persecutors, that he actually instructed the District Attorney, Holabird, first, to take care that the court should not put the negroes beyond the jurisdiction of the executive, and then, instead of presenting to the court the prayer demanded by the Spanish Minister, that the case should be wrested entirely from the jurisdiction of the court, to present a claim, in the name of the United States, for the order of the court, that the blacks should be delivered up as Spanish property. The Spanish Minister never asked this direct violation of the Judicial Department, under instructions from the Secretary of State, did, and the court decided against it. The motive of this direct violation was apparent. The Spanish Minister denied the jurisdiction of the court. The Secretary of State saw that, if the court should disqualify itself, the blacks must be discharged; the court must be ousted of jurisdiction, in order that the President, re-instructed, therefore, the District Attorney to present this as a demand from the Spanish Minister, and, in anticipation of such an order from the court, a small schooner was secretly sent, in the dead of winter, to New-Haven, where the court was sitting, with the following order, I venture to say the most extraordinary one the Government ever signed by the President of the United States.

'The Marshal of the United States for the District of Connecticut will deliver over to Lieutenant John S. Payne, and his associates, the schooner Amistad, now in the hands of the United States, for safe keeping under his command, all the negroes, late of the Spanish schooner Amistad, in his custody, under process now pending before the Circuit Court of the United States, for the District of Connecticut. For so doing, this order will be his warrant.

Given under my hand, at the city of Washington, this 7th day of January, A. D. 1840.

By the President. M. VAN BUREN.

JOHN FORSYTH, Secretary of State.'

This order was, on its face, positive, sweeping, unconditional. No specification of persons, no number, not even their number; all the negroes, late of the Spanish schooner Amistad, in his custody, under process *now pending* before the Circuit Court of the United States, for the District of Connecticut! Is there in the history of this country where the rights of persons are words without meaning? In the kingdom of Dahomey? In the region, in some unknown part of Africa, where the rights of persons are words without meaning? In the land of the self-evident creation of Jefferson? In the Government of the United States! It was, of course, null and void; and if before the decision of the Court, it had been delivered to the Marshal, and he had executed it, he would have staked out the lives of fifty-three negroes, but his own head, and that of Martin Van Buren, the signer of the order, upon the event. It was, of course, null and void, but it was an order, nevertheless. The negroes in the custody of the Marshal were held under a process pending, not against them, but against the Spanish claimants, in the United States; and the District Attorney, to whom it was sent for delivery to the Marshal, sent back, by express, to have the word Circuit stricken out, and the word District inserted in its place, which was done; but whether by Mr. Forsyth, by a clerk in the Department of State, or by Mr. Van Buren himself, there is no trace of a record to show. But, although Mr. Van Buren did sign this order, he did not venture to follow the advice of his Attorney General, and violate the sanctuary of the judicial authority, by directing the Marshal to execute it, in defiance of that authority. He had been admonished against the perpetration of that outrage, by constitutional lawyers, less disciplined to the black code. The District Attorney had flattered himself and the Secretary of State, that the decision of the Court would place all the negroes, late of the Amistad, at the disposal of the President of the United States, and he was instructed, in that event, to present this order into the hands of the Marshal for execution, without allowing time, if he could help it, for the negroes to appeal, but to appeal himself, if the decree of the Court should be in favor of liberty. How a Connecticut lawyer could expect any other decision from a Connecticut Judge, is conceivable only upon a research into the case; second, to deliver up to them the vessel and cargo, as Spanish property, without allowing a dollar to the captors for salvage; third, all the surviving negroes of fifty-three as assassins; and fourth, that the President of the United States should, at their expense, send all these assassins to be tried at Havana.

Mr. Chairman, I ask this Committee to pause and reflect upon these demands, and to say under what Government we should have lived if it had been in the power of the President of the United States to comply with them? It transcends Gen. Jackson's law martial, second section and all. He has family buried the country with arbitrary dealings with human life in every form. Before his time, no American could have conceived without horror the idea that a President of the United States should, in time of profound peace, hold in the balance of life and hand the lives of fifty human beings, without the intervention of any judicial tribunal, without habeas corpus, without the protection of the law of any kind! Yet this was demanded by two Spanish ministers in succession; and must I say that it was countenanced for a time by the Chief Magistrate of the United States, Martin Van Buren, and formally and officially recommended by his Attorney General, Felix Grundy, an owner of slaves.

Yes! at the demand of two Spanish ministers, the authority was then claimed for the President of the United States, of commanding a marshal of a judicial district, under the warrant and protection of the judicial courts, to ship them off without trial, judge or jury, to be judicially murdered in a foreign land.

When, on the 26th of August, 1839, (I pray you not to forget the date,) Lieutenant Gedney took possession of the vessel, there were on board of her the two Cuban slave traders, Ruiz and Montes, without whom the sympathy of this report lavishes as much compassion as the bill lavishes of the money of our constituents. Lieutenant Gedney supposed, at the time, as

The Report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs severely censures the District Attorney, Holabird, for *admitting* in Court that the negroes were Bozals, recently imported into this City. Of what use, then, it have been for him to deny it? The Judge did not thrust for the blood of the hapless prisoners before him, whose lives and liberty depended upon his decision. That decision depended entirely upon the *fact* that they were Bozals. Of that fact, the proofs before the Court were so abundant, so clear, so irresistible, that it was impossible for the Judge not to see and believe them. What was the counter testimony? Two passports for fifty-two persons, utterly invalid upon their face, purporting to be each for one specific individual, with a minute description of his person, and filled up with fifty-two Spanish names, male and female, with the description of the persons in blank, and not one of the particular corresponding with the persons present in Court. Had the passports been upon their face for fifty-two white women, by name, and produced in Court as given for thirty-five men black as jet, under the eye of the Judge, would the comity of nations, or the logic of the District Attorney, have compelled or permitted the Judge to admit the passports, as identifying the persons before him, in defiance of his own senses? Of what use, then, was it for the District Attorney to admit that these negroes were Bozals? The report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs contests the fact; and the first step of its argument is to falsify, by a whole year, the entire crew of the pirate, in her vessel by Lieutenant Gedney. Probably this expedient did not occur to the mind of Mr. Holabird.

The Report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in its zeal to indemnify the much-abused slave traders Ruiz and Montes, deals as unmercifully with the laws of the land, as with its treaties, and with the rights of the Courts. It calls an act of Congress declaring the African slave trade piracy, a preposterous enactment, in which the crime might not well be distinguished from piracy! "Perhaps Great Britain with *putting* into the treaty of Ghent the tenth article, stipulating that both parties to it shall use their best endeavors to accomplish the entire abolition of the traffic in slaves, as if that article had been interpolated by Great Britain, and was not the joint act of both parties to the treaty. With the most fulsome adulation of the "respectable Spanish Minister in the United States," and cringing applause of his correspondence claiming hidemnity for the outrage upon the laws, the professed the Committee to be mortified to feel obliged to remark that the answer [of the American Secretary of State] to the respectable Spanish Minister *was more severe!*

The chairman of the Committee who presented the report moved and importunately urged the House that ten thousand extra copies of it should, by order of the House, be printed for circulation among the people. On the 18th of April, 1841, in resisting the motion, Mr. Gallatin, of Ohio, expressed to the scorn and contempt of the House, some of the false and spurious principles of international law, thick sown throughout the report; but the partial pass of personal feeling, which professes

WHOLE NUMBER DCCXLIII. THE LIBERATOR. 61

THE LIBERATOR.

BOSTON, APRIL 18, 1845.

☞ We have been too unwell this week to be able to give a proper attention to our present number. Due allowance must be made accordingly.

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.
ELEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The American Anti-Slavery Society will hold its Annual Meeting in this city, at the Tabernacle, on WEDNESDAY, sixth day of May next, commencing at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The meeting of the Society has never been held at a more momentous crisis. After ten years of toil and danger, the Society, at its last meeting, adopted the revolutionary motto by which it is now distinguished. Our year has been sufficient to prove the wisdom of assuming its present position. It has raised a standard which it can never lower without dishonor, and which can alone lead it to victory. The events of the last year have shown, beyond a question, that a union with slaveholders is a curse to the slave, and must end in making slaves of Freemen. The alternative of Liberty or Slavery has been presented without disguise to the people, and the majority have solemnly and unanimously chosen the latter. The only hope of the slave, and the only choice for Freemen, is in peaceful revolution, and in the destruction of a Union which was begun in a compromise with evil, and has continued in infamy.

A large and deeply interesting meeting is expected. We this year not be left to chance. The auxiliary societies in towns and counties, should take immediate measures for the appointment of delegates, that every section of country may be fully represented. And every individual member, who can by any possibility make arrangements to be present, should be a self-appointed delegate. The counsels of the warm, and true-hearted, and clear-headed are needed, that the interests and the necessities of the cause, everywhere may be fully known, and the wisest action, and the most effective plans for the promotion of anti-slavery truth for the coming year, be proposed and carried into effect. We need especially, *associated action*, at this moment, and the friends every where should see to it that the gathering be a mighty one, and worthy of the hour and the cause.

The arrangements for the business meetings will be advertised in the next Standard.

EDMUND QUINCY,
FRANCIS JACKSON,
SIDNEY HOWARD GAY, } Committee of Arrangements.

New-York, March 10, 1845.

THE HERALD OF FREEDOM.

An unknown hand has forwarded to me the last number of this paper with a pencil marked title. It contains a few things deserving of notice, though I am extremely reluctant to say any thing more about the existence of the paper, or the conduct of its editor and 'publishing agent.'

The *old* Herald of Freedom' was established mainly and distinctively for the overthrow of AMERICAN SLAVERY, and for that purpose became the official organ of the New-Hampshire Anti-Slavery Society. How far the *new* Herald (which claims to be the *old* one) intends to pursue that great object, time must determine; but, judging from the contents of the numbers I have accidentally seen, the abolition of slavery is evidently to constitute but a very small share of its attention. For example—in the number now before me, about one column is devoted to the subject of slavery, while there are nearly nineteen columns filled with miscellaneous reading! The contents are—a letter from the editor, on railroads and the gallows; four communications about 'the Herald controversy,'—all on one side, of course; a letter from Boston, partly on the same subject, and in the same vein; an original essay on temperance, another 'on spiders and things'; an extract on 'Spring'; an article on 'The Idiot Boy and the Bluebird'; others on 'Past Day,' on 'The London Post Office,' on 'Dietetic Reform,' on 'Water,' and on 'The Licensed Law'; a piece of poetry on the 'Ghosts of the Past,' and a piece of sentiment about the Falls of Niagara. I will not say, that this is giving 'two grains of wheat to a bushel of chaff,' because this would not be just, as some of the articles are excellent; but I must say that this disproportion of anti-slavery matter to the miscellaneous is not tenable to escape criticism, in a journal which claims to be the identical one established years ago *expressly to advocate the cause of our enslaved countrymen at the South*. It is only another proof that 'The Herald of Freedom' is not the 'Herald of Freedom,' and therefore has no more title to patronage as an *anti-slavery* journal, than any other which is devoted to 'matters and things in general.' The 'publishing agent,' however, is abundantly satisfied—for he says, 'A very tolerable Herald we have this week. . . . On the whole, we have received a fair share of patronage.'

In this number, (the 5th,) Mr. French trumpets 'our success, thus far.' The receipts for the first month, ending April 3d, have been $172 51; the expenditures $112 78; leaving cash on hand, $59 73. Of expenditures, $66 10 were paid to 'Third party' J. E. Hood, for printing numbers of the 'new paper'—notwithstanding the intimation given by Mr. Rogers, in a previous number, that *Mr. French* did the printing. I hope it will not be forgotten how rudely, not to say how unmercifully, Mr. Elu was dealt with by the editor, for the alleged crime of belonging to 'Third party,' for it illustrates Mr. R.'s consistency and fairness in this whole transaction. This contract with Mr. Hood also shows the *peculiar* sensitiveness of Mr. French. He could not deign to make a contract for printing the Herald with the New-Hampshire Board, (composed of anti-'Third party' individuals, who felt deeply interested in the success of the Herald,) but he could readily stoop to make one with the editor of the Granite Freeman, the official organ of 'Third party' in New-Hampshire! This looks very much like wishing to preserve harmony among the members and friends of the New-Hampshire Anti-Slavery Society—and very consistent and brotherly withal!

In a letter (dated at Plymouth, April 5th,) from the editor to 'Dear J. R.,' he says—'I just received a letter from Garrison, in which he speaks of your remittance list, and of the old anti-slavery names it discloses—*a gallant portion of the moral bone and muscle of the New-Hampshire Anti-Slavery Society.*' It is a significant manner of *voting* on the old Herald question. I forbear to stop to ask, how much a horrid and tyrannical 'corporation' (with its Trustees, Vice Presidents, Managers, Secretary and Treasurer,) can possibly have any 'moral bone and muscle,' though I should like to know, on the new theory broached in regard to organized and systematic co-operation!—but I wish to ascertain, how large as well as how 'gallant' is the number of those applauded in this extract; and for this purpose, I will borrow the paper referred to, and count 'the old anti-slavery names it discloses.' The result is as follows:—About thirty are recorded, nearly all from two towns only, viz. Dover and Milford. How many of these are members of the State Society, is problematical; I know that several of them are vehement in their opposition to organized action—and, of course, *they* will not pretend to belong to the State 'corporation,' with its 'tyrant Board.' What a formidable host, then!

I have already had occasion to notice the pitiful and venomous animus which seems to actuate many of those who are the partisans of Messrs. Rogers and French in their unprincipled course. Here is an extract from a letter in the last number of 'The Herald,' signed 'E. W. Capron':—

'I see that our great 'Liberators' have descended to depths far below the common priesthood, and for which a politician would be read out of his party, be it what it may. I have yet to learn that the lowest political demagogy ever practised, has been so low as to pry into the private matters of the family circle, to find out who their 'prospective sons in law' are, and who I we think, I positively know is not what that brother. Not that I would accuse him of laboring under a strange 'hallucination,' except such as a priestly desire to sustain a certain organization, right or wrong, always brings on. There are many *such* subjects of mental 'hallucination.' I see too that a censorship is set up, and that, forsooth, have decided that the little sheet shall not come to 25 Cornhill, for the accommodation of 'Third party' friends who chose to take it! Charleston, S. C. begins to find allies among Northern abolitionists!!! Surely they can fling back the charge of Herald, fear free discussion, when made by certain northern presses. The act is a piece of church and priestly spite, made to frighten the Third party. But, it is an insult to every subscriber to the paper, many of whom, probably, have given their money in support of the concern that rejects them. Whoever wrote a certain circular in the bosom of their friendship, will be sure to receive a sting whenever they move in the atmosphere of Truth, or, mention any thing that they pen. Yet with all this opposition—all the popish bulls—and priestly spears, with all the 'crazy' and 'hallucination' charges the Herald has, yet fear free discussion, when made by certain northern presses. The act is a piece of church and priestly spite, made to frighten the Third party. But, it is an insult to every subscriber to the paper, many of whom, probably, have given their money in support of the concern that rejects them. Whoever wrote a certain circular in the bosom of their friendship, will be sure to receive a sting whenever they move in the atmosphere of Truth, or, mention any thing that they pen. Yet with all this opposition—all the popish bulls—and priestly spears, with all the 'crazy' and 'hallucination' charges the Herald has, yet fear free discussion, when made by certain northern presses.'

This is what is called, popularly, *slang*, and deserves not a word of notice.

Here is another extract from a letter dated 'Essex County,' and signed 'Ettra,' which appears in the same paper:

'There are papers that are surrounded by a kind of anti-slavery aristocracy, and their editors don't feel pleasant when they see our rough articles come in. They have higher work than to publish communications coming from such a huge pawn. Their reasons may be good, I don't say but that they are.'

Here is a new grievance, and a new motive avowed for sustaining 'The Herald!' What this vulgar thrust at 'anti-slavery aristocracy' means, is to me incomprehensible. The talk about 'huge paws' is wretched cant on the part of the writer. But he proceeds:

Sunday, March 30th. Last night I read the leading article in the 'Board's Herald,' written by Parker Pillsbury. It is a very bitter and bitterly severe. When we see a boy brought up under the fostering care of a tender father, until he has arrived at mature age, and then, without provocation, suddenly, kicking him about, calling him hard names, ready to take up every little evil report against him, we not only feel sympathy for the sufferer, but our indignation is roused to the very highest pitch. And we speak out and say, if the old man has done a little wrong, we don't bear to see him, that he has treated so kindly, become his executioner.

The above is but a faint illustration of Parker Pillsbury's treatment of N. P. Rogers. He has become N. P. Rogers' executioner, or offers to be, which is the same thing. He calls it 'recording his testimony.' Well, it is a testimony, which will beat him (Pillsbury's) own brains out. There is something *so selfish* and unnatural about it, that it makes me shudder.'

'Something so selfish and unnatural' about the manly yet tender and affectionate testimony of Parker Pillsbury, in his article which was given to the Liberator of the 4th inst.! Read that article again, friends, and then say what must be the spirit of his Essex County reviler. Yet 'The Herald' utters nothing of dissent as to the character and conduct of Parker Pillsbury, but is entirely portrayed!

Observe, too, the spirit and tendency of those journals which espouse the wrong side of this controversy. The following characteristic article is from the Utica Liberty Press, edited by priest Bailey:

'Stephen S. Foster is enacting his eccentricity in Pennsylvania, disturbing churches with his 'free speech,' and making himself generally obnoxious. He tramples down all 'order' that he cannot control, but still is the most orderly man you ever saw when he wants to get the Herald of Freedom out of the hands of Rogers & French. Abby Kelley, Dr. Hudson and Benson are in Western New-York, busy missionating and attempting to break down the rising Liberty movement in that State. Bad luck to them in their efforts! We hope they will fail.

Of course, in the same number of the same paper is the following paragraph. Instinct is a great matter!

'We detest the narrow-minded self-conceit which governs the Garrison clique—a clique, by the way, which is every day losing friends and becoming more and more circumscribed in their sphere! Become more and more embittered by the loss of partisans. A more bitter and uncharitable spirit never existed than they exhibit under the profession of the 'largest liberty,' 'free speech,' 'free press,' and 'wide platform.' They are the very same spirit and principles which have grown up under the fostering influence of Garrison & Co., is now denounced by them as vile as Judas Iscariot ever was. Because Rogers has refused to be 'managed' by them, and that is the sum of his offending. Like Col. Young, of New-York, who, when he found himself, he became 'impracticable,' and had to submit to the guillotine of party spirit.'

The following, says Parker Pillsbury, in his Herald, 'is from the New-England Washingtonian, a paper that is full of Organizations, Odd Fellowships, Rechabite Orders, and nobody knows what, as an April puddle is of *polywogs*. A paper that would no more tolerate, in the Temperance cause, the outrages we have heaped upon Garrison than it would the making of every room in Cornhill a filthy grog-shop.'

'The Herald of Freedom; French's Herald of Freedom; N. P. Rogers's Herald of Freedom, is again upon our table, merry as a cricket, bold as a lion—right glad are we to see your smiling face, lest peradventure you long continue, and your shadow never diminish; not that we mean to say there is anything shadowy, or dark about you; no, bright is the truth, and in that brightness old friends you live, and mean, and may your being—and although fiction, or bigotry, or crazy, may for a little time pile a bushel of *pills* over your light and *bury* you for a season, yet will the truth, like a fire, burn through and through, and its light arise and 'Herald' forth the glad tidings of liberty to man with greater brightness and glory than ever before.'

To be concluded!

SPEECH OF MR. ADAMS.

We have gladly devoted a large portion of our present number to the Speech intended to have been made in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, by Mr. Adams, on the Texas Amistad case. It is another highly important historical document, respecting American slavery and its abettors, and should be read, every word of it, by all the people. What a consummate knave it proves Charles J. Ingersoll to be! Read, in the preparation of his villainous Report! He is, indeed, a most despicable and unprincipled man, and barely servile to the slaveholding power.

SUSPENSION OF 'THE NON-RESISTANT.' The last number of this excellent periodical brings us the painful intelligence, that it 'is suspended indefinitely'—the number of paying subscribers, on whom any certain dependance can be placed, being less than three hundred. 'We have sent out,' says the editor, 'from three to five hundred copies of the Non-Resistant to unknown persons in various parts of the old subscription list, *from whom we have heard nothing*.' This is a revelation equally mortifying and deplorable; but our friends at Hopedale have done right not to incur any serious pecuniary liabilities, merely for the sake of prolonging the existence of the work. The truth is, there are now new papers springing up, for all sorts of reformatory purposes, entirely in advance of a renovated public sentiment sufficient to give them a permanent existence, that they not only go down themselves in a short time, but are sure to drag along with them others, which, but for them, might have survived to a good old age.

'THE PATH-FINDER.' This is the title of a new paper just commenced in New-Bedford, one number of which (and a very good one it is) has been issued, and another is promised in the course of a fortnight; after which, should sufficient patronage be procured to warrant it, the publication will be continued regularly. Price $1.00 per annum, in advance. Communications must be sent, post paid, to John Bailey, 23 Purchase-street; but no money need be forwarded by subscribers until after the receipt of the third number. The Path-Finder is a reformatory journal, and is much needed in New-Bedford and Bristol County.

LETTER FROM CHARLES LENOX REMOND.

PHILADELPHIA, April 5, 1845.

DEAR FRIEND PHILLIPS:—

I have deferred writing until the present time, presuming some account of the movements of friend Foster and myself would be given to the 'Pennsylvania Freeman,' or the 'National Anti-Slavery Standard,' but as Brother Stephen will put do so at his earliest opportunity, I do not think it worthwhile to do so.

Since arriving in this State, I have spent some time in Bucks and Montgomery counties, a portion of it in company with Stephen, and the remainder holding meetings and lecturing myself, and in most places mobs and rumors of mobs have been the order of the day; but receiving personal injury only in a single instance, I will pass them without comment.

I held an excellent meeting at New Hope, and think a good impression was made upon the large and respectable audience present. At most places I have visited, I have found a few choice friends, intelligent, feeling, efficient, and determined to labor while the day lasts; in fact, I believe our good friends, the Lintons, Johnsons, Smiths, Irvings, Janneys, Bessys, Parrisses, Magills and Bowmans shall yet redeem their respective counties from their pro-slavery tendencies. The task to many may appear dark and doubtful, but those choice spirits are fully equal to the undertaking.

I have held a number of meetings in Philadelphia, principally among our colored friends, and am encouraged to believe there is an increasing interest among them, and that they would soon become generally co-operative and efficient again, could they be induced to subordinate their sectarian and political prejudices to the great principles of free inquiry, free speech, and individual action—would they give Humanity a place over mere sect and party; and shoreover, would they resolve to enter no place where Anti-Slavery may not have free access, and kneel before no altar too sacred for the interests of the whole race, and advocacy of the entire law.

I have also held public discussions, in a number of instances, on the merits of moral suasion and Liberty party, as instrumentalities for the overthrow of slavery; and I deeply regret to find among the young men of color, a very decided preference of the latter, the same want of honesty, magnanimity and fairness, so frequently characterising politicians every where, and often, without alluding to principles, denouncing, in unmeasured terms, the American A. S. Society, and asserting that Mr. Garrison and his coadjutors have made money out of the cause, and have driven Dan to Beersheba; and I am sorry to say, no man has figured so largely in these unwarrantable attacks, unscrupulous assertions, and unmerited denunciations, as Frederick A. Hinton, who, at the lecture given on Monday evening last, in Rev. Mr. Collins' church, took occasion to express his wishes of the audience, and for the third time attacked the members of the American Society, distinctly stating that '*Garrison, for instance, advocated the abominable doctrine of men taking women, for wives, and when tired of them, casting them off and taking other wives,*' &c. The principal portion of his remarks I was willing to have taken for what they were worth, taking into consideration the source from which they emanated; but the accusation made as stated in the foregoing, was more than I could quietly sit under, without entering my solemn protest, and signifying to the large assembly my determination to hold him to his proof through the columns of some public journal;—and in the name of the poor slave, his righteous cause, and the Society of which Mr. Garrison is presiding officer, and myself a humble representative, I call upon Mr. Hinton and Brother Foster to prove the charge, or retract as publicly. I shall decline saying more at present, giving Mr. Hinton time to exonerate himself, or stand condemned to the public and the world as one guilty of wilful detraction and slander.

Make such use of this hastily scrawled letter as you think proper; and, presenting my kind remembrances to friends,

Faithfully yours,
CHARLES LENOX REMOND.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MEETING.

SOUTH BRIDGEWATER, April 6, 1845.

FRIEND GARRISON:—

The Plymouth County Anti-Slavery Society held its twenty-second meeting, at Bethesda Hall, in North Bridgewater, on Wednesday last. The attendance was small, but of the right stamp.

The President, Rev. E. Hewitt, called the meeting to order, and William Whiting offered prayer. Remarks were made by Lewis Ford, E. Hewitt, Richard Thayer, and Rev. Charles Dudley, the latter of whom commenced by saying that he was not in the habit of speaking in meetings of this kind, but as he understood we were to have a free meeting, he would make a few remarks. And first, he was an anti-slavery man. Every pulsation of his heart beat for the slave.

How true this was, the sequel will show.

Adjourned at noon for one hour, and had a social talk while taking a little needful refreshment.

Came together in the afternoon, with some addition in number and spirits.

Ann Bicknell offered a resolution, the substance of which was, that we sympathize equally with the slave and the slaveholder; that both were very unfortunate, and that the slaveholder deserved our sympathy and pity as much as the slave; that God had so constructed the human mind, that it could not be, that it was hard for them to do unto others as they would have others do unto them. This, I believe, was the substance of the argument.

Rev. Mr. Dudley followed in nearly the same course of remarks, saying that slaveholders had been called hard names, and that he, for instance, had been with the slave, and none with the slaveholder.

Richard Thayer said he did not agree with the two speakers. Suppose, said he, I steal two of friend Bennett's horses, and carry them off; would my friend Dudley sympathize with me as deeply as with friend Bennett?

But the speakers did not feel disposed to confine themselves to paper resolutions, but spoke as the spirit moved them. The discussion took a wide range, of course.

The remarks were made by Joshua Perry, Jesse Torrey, and Lewis Ford, who, with Richard Thayer, took the strong and truthful ground, 'No union with slaveholders,' and no compromise with a pro-slavery church and clergy. This, of course, brought down the pro-slavery wrath, and Rev. Mr. Dudley, who was a member of the Methodist church and clergy, spoke several times, and in the course of his remarks declared, that he was no pro-slavery man, as it was a warm-hearted abolitionist; though he was no come-outer. He berated the come-outers; and they were opposed to organization, to preaching, to the ministry, and to all government. S. S. Foster, in particular, received a large share of his vituperation and abuse; said he carried the vilest tongue of any man he had ever seen or heard speak; said that he should shut him out of his pulpit as he could the pigeons out of his dovecote; denounced the come-outers with bringing their no-sabbath, no-church, no-ministry, no-government notions into anti-slavery meetings; and then he was the first one and only one in that convention who dragged in those questions, and went on to discuss the Sabbath question; told what blessings had followed the keeping of the Sabbath, and said, if we did not support the church, the clergy and the government, anarchy and blood would follow. 'Happy is he that condemneth not in others that which he alloweth in himself.'

Our meeting continued through Fast day, and it was a spirited meeting. It being at one corner of the county, but few of our sea-board friends were there. I wish in this connexion to exhibit a little of the Universalist pro-slavery, as I have heretofore that of the Orthodox. The 'Christian Freemen' says, in speaking of the doings and sayings of the Old Colony Conference—'Brother Dudley has already done a good work at North Bridgewater. There is a good religious interest, with a growing number of worshippers, and the society has become able to support preaching one half of the time.' Now, I believe he has not done a 'good work,' but the work of the devil, and every other pro-slavery priest, their 'religious interest,' with a 'growing number of worshippers,' to the contrary notwithstanding.

The chief priests and Pharisees were just as full of religion when they crucified Christ, as is the church and priesthood of the present day, and of the same kind. Then they would strain at a gnat and swallow a camel; now they will strain at the Sabbath, and swallow slavery.

Yours, for truth and freedom,
JOHN NOYES, JR.

N. B. I neglected to say that William Whiting made one of the best speeches delivered on the occasion.

THE U. S. CONSTITUTION.

SPRINGFIELD, April 19, 1845.

BRO. GARRISON:—

I noticed in the last Liberator a short article, saying that the Constitution recognising slavery was no more proof of its justice, than the Christian religion recognizing sin is a proof that Christ was in favor of sin. If Christianity, in its recognition of sin, held out its hand of fellowship to it, allowed it a representation in the courts of heaven, a seat in its halls of legislation, provided for its return to the bosom of the church, when it had sinned, and made it a duty binding on all professors of Christianity to sustain sin at the point of the bayonet, when it attempted to hide itself or escape, I should think it certainly did justify sin. For proof of the Constitution doing this, I would refer the reader to the continuation of the article signed 'Divunion,' in which is repeated what has often been shown before, in regard to the pro-slavery character of this country's Constitution. Again he says, 'The South *has* perverted the anti-slavery character of the Constitution, as is shown by its banishment of Mr. Hoar.' I ask, if the perverting of the minds of the North is also allowed by the Constitution, *because* slavery is justified there? As well might it be said, because the Constitution admits Florida lawfully into the Union, therefore Texas may be admitted as lawfully. Even if the Constitution was violated by the ill-treatment of Mr. Hoar, what is to prevent our friends, if, in pledging itself to sustain slavery, must necessarily use the means, even to the imprisonment and death of Northern interferers,) still it would by no means follow that it is violated in the holding as slaves the black population of the South, that everything can be used by slaveholders to gain all their ends; and those who would oppose them, always have their mouths shut by the try, 'The Constitution upholds it, as on our side.' Now, I would ask, why has the Constitution been always appealed to, to justify this gross course of slaveholders? Why, if it is so decidedly anti-slavery as Liberty men assert? For one, its anti-slavery character does not suit me; for I wish to see a Constitution which shall never be mistaken for a pro-slavery instrument, or appealed to to sustain slavery. If this it may be replied, 'The Bible also is appealed to by pro-slavery men, to sustain their system'—is it therefore a pro-slavery Bible? No, by no means. The pro-slavery character of the Bible was not discovered till quite recently. It is one of the many modern discoveries which astonish our earth. It is not regarded as the pro-slavery book of slaveholders; for if it were, why, I ask, are such severe laws enacted against teaching it to the slaves in Sabbath Schools? Two thirds of the slave population, perhaps, have no means of access to any other book than the Bible; and this they are not allowed, as a general thing, to read themselves; and in some instances where they have been punished severely for being caught with such a book; whereas they might read the Constitution through and through, by night and by day, before the slaveholder would tremble with fear lest they should become acquainted with their situation by reading it. The laws against teaching a slave to read were made, no doubt, with reference to his reading the Bible, and thereby obtaining a knowledge of his rights. But I forbear. I leave the subject to some one more able, who wishes to show the difference between a *so-called* pro-slavery Bible, and a real, thorough-going pro-slavery Constitution.

DISUNION.

RELIGIOUS SPONGING OF FEMALE OPERATIVES—A CASE OF CRUEL INJUSTICE.

LOWELL, April 13, 1845.

BRO. GARRISON:—

I am a stranger, in a strange place, having been a resident of this city but a few short months; but short as the time is, it has been long enough to reveal to me something of the wealth, luxury, power, extortion and oppression of the few opulent and indolent, and the servility, toil, want, misery and suffering of the many, who drag out miserable lives to support those in their indolence.

It does not require much sagacity to search out want and misery in this renowned city of spindles—this industrial city. There are those here, as in other places, who robbe the poor to enlarge their overgrown wealth, and who, in this Christian State, is every. Men in the image of God are not a little below the angels, but a trifle above the brutes. Sectarianism, that monster of iniquity, stalks about as at noon-day, and fastens itself, with all its unrelenting shackles, upon nearly the whole community, and especially on those of the sufferers upon the operatives—but they do not see it, for blindfold are they led along. The females in these seminaries of ignorance, I presume, have never dreamed of their enormous taxation without the least representation. The laws of the corporations require every operative to attend on Sunday, some stated place of what they denominate worship. If they comply, then they must hire a seat, and pay five, six, or seven dollars a year. Out of 8000 operatives, probably 6000 pay this tax ($30,000) for a seat in a house called the Lord's. If they attend without hiring a seat, they must sit in the aisle or preaching.' But this is not all, as much more, no doubt, is extorted from them in shape of charities; for I understand those *long-handled dishes* are weekly passed round, and the poor girls must not be seen in withholding.' They must hear the gospel to the poor, and have 'Tracts' supply the destitute churches of America with faithful preachers—'They must give to Bible Societies and Sabbath School Unions'—'They must truly make their pastors and their wives and children life-members of all these benevolent societies.' Last Sabbath I attended a Bible meeting, and also the same honor conferred upon him; and more than all, the corporation agents and overseers must become life-members, too, even if they do work on Sunday, and employ twenty or thirty to work for them. All of these taxes must be paid by the girls; and yet if they should speak out their mind, they would have St. Paul quoted to her by wholesale—such as 'Women should keep silence,' and 'It is a shame for a woman to speak,' &c. The first day here is very much regarded; but then the Lord's command is quite elastic—it yields to every kind of necessity and mercy. It reminds me of the man who was to leave off his cups, on condition that he have some when he washed sheep, which, by the way, occurred at least three times a day. So, works of necessity cover all a person wishes to do.

But I commenced writing to make known to you a few facts, as they were given me by a poor woman who has suffered greatly, and as appears unjustly by the hand of oppressors; that you, or E. Q., or W. P., or some one in whose heart's spark of humanity still lingers, may examine into the cause of her complaint, and see if there is not one ray of hope left her. Oh! that there was in every city, town and village, at least one Isaac T. Hopper; for then sufferers like this poor woman would know where to apply for relief. At my boarding-house came, for a week to work, this poor colored washing-woman. I marked her dejected countenance, as she seemed heart-stricken, and worn with labor and fatigue.—Seldom did she smile, but appeared burdened with care and grief. A deep spirit of piety pervaded all her words and actions. I conversed with her, and found her a woman of many sorrows. She has told me her tale; and as I consider her a person of strict veracity, I thought best to make you, and if you please the community, acquainted with the circumstances.

She said she came to this place when it was comparatively new. She had many trials to encounter. She was married, and her husband established himself in a lucrative business; and by dint of economy and frugality, they acquired a competence. Her husband bought a handsome house, had it well fitted up, and they were enjoying a comfortable, happy life. Soon her husband was taken from her, leaving her a widow with four small children. This was to her a severe trial; but more still were to be added. The property of her husband was valued at $2700, with a mortgage of $700. This money she could not raise, for she was colored. She was repeatedly told that her debt, was too good for her, and, at length, in the middle of winter, she and her four children were turned out of her house into the broad streets, with no other shelter than the wide canopy of heaven!—the whole amount of her loved and cherished home, with other property, was sold to the highest bidder for gain. And, said she, 'I have never received one straw's worth; but for six years I have been jilted from place to place, toiling for my daily bread and for my little ones. But my God has sustained me. I am destitute of all, and I feel that the poor were, for I am sure it is on account of my color that they suffer me to be so treated. If I had been white, it would have been otherwise; or even if I had been Irish, they had not dared thus to rob me, for fear I would avenge myself. But I am a poor colored woman, and they have me at their mercy.' Truly, the spirit of slavery is here; and those are here, too, who devour widows' houses, &c.

My brother, my own heart' dies within me when I listen to such tales of woe—when I view the emaciated beings of earth, groaning under the yoke of oppression. But I am a woman, and what can I do? I would, if I could, enlist your sympathy, and that of the community, in behalf of this poor woman, and plead for an investigation; and if nothing can be done legally, I would like to have such a fire kindled around that unprincipled oppressor, as would turn out into the deep snows of winter, a widowed mother and her babes, that he would wish to skulk away to the Great Swamp, or the ever-glades of Florida, for a refuge! Yes! let him be away from the free air of Massachusetts, if it is free, and cover himself with the mantle of Southern slaveholders, and breathe the pestilential atmosphere of the South, through the meshes of that flimsy web that is drawn between us at Mason & Dixon's line. Something has been said of holding a Convention here. Can it not be done, and Boston be represented? Can not our friends are in Southern chains, and this poor woman has fallen among thieves and robbers. Truly, who have bruised her, and left her half dead? The priest and Levite have passed her by on the other side, and no good Samaritan has yet poured in the oil to heal her wounds, or comforted her and her up. Will not the friends of humanity listen to this call, and appoint an indignation Convention here, in behalf of those in chains, and the bruised and wounded everywhere, and kindle such a flame that the wicked may tremble like Belshazzar? Can there not a warning cry go forth from Lowell?

Very respectfully, I subscribe myself, thy friend, and a friend of the oppressed. E. J. A.

☞ The case referred to by our correspondent is, indeed, a distressing one, and deserves to be promptly investigated. Alas! it is only one of a series of appalling outrages perpetrated upon the enslaved population of republican America.]—*Ed. Lib.*

NORFOLK COUNTY. Our anti-slavery coadjutors in this County (owing to an accident) will have but a limited notice of the time of their annual gathering; which is ordinarily held in a more stirring manner. *Next day next*; but, as they claim to be 'minute men' in the present revolutionary struggle, they will not excuse themselves from making a prompt and strong rally on the occasion alluded to, because they have not received a monthly circular from the Liberator. We have to be present, with Messrs. Douglass, Phillips, and Quincy. Norfolk County is said to be the 'Banner County' in the cause of Washingtonianism in Massachusetts: it ought, therefore, to be—strange that it is not!—the 'Banner County' in the cause of abolitionism and human rights. Our Washingtonian friends are reminded, 'that one good turn deserves another.' Will they not cheer us by their presence and their words at Dedham next Thursday? [See notice of the meeting in another column.]

ESSEX COUNTY. The meeting of the Essex County Anti-Slavery Society, which is to be held at Manchester on Saturday and Sunday next, we have no doubt will be an effective one, and worthy of attendance from all parts of the County. It will be seen that several able and eloquent speakers are to be present. We regret that the poorer state of our health forbids our cherishing a reasonable hope that we shall be permitted to participate in the proceedings.

PATRONIZE IT. As a portion of our white and colored subscribers in Boston will see the Liberator this day, (Thursday) we would respectfully urge upon them the importance of sustaining that anti-slavery friends, in every quarter, will continue to put down their names on the list of his patrons. We, again repeat, that he is worthy of all encouragement, and that every anti-slavery family ought to have a copy of this masterly work.

CASE OF MR. COFFIN. We are happy to learn that our worthy friend was released at the end of ten days from the 'durance vile' to which he was condemned by Justice Spencer, of the commonwealth, and is now at liberty. The case has been continued to the June term. N. B. A blunder occurred in the printing of our editorial article on the subject last week. In the second column, first paragraph, the sentence—'If, to-day, it makes that a criminal act, which yesterday was innocent; or that, to-day, an innocent act, which yesterday was criminal; he must expound and enforce the law accordingly,' &c.

☞ Read the articles from the United States Gazette and the New-York Tribune, in the preceding page, to be satisfied, abolitionist! that the Whig party, as such, is hostile to the cause of emancipation, and that a dissolution of the Union is the true ground for you to occupy.

New-York City Election.—The Natives have met with a total overthrow; they have not carried a single ward. Last year they had 12 out of 17. Havemeyer, Loco, is elected Mayor by 6 or 7000 majority. Sidney Jones gave 5000 votes, and the Whig Water Ticket about 10,000. Havemeyer has some 6000 plurality over Harper.

Connecticut Election.—Roger S. Baldwin is re-elected Governor by the people. All the other Whig candidates for State offices and for Congress are chosen, and there is a decided Whig majority in both branches of the Legislature.

LIBERATED SLAVES!
EMPLOYMENT WANTED.

Places are wanted, either in town or country, for the following colored women, lately slaves in Louisiana; being a portion of those recently emancipated by Mr. Halliday, Esq. Secretary of the Commonwealth, viz:

BETSEY, 31 years old, having a son 5 years old.
MARIA, aged 23, having a daughter 3 years old.
MINERVY, aged 22, having two infants.
ROSA, aged 18 years.
FRANCES, (girl,) aged 12 years.

The last named have some knowledge of housework. They are all believed to be strong and healthy, of correct deportment, and more capable and intelligent, than the average of persons of their class in Louisiana. They are now in Boston, on expenses; and wages are not so much a consideration as procuring for them, immediately, homes in respectable families, where they may learn to gain a subsistence for themselves and their children.

Persons disposed to receive one or more of them, will please write by mail, to

ELLIS GRAY LORING,
No. 27 State Street, Boston.

Editors of Anti-Slavery and other papers favorably disposed, are invited to copy this notice.

From the Columbia Republican—Extra.

MORE FROM THE WRECK.

HEBRON, April 17, 1845.

Two more Bodies Found—13 *in all Recovered.*—Today two more bodies were recovered from the river outside of Hebron, Washington County, one was that of a Miss Torrey, of Pennsylvania, and the other that of Miss Catharine T. Parker, of Utica. Both were recognized by the friends of the deceased present.

We were present at the Coroner's inquest over the body of Mrs. Parker, and from the evidence given, it was almost beside himself, and it was with difficulty he could be restrained. During the examination, he called loudly upon the perpetrator of the thing in a verdict of *murder* against the pilot of the boat.

The body of Mrs. Ann Lamberton, of Jamaica, L. I. has been recognized among those that were recovered.

Mrs. Gelston, of Schenectady, took passage on the Swallow, near Albany, and has not been seen. Her friends are present at the wreck, and anxiously watching for her body. She was only 22 years of age, and was recently married.

Mrs. Stillman of New-York is supposed also to be among the drowned.

Capt. Squires thinks that no more bodies will be found in the boat. Thorough search, as far as possible, has been made, and the boat is within the boat, but without success. A large number of persons are grappling around the boat, and hundreds of spectators are looking on.

We begin to hope that the loss of life will be limited to a small number, and that the exaggerated reports which have been circulated are without foundation.

Extract of a letter from a gentleman high in office, to his correspondent in New-York—italicised as printed:

SABINE TOWN, March 25.

Texas is *certain* to accept of annexation on the *terms* set forth in Milton Brown's bill. A powerful meeting was held in this neighborhood a few days ago in its favor.

From Texas, by way of the Red River.—The Red River Republican learns from gentlemen direct from Texas, that the most populous settlements through which they passed were in a state of joy at the passage of the Annexation resolutions. When the news reached San Augustine, cannons were fired, and a public meeting was held in celebration of the event.—*New-Orleans Pic., April 5th.*

Death of Rev. Dr. Milnor.—We are pained to announce the decease of the Rev. James Milnor, D. D. Rector of St. George's Church in this city, who died suddenly last evening, at the age, we should judge, of near 70.

He had just gone to bed in health and cheerfulness, when he was seized with a violent pain in a few minutes expired. The disease was in the heart. He had before been brought very low by disease in the same quarter, though recovered by the physicians got in the stomach.—*N. Y. paper.*

DIED—In Princeton, March 20th, of typhus fever, Miss Salina Mirick, youngest daughter of Mr. John and Mrs. Polly Mirick, aged 19 years. Seldom is the scene of death surrounded with more stirring words. Her sickness was short—only one week from the first attack to the closing scene. Nearly from the first, she was deprived of her reasoning faculty and yet her same conversation express her anticipations of the glorious reward awaiting her in the spirit-land. Her bereaved friends feel their loss keenly, but they believe that her ransomed spirit is more actively and constantly employed in the redemption of men from sin and suffering, in a higher sphere than it could be if at the passage of the Annexation resolutions. When the news reached San Augustine, cannons were fired, and a public meeting was held in celebration of the event.—*New-Orleans Pic., April 5th.*

DIED—In Princeton, March 20th, of typhus fever, Miss Salina Mirick, youngest daughter of Mr. John and Mrs. Polly Mirick, aged 19 years. Seldom is the scene of death surrounded with more stirring words. Her sickness was short—only one week from the first attack to the closing scene. Nearly from the first, she was deprived of her reasoning faculty and yet by her same conversation express her anticipations of the glorious reward awaiting her in the spirit-land. Her bereaved friends feel their loss keenly, but they believe that her ransomed spirit is more actively and constantly employed in the redemption of men from sin and suffering, in a higher sphere in God's mansion of light, than if she had been spared to the mighty conflict between the powers of darkness and the TRUE Church of the redeemed on earth. We feel a deep interest, and feel we shall ever remember her sweet melody in the anti-slavery gatherings and sewing circles. Her memory shall be blessed.

☞ Printers in Maine are requested to copy this notice.

LECTURES ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

Addison Davis of Lynn, will deliver a Lecture on Capital Punishment in the vestry of the Fifth Universalist Society, on Sabbath evening, April 27th, at 7 o'clock.

Charles Spear will deliver a Lecture on Capital Punishment in Haskell's Hall in Chelsea, on Wednesday evening, April 23d.

NORFOLK COUNTY A. S. SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of the Norfolk County A. S. Society will be held at DEDHAM, on THURSDAY, the April 24th, in the TOWN HALL, at 10 o'clock, A. M. Accidental circumstances have prevented this advertisement from appearing in the Liberator. It is hoped that the friends will feel called upon to make extraordinary efforts to give notice of the meeting, and to bring their friends to attend. Mr. Garrison, W. Phillips and Mr. Quincy are expected to be present, and efforts will be made to secure the presence of Mr. Douglass. Let there be a general rally of the abolitionists of Norfolk County on that occasion, and the meeting cannot fail to be an interesting and profitable one. The friends of

POETRY.

A VOICE FROM THE ANTI-SLAVERY HALL.

BY A. H. PRICE, OF HOPEDALE.

A voice from the Fair! A voice from the Fair!
Clear and shrill on the winter air,
It comes from the young, it comes from the old,
Peals o'er the hill-tops commanding and bold—

Let the slaves be free,
And the Upas-tree
Of Oppression be thrown to the depths of the sea!
We have worked for the right,
And have added our mite
To the power that shall do away Slavery's blight.
Our voice shall swell loud,
To startle the crowd,
Who are weaving in darkness for Freedom a shroud.
As it falls on their ears,
They will shudder with fear,
And drop their foul work with a penitent tear.
Then come, one and all,
As ye list to our call,
And help us roll onward the Liberty ball.

Let the strong and the free, the happy and gay,
Remember the slave who is toiling away,
With little to comfort, and nothing to cheer;
Who drags out in sorrow each wearisome year.

Here is work for all you,
Who are valiant and true,
To swell our long train with energies new;
We will wake up the South
By the word of our mouth
As the tyrant doth gaze on the wide-spreading drouth
Of the once fertile plain,
Where the letter and chain
Do clank on the ears of the lovers of gain.

He will seem to make haste
To repeal the sad waste
And to let the poor slave of sweet liberty taste.
Then, courage for all
Who work for the thrall,
For the birthright of Freedom shall soon be for all;
As our numbers increase, our hearts will be strong;
While the wheels of reform are rolling along:
We are cheered on our way by the smile of the Lord,
And the seal of his love is our certain reward.

When our labor is done,
And the victory won;
When the Kingdom of Righteousness here has begun.
O then will we rest,
With the weary once blest,
And peace, like a river, fill every breast.
Pining bondman, look up!
See a vision of Hope,
Through the gathering clouds that are seeming to ope!
The Jubilee year
Is certainly near,
When the rod of the tyrant no more shall ye fear.
Then, bondman, rejoice!
As ye list to our voice,
For the rich boon of Freedom we know is your choice.

PUNCH has his own way of showing up the evils in the social state of England. The following carol is biting.

A CHRISTMAS CAROL.

To Church betimes! The Christmas chimes
Are calling high and low in;
To Church then all, both great and small!
Chorus of many voices.
We've not a coat to go in!

Like our old sires, with roaring fires,
The fangs of winter braving;
Huge logs piled high, to sit thereby
Chorus.
We've not a single shaving!

Good Christmas fare is physic rare
To warm the regions inner;
Plum pudding join to stomt sirloin.
Chorus.
We've not a crust for dinner!

Fill glass and bowl, each jovial soul,
As round the hearth we close in;
Our wine is bright in its ruddy light.
Chorus.
Our very water's frozen!

Right late we'll sup, and keep it up
Till time to morn shall creep on;
Then sink to rest in downy nest.
Chorus.
We've not a bed to sleep on!

Loud be the song, the laughter long;
Our joy no care shall leaven;
Christmas is here but once a year.
Chorus.
For that, at least, thank Heaven!

WHAT IS A CHURCH?

What constitutes a Church?—
Not Roman basilic or Gothic pile,
With fretted roof, tall spire, and long-drawn aisle
—These only mock thy search:
Fantastic sepulchres, when all is said,—
Seek not the living Church among the dead.

What is a Church indeed?
Not triple hierarchy, or throned priest,
The stolen trappings of the Romish beast,
Altar, or well-sung creed,
Rites magical to save, to sanctify,
Nor ought that lulls the ear, or lures the eye.

A band of faithful men
Met for God's worship in an upper room
Or canopied by midnight's starry dome,
On hill-side, or lone glen,
To hear the counsels of his holy word,
Pledged to each other and their common Lord.

These, few as they may be,
Compose a Church, such as in pristine age,
Defied the tyrant's zeal, the bigot's rage,
For where but two or three,
Whatever place, in faith's communion meet,
There, with Christ's presence, is a Church complete.

POWER AND BENEVOLENCE.

God is not *great* because *omnipotent!*
But because power in him is understood,
And felt and proved to be benevolent,
And wise, and holy—thus it ever should!
For what He wills, we know is pure and good,
And has in view the happiness of ALL!
Hence love and admiration—never could
The contrite spirit at his footstool fall,
If power, and power *alone*, its feelings did appal!

If then divinest power be truly so,
Because its only object is to bless,
It follows, that all power which man can know,
The highest even monarchs can possess,
Displays alone, their less than littleness,
Unless it seek the happiness of MAN,
And glory of the Highest:—nothing less
That such a use of power one moment can
Makes its possessor great, on wisdom's godlike plan.

BERNARD BARTON.

APRIL.

Thou gentle herald of the flowery Spring!
Mother of violet and pale primrose,
Whose beauty now on every wild bank grows,
Hark! how the joyous birds thy welcome sing!
Well pick'st—some chattering is the hawthorn hedge,
Some deep embower'd in lonely glen or brake,
And others booming from the watery sedge—
All joined, a various concert for thy sake,
Most musically and most fondly make!
Sweet April, whose dear face so oft appears
The semblance of the brightest thing on earth,
Which is a lovely laughing girl in tears,
Thy coming wakes the groves to bloom and mirth!

REFORM AT HOME.

☞ The case of Mr. Coffin, of New Bedford, whose excellent letter is given below, was commented upon at some length in the last Liberator. It will be prodictive of much good to the cause of religious freedom, or we greatly mistake the spirit of the age.

From the New-Bedford Pub-Finder.

LETTER FROM WILLIAM C. COFFIN.

The subject of oaths and affirmations has occupied the attention of the people for a few days past, in consequence of my refusal to swear or affirm, when called upon to do so, by Judge Spooner of the Police Court, and my imprisonment in default of his authority. I trust the subject will be fully discussed; and if my refusal and consequent confinement within these walls, have been the first effect to call public attention to it, I am glad to be here, for good will surely come of it. The whole subject of nonresistance, most emphatically, is discussed, and when it is fully examined in the light of Christianity, it cannot fail to be received by honest minds.

I object to taking an oath, because I believe that Christianity forbids it. When a positive declaration is made by Christ that we should not swear, I believe it is a high and consequential duty to obey Christ says, 'Again ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths. But I say unto you, '*Swear not at all*': neither by heaven, for it is God's throne, &c. But let your communication be yes, yes; nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these, cometh of evil.' The Apostle says, 'But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath. But let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay, lest ye fall into condemnation.'

The early Christians understood these declarations to be a prohibition of all oaths, and for two of three hundred years after Christ, when called upon to take an oath, the reply was, 'I am a Christian, I swear not.' They believed such an act to be contrary to Christianity, and refused. There are many objections to the taking of oaths that might be presented; but the Path-finder is a small paper, and I do not wish to occupy much space, thereby excluding other and important articles from its columns.

We are told by Christ, then, that any thing more than a simple statement of the truth, without oath, cometh of evil; and by James, that we shall fall into condemnation if we take it. A person desiring to act consistently with Christianity in this matter, is condemned, out of the statute book—the State Bible—to fine and imprisonment, for not doing what cometh of evil. The members of the Society of Friends have always refused to take an oath.

My objections to an affirmation follow, of course, from my nonresistance principles. If I have not the right to inflict injury upon my brother man, under any circumstances,—if the law of love to enemies, forgiveness, is to be the rule of action instead of revenge,—then, surely, the system of punishment which obtains among us, for a violation of the State laws, is wrong: for what is wrong for an individual, is wrong for a congregation of individuals to do. We cannot love our neighbor as ourself, and at the same time punish him. We cannot love our enemies, and hang them by the neck, or shoot them.

Christianity teaches us to love our enemies, and to do good to them that despitefully use us and persecute us. We are taught by the State Bible to act contrary to these requirements—to shut up our enemy within stone walls, and for some offences to kill him at the gallows. The law of love is abrogated, and a system of punishment—an antichristian system—substituted. With such a system, Christians can have nothing to do. A person affirming, promises to tell the truth, and commutes that the pains and penalties of perjury may be inflicted upon him, if he fails to do it. Can I, consistently with non-resistance principles, acknowledge that the Judge has the right to punish me, if I fail to tell the truth? Is such punishment, if I fail to tell the truth? It seems to me that I cannot. I must be convinced, then, of my non-resistance errors, (if they are errors,) before I can make affirmation.

As I am not responsible for the free act of another, it seems to me now, that I might make a statement of facts, without oath or affirmation, before a court, consistently with my non-resistance principles. If others make a bad use of the information which I give, that is not my fault. I have not always paid taxes to government: am I guilty of upholding a wrong system if I am compelled to pay the money, and if I protest, at the same time, against a bad use being made of it? I think not. I hope, however, that this subject will be fully discussed, that we may know what our duty is in regard to it. This paper is established to aid in finding the path of truth and duty, and I trust, when found, we shall be able to walk in it.

WM. C. COFFIN.

County Jail, April 7th.

☞ The following cogent Essay is from Jonathan Dymond's profound work, entitled 'Essays on the Principles of Morality, and on the Private and Political Obligations of Mankind,' and seems to us unanswerable.

OATHS.

'An oath is that whereby we call God to witness the truth of what we say, with a curse upon ourselves, either implied or expressed, should it prove false.'*

A CURSE. Now supposing the Christian Scriptures to contain no information respecting the moral character of oaths, how is it a reasonable, or prudent, or reverent, for a man to make his salvation upon the truth of what he says? To bring forward so tremendous an event as everlasting destruction to the perjurer of the Lord† in attestation of the offence perhaps of a poacher, or of the claim to a field, is surely to make, unwarrantably, light of most awful things. The consideration applies, even if a man is sure that he speaks the truth: but who is beforehand, sure of this? Oaths in evidence, for example, are taken before the testimony is given. A person swears that he will speak the truth. Who, I ask, is sure that he will do this? Who is sure that the embarrassment of a public examination, that the enormous temptations of courts, that a secret influence of inclination or interest, will not occasion him to utter one inaccurate expression? Who, at any rate, is so sure of his own life, that it is rational, or justifiable, specifically to stake his salvation upon his accuracy? Thousands of honest men have been, by mistaken; their allegations have been sincere, but unfounded. Perjury is should be thought not a legitimate objection, let it be remembered that few men's minds are so sternly upright that they can answer a variety of questions upon subjects on which their feelings, and wishes, and interest are involved, without some little deduction from the truth, in speaking of matters that are against their cause, or some little over-coloring of facts in their own favor. It is a circumstance of constant occurrence, that even a well-intentioned witness adds to or deducts a little from the truth. With him, amid such temptation, would make, who ought to make, his hope of heaven dependant on his strict adherence to accurate verbal truth? And if such considerations indicate the impropriety of swearing upon subjects which affect the lives, and liberties, and property of others, how shall we estimate the impropriety of using these tremendous sanctions to secure the delivery of a summons for a debt of half-a-crown?

These are moral objections to the use of oaths, independently of any reference to the divine moral law. Another objection of the same kind is this: To take an oath is to assume that the Deity will become a party in the case,—that we can call upon Him, when we please, to follow up by the sanction of His almighty power, the contracts (often the very insignificant contracts) which men make with men. Is it not irreverent, and for that reason immoral, to call upon him to exercise this power in reference to subjects which are so insignificant, that other men will scarcely listen to the discourses to their details? The objection goes even further. A court may require an oath of the man whom he has plundered, that he will not attempt to pursue or to prosecute him. Pursuit and prosecution are duties; so then the oath assumes that the Deity will punish the swearer in futurity, if he fulfils a duty. Confederates in a dangerous and wicked enterprise bind one another to secrecy and to mutual assistance, by oaths,—making that God will become a party to their wickedness, and if they do not perpetrate it, will punish them for their virtue.

Upon every subject of questionable rectitude that is sanctioned by habit and the usages of society, a person should place himself in the independent situation of an Inquirer. He should not seek for arguments to defend an existing practice, but should simply inquire what our practice ought to be. One of the most powerful recommendations of the amendment of public institutions consists in this circumstance; that most men endeavor rather to justify what exists than to consider whether it ought to exist or not. This cause operates on the inquirer, if he be not. We therefore invite the reader, in considering the question which follows, to suppose himself to be one of the Inquirers at the mount,—to think nothing of the customs of the present day, and to have no *desire* to justify them.

'Ye have heard that it hath been said of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths. But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven, for it is God's throne; nor by the earth, for it is his footstool; neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the Great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be yea, yea; nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.'†

If a person should take a New Testament, and read these words to ten intelligent Asiatics who had never heard of them before, does any man believe that a single hearer of them would think that the words did not prohibit *all* oaths? I lay stress upon this consideration; ‡ ten unbiassed persons would, at first sight, understand the prohibition universal, we have no contemporary information that is the real meaning of the words. For to whom were the words addressed? Not to schoolmen, to whom it was known that they would make nice distinctions and curious investigations; not to men of learning, who were in the habit of cautiously weighing the import of language; but to a multitude,—a mixed and unschooled multitude. Is it to such persons that the prohibition was addressed; it was to such apprehensions that its form was adapted.

'It hath been said of old time, Thou shalt *not forswear thyself*.' Why refer to what was said of old time? Perhaps it was necessarily; to point out that the present requisitions were *different* from the former; that what was prohibited now, was *different* from what was formerly allowed before. And what was prohibited before? Swearing *falsely*—swearing and *not performing*. What then could be prohibited now? Swearing *truly*,—swearing, even, and *performing*. That is, swearing at all. It is manifest that if truth may not be attested by an oath, no oath may be taken. Of old time it was said, 'Ye shall not swear falsely.' Now it is said, 'If a man swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond, he shall not *break* his word.'§ There could be no intelligible purpose in commentating upon the new precept from these, but to point out a characteristic difference; and there is no intelligible characteristic difference but that which denounces all oaths. Such were the views of the members of the Society of Friends, who, if they, say, one of them, 'is satisfied with the honest *keeping* of the oath, but Christ cuts off the *opportunity* of perjury.' ‖ Perhaps, however, that this oratory reference to the former law is in my view absolutely conclusive of our Christian duty, I would remark, as an extraordinary circumstance, that Dr. Paley, in citing the passage, omits this introduction, and takes no notice of it in his argument.

'I say unto you, Swear *not at all*.' The words are absolute and exclusive.

'Neither by heaven, nor by the earth, nor by Jerusalem, nor by thy own head.' Respecting this enumeration, it is said that it prohibits swearing by certain objects, but not by all objects. To which a sufficient answer is found in the parallel passage in James. 'Swear not,' he says; 'neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any *other* oath.' This mode of prohibition, by which an absolute and universal rule is first proposed and then followed by certain examples of the forbidden thing, is elsewhere employed in Scripture. 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth.'** No man supposes that this after-enumeration was designed to restrict the universality of the law. 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image,' or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth.'** No man supposes that this after-enumeration was designed to restrict the universality of the law. 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me.' Is it rational, or justifiable, specifically to make his salvation upon the truth of what he says? To bring forward so tremendous an event as everlasting destruction to the perjurer of the Lord† in attestation of the offence perhaps of a poacher, or of the claim to a field, is surely to make, unwarrantably, light of most awful things. The consideration applies, even if a man is sure that he speaks the truth: but who is beforehand, sure of this? Oaths in evidence, for example, are taken before the testimony is given. A person swears that he will speak the truth. Who, I ask, is sure that he will do this? Who is sure that the embarrassment of a public examination, that the enormous temptations of courts, that a secret influence of inclination or interest, will not occasion him to utter one inaccurate expression? Who, at any rate, is so sure of his own life, that it is rational, or justifiable, specifically to stake his salvation upon his accuracy? Thousands of honest men have been mistaken; their allegations have been sincere, but unfounded. Perjury is should be thought not a legitimate objection, let it be remembered that few men's minds are so sternly upright that they can answer a variety of questions upon subjects on which their feelings, and wishes, and interest are involved, without some little deduction from the truth, in speaking of matters that are against their cause, or some little over-coloring of facts in their own favor. It is a circumstance of constant occurrence, that even a well-intentioned witness adds to or deducts a little from the truth. With him, amid such temptation, would make, who ought to make, his hope of heaven dependant on his strict adherence to accurate verbal truth? And if such considerations indicate the impropriety of swearing upon subjects which affect the lives, and liberties, and property of others, how shall we estimate the impropriety of using these tremendous sanctions to secure the delivery of a summons for a debt of half-a-crown?

These are moral objections to the use of oaths, independently of any reference to the divine moral law. Another objection of the same kind is this: To take an oath is to assume that the Deity will become a party in the case,—that we can call upon Him, when we please, to follow up by the sanction of His almighty power, the contracts (often the very insignificant contracts) which men make with men. Is it not irreverent, and for that reason immoral, to call upon him to exercise this power in reference to subjects which are so insignificant, that other men will scarcely listen to the discourses to their details? The objection goes even further. A court may require an oath of the man whom he has plundered, that he will not attempt to pursue or to prosecute him. Pursuit and prosecution are duties; so then the oath assumes that the Deity will punish the swearer in futurity, if he fulfils a duty. Confederates in a dangerous and wicked enterprise bind one another to secrecy and to mutual assistance, by oaths,—making that God will become a party to their wickedness, and if they do not perpetrate it, will punish them for their virtue.

Upon every subject of questionable rectitude that is sanctioned by habit and the usages of society, a person should place himself in the independent situation of an Inquirer. He should not seek for arguments to defend an existing practice, but should simply inquire what our practice ought to be. One of the most powerful recommendations of the amendment of public institutions consists in this circumstance; that most men endeavor rather to justify what exists than to consider whether it ought to exist or not. This cause operates on the inquirer, if he be not. We therefore invite the reader, in considering the question which follows, to suppose himself to be one of the Inquirers at the mount,—to think nothing of the customs of the present day, and to have no *desire* to justify them.

'Ye have heard that it hath been said of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths. But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven, for it is God's throne; nor by the earth, for it is his footstool; neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the Great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be yea, yea; nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.'†

If a person should take a New Testament, and read these words to ten intelligent Asiatics who had never heard of them before, does any man believe that a single hearer of them would think that the words did not prohibit *all* oaths? I lay stress upon this consideration; ‡ ten unbiassed persons would, at first sight, understand the prohibition universal, we have no contemporary information that is the real meaning of the words. For to whom were the words addressed? Not to schoolmen, to whom it was known that they would make nice distinctions and curious investigations; not to men of learning, who were in the habit of cautiously weighing the import of language; but to a multitude,—a mixed and unschooled multitude. Is it to such persons that the prohibition was addressed; it was to such apprehensions that its form was adapted.

'It hath been said of old time, Thou shalt *not forswear thyself*.' Why refer to what was said of old time? Perhaps it was necessarily; to point out that the present requisitions were *different* from the former; that what was prohibited now, was *different* from what was formerly allowed before. And what was prohibited before? Swearing *falsely*—swearing and *not performing*. What then could be prohibited now? Swearing *truly*,—swearing, even, and *performing*. That is, swearing at all. It is manifest that if truth may not be attested by an oath, no oath may be taken. Of old time it was said, 'Ye shall not swear falsely.' Now it is said, 'If a man swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond, he shall not *break* his word.'§ There could be no intelligible purpose in commentating upon the new precept from these, but to point out a characteristic difference; and there is no intelligible characteristic difference but that which denounces all oaths. Such were the views of the members of the Society of Friends, who, if they, say, one of them, 'is satisfied with the honest *keeping* of the oath, but Christ cuts off the *opportunity* of perjury.' ‖ Perhaps, however, that this oratory reference to the former law is in my view absolutely conclusive of our Christian duty, I would remark, as an extraordinary circumstance, that Dr. Paley, in citing the passage, omits this introduction, and takes no notice of it in his argument.

'I say unto you, Swear *not at all*.' The words are absolute and exclusive.

'Neither by heaven, nor by the earth, nor by Jerusalem, nor by thy own head.' Respecting this enumeration, it is said that it prohibits swearing by certain objects, but not by all objects. To which a sufficient answer is found in the parallel passage in James. 'Swear not,' he says; 'neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any *other* oath.' This mode of prohibition, by which an absolute and universal rule is first proposed and then followed by certain examples of the forbidden thing, is elsewhere employed in Scripture. 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth.'** No man supposes that this after-enumeration was designed to restrict the universality of the law. 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me.' Is it rational, or justifiable, specifically to make his salvation upon the truth of what he says? To bring forward so tremendous an event as everlasting destruction to the perjurer of the Lord† in attestation of the offence perhaps of a poacher, or of the claim to a field, is surely to make, unwarrantably, light of most awful things. The consideration applies, even if a man is sure that he speaks the truth: but who is beforehand, sure of this? Oaths in evidence, for example, are taken before the testimony is given. A person swears that he will speak the truth. Who, I ask, is sure that he will do this? Who is sure that the embarrassment of a public examination, that the enormous temptations of courts, that a secret influence of inclination or interest, will not occasion him to utter one inaccurate expression? Who, at any rate, is so sure of his own life, that it is rational, or justifiable, specifically to stake his salvation upon his accuracy? Thousands of honest men have been mistaken; their allegations have been sincere, but unfounded. Perjury is should be thought not a legitimate objection, let it be remembered that few men's minds are so sternly upright that they can answer a variety of questions upon subjects on which their feelings, and wishes, and interest are involved, without some little deduction from the truth, in speaking of matters that are against their cause, or some little over-coloring of facts in their own favor. It is a circumstance of constant occurrence, that even a well-intentioned witness adds to or deducts a little from the truth. With him, amid such temptation, would make, who ought to make, his hope of heaven dependant on his strict adherence to accurate verbal truth? And if such considerations indicate the impropriety of swearing upon subjects which affect the lives, and liberties, and property of others, how shall we estimate the impropriety of using these tremendous sanctions to secure the delivery of a summons for a debt of half-a-crown?

These are moral objections to the use of oaths, independently of any reference to the divine moral law. Another objection of the same kind is this: To take an oath is to assume that the Deity will become a party in the case,—that we can call upon Him, when we please, to follow up by the sanction of His almighty power, the contracts (often the very insignificant contracts) which men make with men. Is it not irreverent, and for that reason immoral, to call upon him to exercise this power in reference to subjects which are so insignificant, that other men will scarcely listen to the discourses to their details? The objection goes even further. A court may require an oath of the man whom he has plundered, that he will not attempt to pursue or to prosecute him. Pursuit and prosecution are duties; so then the oath assumes that the Deity will punish the swearer in futurity, if he fulfils a duty. Confederates in a dangerous and wicked enterprise bind one another to secrecy and to mutual assistance, by oaths,—making that God will become a party to their wickedness, and if they do not perpetrate it, will punish them for their virtue.

With such distinctness of evidence as to the universality of the prohibition of oaths by Jesus Christ, it is not in strictness necessary to refer to those passages in the Christian Scriptures, which some persons adduce in favor of their employment. If Christ have prohibited them, nothing else can prove them to be right. Our reference to those passages will accordingly be short.

'I adjure thee by the living God that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God.' Of those who adjure that Christ, in answering to this, 'Thou hast said,' took an oath, a sufficient answer has already been given. Christ, if he had then took an oath, he swore by the Deity, and this is precisely the very kind of oath which it is acknowledged he himself forbade. But what inaccurate reason could there be for supposing that Christ, if he had then heard of calling upon a prisoner to *swear* that he was guilty? Nothing was wanted but a simple declaration that he was guilty, and that he was. With this view, the proceeding was extremely natural. Finding that to the less urgent solicitation he made no reply, the high priest proceeded to the more urgent. Sebleusner, in his commentary, remarks upon the passage, that the words I adjure, do not here mean, 'I make to swear, or put upon oath,' but, 'I solemnly and in the name of God, conjure, or entreat.' This is evidently the natural and the only natural meaning; just as it was the natural meaning when the evil spirit said to Christ, 'I adjure thee by the living God that thou torment me not.' The evil spirit surely did not administer an oath.

'Christ is my witness that without ceasing, I make mention of you always in my prayers.' Is it not the Almighty was witness to the subject of his prayers is most true; but to state this truth is not to swear. Neither has language been used to which is indicated below contains the characteristics of an oath, according to the definitions even of those who urge the expression. None of them contain, according to Milton's definition, 'a curse upon ourselves; nor according to Paley's, an 'invocation of God's vengeance.' Similar language, but in a more emphatic form, occurs in the epistle to the Christian Corinthians converts. It appears from 2 Cor. ii. that Paul had resolved not again to go to Corinth in heaviness, lest he should, in coming, find those who ought to make him happy. Paul said, 'Moreover I call God for record upon my soul, that *to spare you* I came not as yet unto Corinth.' In order to show that he had not been in error in thus resolving, he adds the apostle imprecated the vengeance of God if he did not speak the truth. Who can show this?—The expression appears to be a form of speaking, a common mode of saying. God is witness; or, as the expression is sometimes employed in the present day, God knows that such was my endeavor or desire.

The next and the last passage is of a very exceptionable class: it is founded upon silence. 'For men verily swear by the greater, and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife.' Respecting this, it is said that it 'speaks of the custom of swearing judicially without any mark of censure or disapprobation.' To which it may be contended that whatever an apostle mentions without reprobating, he approves? The same apostle speaks just in the same manner of the pagan games: of running a race for prizes, and of fighting for the mastery. Yet who would adopt the argument, that *because* Paul did not then censure the games, he thought them right? Is not the common custom both of swearing and of the games are adduced merely by way of *illustration* of the writer's subject.

Respecting the usefulness of oaths, then, as determined by the Christian Scriptures, how does the balance of evidence stand? On the one side, we have plain emphatical prohibitions,—prohibitions of which the meaning cannot be fully proved, the more they are investigated; on the other, we have —counter precepts?—No—It is not even pretended; but we have expressions, the use of language, of which it is saying much to say that it is *doubtful* whether they are oaths or not. How then would the man of reason and of philosophy decide?—'Many of the Christian Fathers say Christ, by forbidding, denied *all* oaths without exception.'‖ Grotius was himself an advocate of oaths. 'I say nothing of perjury,' says Grotius, 'since *recovering truly* is unlawful to Christians.'¶ Chrysostom says, 'Do not say to me, I swear for a just purpose: it is no longer lawful for thee to swear, either justly or unjustly.'‖ 'He who, after Christ,' says Origen, 'has preculded murder by taking away anger, and who has driven away the pollution of adultery by subduing desire, would not, if he lived for life the crime of perjury by forbidding us to swear; for where there is no oath, there can be no infringement of it.'§ Such is the conviction which the language of Christ conveyed to the early converts to his pure religion; and such is the conviction which I think it would convey to an unbiassed mind, if familiarized as with evil, and if we did not read the New Testament rather to find justifications of our practice, than to discover the truth and to apply it to our conduct.

*Rom. i. 9. See also 1 Thess. ii. 5, and Gal. i. 20.
† Heb. vi. 16.
‡ Rights of War and Peace.
‖ De Lege, Lib. iv. c. 2.
§ In Gen. iii. Hom. xv.
¶ In Cant. Hom. 13.

AWFUL DISASTER ON THE NORTH RIVER.

STEAMER ROCHESTER, Tuesday, 3 A. M.

MY DEAR FRIEND,—You may value a few lines from an eye witness, descriptive of the terrible accident which befel the Rochester, yesterday evening, about eight o'clock, when going at a rapid rate, the boat struck on a small rock island abreast the town of Athens and the city of Hudson. I was sitting in the upper saloon in conversation. At the first severe shock the passengers rushed below, but fears were enlarged by the appalling sounds of the rending of timbers, and the evident destruction of the boat; while the water came in with frightful rapidity. Those who had 'turned in,' in the after cabin, had barely time to leap from their berths, before the water was upon them.

You can imagine the horrors of the scene at this moment when more than three hundred souls were thus exposed to the mind of falling snow, and almost utter darkness. A few minutes afterwards was heard the boiler fires, a sheet of mingled steam, smoke and flame, poured into the boat, illuminating the ghastly countenances of the crowd, and the rigging and completing the consternation. The conviction that the curse of fire was to be added to our other imminent perils, succeeded the resignation of the last hearts. But the rapid sinking of the boat extinguished the fires, and all was darkness again.

In less time than 10 minutes, by the blessing of God, the stern rested on the bottom, the water came up above the windows of the aft saloon state rooms—Several females were drawn out of state rooms by dashing in the sashes, and conveyed safely ashore, one very aged, and now lying on board this boat in a precarious situation—were taken from the Ladies' Cabin by assistance from the floor. They had sustained themselves on their faces. Thus they had been forced high and dry upon the rock, and the boat, split upon a midship, was left rising almost perpendicularly upon the recovered wide-spread timbers clinging to the bulwarks. The remainder of the passengers were sadly grouped on the forward upper deck, some with a sudden glare of vivid light, and completing the consternation. The conviction that the curse of fire was to be added to our other imminent perils, succeeded the resignation of the last hearts. But the rapid sinking of the boat extinguished the fires, and all was darkness again.

In less time than 10 minutes, by the blessing of God, the stern rested on the bottom, the water came up above the windows of the aft saloon state rooms—Several females were drawn out of state rooms by dashing in the sashes, and conveyed safely ashore, one very aged, and now lying on board this boat in a precarious situation—were taken from the Ladies' Cabin by assistance from the floor. They had sustained themselves on their faces. Thus they had been forced high and dry upon the rock, and the boat, split upon a midship, was left rising almost perpendicularly upon the recovered wide-spread timbers clinging to the bulwarks. The remainder of the passengers were sadly grouped on the forward upper deck, some with a sudden glare of vivid light, companions, and actuated by the most dreadful apprehensions for their fate.

By this time the alarm had been thoroughly communicated to Hudson and Athens. The bells of the churches began to ring, and the river was soon covered with torches, waving in the fleet of boats that put off to our assistance; while the Rochester, which had found it difficult to reach the and the Express, which had now come up, were greatly approaching alongside. The sound of the bells pealing in the distance, the glare of torches in the boats, the light of the waving torches, and the wailing grief of many on the wreck, constituted pictures of the most thrilling scenes.

In the course of an hour all were taken off who remained, in the Rochester, the past seeming like a terrible dream. I am approaching the city. I can scarcely be at home, so unnerved am I. Many leaped immediately overboard in that frenzy of mind which precludes the power of self-preservation; but they were saved. The doors of most of the state rooms were so sprung as to close on the minutes, and examination will probably discover the dead within some of them. I can scarcely hope otherwise.

The boat is a complete wreck. It was a mournful sight as we cast off from her side. The Captain behaved nobly—calming fears, and making his voice heard every where in advice, with the most thorough judgment and self-possession. The baggage is almost all deep under water, and will be recovered only to a damaged state.

Our hearty thanks are due to the officers of the Rochester and Express for their prompt assistance and untiring assiduity to save every thing that hand could be laid on.

Friends in the Rochester tell me that the yell of a gong, as they floated down, caused to their ears from the sinking boat, was of a character never to be forgotten. Yours truly,

HENRY F. HARRINGTON.

N. B. Morning—The apprehensions of loss of life which I have intimated above, are fully realized. Several females were seen to be washed off by the water as it rose above the guards, and all it is feared would have been swept from the cabin, several on board our boat have nothing but their night dresses.

☞ By later accounts it is estimated that not less than forty or fifty of the passengers were lost! The whole number of bodies thus far recovered, is eleven, as follows:

The Misses Wood, sisters, of Albany; Mr. Davis, of Troy; Mr. Gardner, of G. A. Coffin, of Troy; Mrs. Coffin, wife of G. M. Coffin, ditto; Mrs. Conklin, of Bennington, Vt.; Mrs. Walker, of New-York; Miss Briggs, mariner, Troy; Miss Spencer, ditto; one young man, supposed to be from the west; one young woman, not recognised, dressed in mourning. Mr. Davis, of Troy, was found, 25d, $37 of which were of the Mohawk Valley Bank.

The ladies' cabin, in which it is feared many went down, yet remains to be raised.

THE BLOODY AND OPPRESSIVE SOUTH.

ANOTHER CHAPTER.

Duel.—A hostile meeting took place between Judge Gilbert Leonard and Mr. Philip Theo, of Plaquemine. They met on Friday last, at Point Coupee, below the city. Their weapons were fowling-pieces, loaded with ball. Two shots were exchanged at the distance of fifty paces.

At the second fire, Mr. Tocs struck Judge Leonard on the left side. The ball broke the third or fourth rib, and lodged in the upper lobe of the right shoulder. We understand the wound is not considered mortal.—*Picayune*, 23d.

A duel occurred in Winchester, on the 19th, between J. M. Bryan, D. D. Jones, and J. Jones, with pistols, at ten feet distance. Neither party was seriously injured.

Rumored Duel.—We have seen a letter from Little Rock, in which it is stated that it is rumored that a rumor is afoot that a hostile meeting is shortly to take place between Ex-Governor Butler, U. S. Commissioner, and Mr. Conway, of the Gazette. We sincerely hope the report may be untrue.—*N. O. Pic., March 12.*

Lynching.—We hear of great outrages of the law in Madison Parish, Tensas, La., in this State. A respectable farmer in that township had been for more than a year, in the destruction of his property and of his other means. The perpetrators of these acts remained undiscovered till very lately, when, since, when six or eight of them were apprehended, several of them have confessed, and were condemned to receive so many stripes, and were whipped several days in succession. One of them made his escape, after receiving the first instalment of stripes. The others were all in custody, and there was great excitement in the neighborhood.—*St. Louis Republican, March 21.*

During Outrage.—An intelligent and accomplished young lady was shot, on the 2d of March, in Madison, in this county, late in the evening, for the purpose of gathering flowers. When within a hundred and fifty yards of her dwelling, she was seized by two persons supposed to be negroes, and the first thing she knew, her person was hoodwinked and gagged, and unable to give any alarm. She was then borne off about a mile and a half, where she was divested of her outer clothing, and was about receiving further violence, left to make her way back, as best she could. Being confused and unaccustomed to the place, she was lost, and was found wandering, and it being then dark, she attempted to make her way back, and after wandering about through the woods for some time, she became exhausted from fatigue, and fell down amidst a pile of brush, where she lay through the night, lying in a state of insensibility.—*Pulaski (Tenn.) Gazette.*

The Richmond (Ky.) Chronicle announces the death of Mr. Robert Simpson, of Clark county, who was brutally beaten at the house of David Lanter, about three years ago, in Madison county. Lanter has been committed to jail, by an examining court, charged with having been engaged in the transaction, to which his trial will be brought up at the Circuit Court. Suspicions are entertained that other participated in the foul deed.

Horrid Murder.—Two young men, named Joshua Jones and Hawthorne, residing near Belleville, (Ala.) were shot dead by a neighbor named Jesse Henry. The murderer had not been arrested. The murder was the consequence of the attempt made by wife. It was not stated what induced the man to commit the murder.

We learn from the Alabama Journal of the 12th instant, that on the Mobile and Montgomery last, William B. Womack, of Shady Bower, Butler county, Ala., Tuesday was shot by one of his slaves. He lingered till the 9th of February, when he died. The man who shot him and three accomplices are in jail to await their trial. It is said that they have confessed their guilt.

Outrage.—On Tuesday night, a young man named Edmund Schenzeyder, having given the boarders of two watchmen, visited a house in the third municipality, for the purpose of arresting a runaway negro. The owner of the house, with a little man, refused to admit them, and fired a fowling-piece loaded with ball, in the face of Schenzeyder, severely wounding him, and depriving entirely one of his eyes. The man who fired the gun was immediately arrested and lodged in prison.—*New-Orleans Bee, March 20.*

Murder.—An old man, about 90 years of age, were called from his home, near Pearl River, in Monticello, Mississippi, on Pearl river, was murdered a few days since by his son-in-law. The murderer has been arrested.

Suicide or Murder.—The Columbia, Mt. Statesman of the 7th ult. says:

'We learn that on Sunday night last, Martin Breedlove, of Bedford county, having given the assistance of Mr. Wilson, a neighbor of his, some eight or ten miles north of Columbia. Breedlove had been at Wilson's some time, when the latter discovered that he left the house, and a few minutes afterwards was found near Wilson's door, with his throat cut. On the premises, there was a pool of blood, and a murder by some person unknown. Many believe, however, that he committed suicide. Breedlove and Wilson were in good fellowship the evening—the former left a wife and four children.

Fire and Horrible Death.—Our community was horror-stricken on last Thursday morning, by the reported death of Mrs. Mary West, aged about 50 years, and her grandchild, Mary Swisher, aged about 12 years, living four miles north of this place, whose charred bodies were drawn out of the flames of the burning and blazing ruins of the house in which they lived. The fire was first discovered about day-light, but it had progressed, that it was impossible to arrest the entire destruction of the building. The cause of the unfortunate old lady and her grand-son, when discovered and drawn out, was a spectacle most shocking to behold. Nearly all the limbs of the body were entirely or partly burnt off; their heads were almost burnt to a crisp. It is the request and wish that the deceased had come to their death by the violence of some unknown person or persons, and that perpetrators of the deed be found out. It is known to be in possession of several hundred dollars in silver and paper money; and there is no doubt that the perpetrators of the deed have taken flight in the pursuit of this, and very probably obtained the whole of it.—*Salisbury (N.

THE LIBERATOR.
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY,
AT THE ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE, 21, CORNHILL,
BY
HENRY W. WILLIAMS, GENERAL AGENT.

☞ All remittances are to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper are to be directed, (post paid,) to the General Agent.

☞ TERMS.—$2 50 per annum, payable in advance; or $3 00 if the expiration of the year exceeds six months.

☞ Five copies will be sent to one address for ten dollars, if payment be forwarded in advance.

☞ ADVERTISEMENTS making less than a square inserted three times for 75 cts.; one square for $1 00.

Financial Committee.—Francis Jackson, Ezra Lunt, Edmund Quincy, Henry Ingersoll Bowditch, Wendell Phillips. [This committee is responsible only for the financial economy of the paper.]

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR. OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD—OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND. J. BROWN YERRINTON, PRINTER.

VOL. XV.—NO. 17. BOSTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1845. WHOLE NO. 745.

THE LIBERATOR.

[FOR THE LIBERATOR.]

A JOINT LETTER TO GEORGE A. BROWNSON AND THE EDITOR OF THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

In which the Editor of the North American Review is proved to be no Christian, and little better than an Atheist.

By R. Hildreth, Author of "Theory of Morals."

Gentlemen:—

Two such incompatibilities as you, may perhaps be a little surprised at finding yourselves thus shaken together into one letter. But, notwithstanding, there is a natural affinity between you; and my business is with you both.

Not long since, I published a book, entitled "Theory of Morals," which you both have done me the honor to notice. You find in that book, nothing hardly to approve, and much to condemn,—and that is natural. There are among writers and scholars, two classes of men,—the few, who busy themselves in examining the foundation, and testing the truth of received opinions; and a much larger class, who shrink from all question the current doctrines of some popular sect or party, or the floating opinions of the day, and build with zeal and plausibility the whole superstructure of science and life, upon that basis. This latter class, among the Greeks, took to themselves, in that language, the name of *Gnostics*, knowers. *Sophists*, wise men, was the name they proposed themselves, and so they were thought, in their generation, to be; though time and experience presently disclosed the emptiness of their pretensions. The others called themselves *philosophers*, lovers of and seekers after knowledge—an appellation which Gnostics and Sophists have ever contended for, but which properly belongs only to those who reject all authority, and rely for the discovery and perception of truth upon consciousness, reason, observation and experiment.

It is to the class of Gnostics or Sophists that you, Messrs. Reviewers, belong. You, in your own opinion, and in that of others, are the leaders among men, the wise men of this place and day; you, Mr. Brownson, a Gnostic, a Sophist of the Roman school; you, Mr. Hildreth, an American Gnostic, a Sophist of the Cambridge school. Though you do not exactly agree in your sophistry, you are both Sophists,—*brands ambo*,—and hence the interest of your union against me. For I am a very humble, but zealous and sincere member of that unhappy, (in the world thinks,) and, in their own day, despised, prosecuted, misunderstood, and, for a time, slain, who love and seek the truth, simply because it is the truth; who seek for others to reap, who plant with toil and tears, and watering with their own blood, that mustard-seed of knowledge, which, map, produces in after-times a mighty tree, in the branches of which the whole flights of parent sophists perch and feed, chatter, and clap their wings, as if it were really their tree!

Between sophists and philosophers, there always has been, and always will be, a natural and inevitable hostility. A tree may be very good and useful in its day, but very tree grows old and rubbed, and at length to bear wholesome fruit, and comes presently to cumber the ground. It must be cut down, and something more adapted to existing wants and circumstances planted in its place. Young trees, even those of the same species, grow with difficulty in the shade of an old one; it poisons, starves, debilitates, distorts them. That young tree may grow up straight, fair, and more useless, and worse than useless trunks, however ancient and venerable, must fall. This is necessary, even in the economics of the vegetable world, to which those eminent, venerable trunks belong. Here is the first, the necessary work of the philosopher. Be the mustard-seed ever so fair and fair, be the old, rotten, and now cumbersome tree, the whole flattering parrot race of Gnostics and Sophists, who have perched so long in its shade, though it grows upon its fruits, careless though that shade be death and those fruits poison to creatures superior to themselves, alarmed at this attack upon that whereby they live, scoop forth, as they do, a hot rebuke, behalf, behalf, with their filth, and stun him with their clamor.

Such, gentlemen reviewers, is the treatment I have experienced at your hands. You profess to review my book; you only misrepresent and rail at it. I do not complain of this. I knew what you could; you have supplied the necessities of your nature; you have fulfilled your vocation.—"Science is of that nature," says a certain philosopher, "as none can understand it to be, but such as in a good measure have attained it." Another observes, 'that our confidence of the truth of any opinion is always found to increase in proportion to the extent of our knowledge of the grounds on which it rests.' You, Messrs. Reviewers, possess neither of these essential qualifications, either for understanding my work, or judging your own—fired up in the schools, you repeat, like parrots, a set of words which either mean nothing, or mean a dozen things totally distinct from each other; and while you confuse yourselves and your readers, by the repetition of sounding phrases without any fixed or definite ideas, you think, poor fellows, like your predecessors, the schoolmen, that you are teaching philosophy! The spring cannot rise higher than its source. He who seeks for truth, not by looking in nature as it is, but in idle repetitions of the dull verbiage of the schools, will never discover more than the schools have discovered; and will even be incapable of understanding those who do. The schoolmen could not understand Bacon, Hunter, Newton and Lavoisier were the laughingstock of the vulgar, in their day.

Because I publish a 'Theory of Morals,' you assume, as a matter of course, that I undertake to lay down a set of moral maxims, everywhere, for everything; to settle forever the moral qualities of all possible actions, as infallibly as I demonstrate, by, as Euclid has settled the properties of the triangle. You mistake, gentlemen, I do not think moralists are one thing, and mathematics another.—I leave the folly of confounding them to Schoolmen like you. The object of my book is clearly expressed in the title page of it. It is, 'an enquiry concerning the law of moral distinctions, and the variations and consequences of ethical codes.' That men do every where make moral distinctions, and act upon them, and that the moral distinctions thus made, and the actions and systems of opinions these involving, are very various and even contradictory, may possibly have escaped the knowledge of pedants, who know nothing except what they find in books, and are blind to what lies before the observers of mankind. The most contradictory opinions as to the moral rectitude of actions, indeed as to the moral character of the actors, and of actions and methods of life, exist not only in different ages and different communities, but in the same age and the same community. These differences of opinion lead to the most remarkable events in the history of man, and prevail now, to a great extent, here among us. Here in the very city of Boston, there are professed teachers of morals, who hold that war, capital punishments, slavery, wine-drinking and rum-selling are all right; and who support a set of institutions and customs founded on those ideas of right. There is another set who declare these practices to be all wrong, and who demand, in consequence, great changes in manners and laws. Here in Boston, there are those who look upon dueling as no better than wilful murder; others regard it as wrong indeed, yet as a pardonable offence; while, others think it, under certain circumstances, justifiable and right. Odder yet, a grave reviewer and Professor of Moral Philosophy, will go and vote for a duelling and advocate of duelling, to be President of the United States; and the next week, or the next month, will pour out a whole week's full of indignation against an unhappy author, who ventures to exhibit that view of things, which can alone relieve the said indignant Professor and critic from the charge of being an infamous villain and coward. Yet no one has his note to elevate to the highest office in his country, is man no better than a bloody murderer.

What is more strange still, in a system of morality is uniformly taught in our schools and our pulpits, quite distinct from that acted, upon in life; and does every one, individual undertake to carry his school morals into life, or ask any of our reverend divines themselves to practice what they preach, he is scouted and sneered at, not by the world only, but by the reverend brotherhood, as a foolish fanatic, or an impertinent intermeddler.

Surely this is a state of things calculated to awaken curiosity and inquiry. Whence come these differences and inconsistencies? How shall I decide when doctors disagree? What shall I think of these self-sufficient, self-conceited professors and critics themselves? How does it happen that men differ so in their moral judgments? How does it happen that they ever agree? Whence come the changes constantly taking place in our ideas of right and wrong? According to what rule or law do men make moral distinctions? How does the world in fact, and how should it, in reasonable tent? This, says Mr. Brownson, is not a theory of morals, but only a theory of men's *notions* of morals. I care nothing for your philosophy, sir. What schoolmen mean by morals, I know as little as they do. Men mean by them, modes of acting, including opinions which lead to modes of acting, some of which they call moral, others, which they call as morally wrong, and others as morally indifferent. It is the origin of coincidences and differences of opinion as to the moral character of actions, which I undertake to investigate; and whether such an investigation be called a theory of morals, or a theory of men's notions of morals, is perfectly indifferent. The name is of no consequence.

From a pretty wide survey, I come to the conclusion that, in speaking of actions as the subjects of moral approbation or disapprobation, men in all cases whatever, when they refer, not to the motives of the actor, but merely to the outward act, if they adjudge it worthy of moral approbation, do so on account of some pleasure, some agreeable emotion which that action produces in some sensitive being other than the actor; and on the other hand, if they disapprove, it is they do so on account of some painful emotion which that act causes in some sensitive being other than the actor. But the sentiment which enables us to take pleasure in the pleasure of others, which causes us to approve,—that is, to be pleased with, to be agreeably affected by, acts having that tendency—and which impels us to the performance of such acts, is a well-known sentiment, called benevolence;—therefore, it is the sentiment of benevolence which lies at the foundation of all moral distinctions. I have had no such sentiment, we should make no such distinctions.

But all systems of practical morals ever yet extant on, perceive, feel, and even in philosophy, many acts which confer intentional pain upon others. All systems of practical morals make distinctions in the degrees of approbation and disapprobation, with which the same overt action is regarded, founded on the relative circumstances and position, as well of the person to whom the act is done, as of the person who does it. Yet, though the sentiment, which, whether the schools know it or not, do in fact distribute human actions into five great classes, having reference only to the moral motive as to the outward act:—1st. *Highly virtuous or meritorious actions*, performed by, and expected of, only a distinguished class of persons, and rewarded in an ascending scale of merit; 2d. *Duties*,—actions expected of every body, the non-performance of which subjects one to blame and reproach; but for which no reward is given, and which are called orders of persons; 3d. *Indifferent actions*,—which have no moral character at all; 4th. *Permissible or venial actions*,—actions, though regarded with disapprobation, yet do not seriously impeach one's moral character; 5th. *Faults and crimes*,—actions, the habitual or even occasional perpetration of which, subjects a man to the character of a bad man; and which sink below each other to an indefinite depth of wickedness. From this classification, it is plain, that though the sentiment of benevolence be the origin and foundation of moral distinctions, yet that those distinctions are greatly modified by other influences; and the first part of my book is devoted to the investigation of the nature and operation of these influences, and of the various modifications of moral ideas thence resulting.

Having ascertained, as I suppose, the nature and origin of moral distinctions,—having shown that they result from the very constitution of man, and that the knowledge of them, like all other knowledge, must be progressive, resulting in frequent changes of opinion, even on points the most vital,—I proceed, in the second part, to apply these ideas to the explanation of known diversities of moral judgment, and to show, that all such diversities arise either from different opinions as to the consequences of actions, or from having chiefly in mind a different person, or different sets of persons, as the subjects of those actions, or from different degrees of the comparative force of the sentiment of benevolence, or from all these causes combined. Thus, for instance, in considering the subject of slavery, those who look chiefly to the good of the masters, and take but a cursory and superficial view of that good, (as the masters themselves do,) will set down slavery as a good thing, and the relation of slavery as morally right; while, on the other hand, they who go deeper into the matter, who examine into the real, permanent effect of slavery upon the masters, and even without that, those who look ever so cursorily, to its effect upon the slaves, will, if they possess any considerable share of benevolence, be apt to look upon slavery with disgust and abhorrence, as a combination of all sorts of evils and crimes. Those who imagine that the slaves, if suddenly set free, would take, (as they do,) the place of masters' throats, naturally regard immediate emancipation as worse than folly, as a crime; while those who anticipate no such evil, but, on the contrary, the mutual benefit to masters and slaves, regard immediate emancipation as an imperative duty. Those who by judging of human actions, look only to their effects upon the actors, consider slavery if they think it displeasing to God; but if they regard it as a divine institution, they approve it.

Whatever other opinions men may give for their moral judgments, however they may pretend to disregard consequences, yet, in point of fact, they do always regard consequences; they do believe that good will always be the result of that which they regard as right. "Let the heavens fall, they cry; so that justice be done." Yes, they do feel perfectly sure that the heavens will not fall,—nay, that to do justice, is the only way to keep them from falling.

Finally, I am led to conclude, that the progress and increase of true morality,—that morality which consists in making man happier,—depends, first, upon the progress of knowledge, enabling us to form a more correct estimate of the real effect of certain actions, or courses of action, on human happiness; and, secondly and principally, upon an increase of the relative force of the sentiment of benevolence, whereby we are impelled to the performance of good actions. I am also led to conclude, *and this is the most important conclusion in the whole book*, that the relative force of the sentiment of benevolence can be most effectually, if not alone, increased, by diminishing the force of those numerous pains by which the impulses of the sentiment of benevolence are perpetually deadened, or counteracted; that it is contrary to the constitution of human nature to expect those who are perpetually tormented by pains of their own, to sympathize much with the pains of other people; that to make men better, we must begin by making them happier; and that all the preachments of all the priests and professors in the world, will avail nothing, to the reformation of mankind, so long as those same priests and professors refuse to do any thing for the relief of the enormous pains and evils, which, under their eyes, are heaped, by others, on the contrary, do their utmost to perpetuate those evils, by representing them as decrees of nature, and ordinations of God.

Hinc illæ lacrymæ—hence those tears—hence the ferocity with which you, gentlemen, have assailed me. It is your vocation to apologize for, to gloss up, to distort, to misrepresent, the pains and wrongs. You live by making silver shrines, and shouting, 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians!' Of course, I get hurly the same treatment at your hands, that Paul got at the hands of the silversmiths.

But though you scout my theory, what do you propose in its place?

A walking *variorum* edition of all sorts of opinions,—a fifth-rate declaimer, carried away, at such times as he is, by the inspiration of the God, while he holds all the time, that it consists in obedience to something above God, to something which God himself is obliged to obey;—a man, who, when he does speak plainly, little better than a sneaking hypocrite? I do not wish to use hard words; but, upon my conscience, I cannot see that he is any thing else.

But what is this something, alike binding upon the actions of God and man? What are these moral distinctions, which, even the Deity is represented controlled? 'They are,' says our critic, 'intrinsic and essential qualities of actions, eternal and unchangeable, though it pleases the Deity to make them necessarily result from the properties and relations of every being and object in the universe.' Now, Mr. Critic, had God at any time any control, or had he now, over the properties and relations of the beings in the universe? If he had, and has, does he not necessarily control moral distinctions too? If he has not, what is he but a mere cypher, a supernumerary, a nobody, a nothing? This, sir, is your conclusion, not mine. But what do you mean by 'intrinsic and essential qualities of actions?' Is not every action essentially subjective in its origin, the combined result of some peculiar degree of moral knowledge, capacity or motive? And have you the assiduity to minimize, that things wholly antagonistic in their origin, and which change totally with the change of that in which they originate, have yet intrinsic and essential qualities, eternal and unchangeable, though the heavens fall? You tell us, 'that every being or object must *necessarily* have its own laws of being, its peculiar adaptation, its nature or finities, its appropriate relations to other beings, its end or object, with reference to other beings and objects. Every intelligent being, in every conscious act, either acknowledges or disowns the relations of his nature, either recognizes or disowns the relations of his physical and moral being. Hence, every conscious act of such a being, has a moral character, or quantality or moral character: it is in itself right or wrong. Now, tell me whence come these 'laws of being,' these 'adaptations,' these 'finities,' these 'ends,' these 'relations' most necessarily have? Has God any thing to do with them? Did he appoint them? Then he makes moral distinctions. But that you deny. Then they are eternal, and some high or law of moral obligation, which controls him as it does us. He is, then, like ourselves, a mere instrument; he has no discretion, no will, no power, so that our business ought to be, not to investigate his will, which is secondary, but the superior primary law by which fitt will of necessity, which, by the way, you call Providence? Why, sir, it is thevery doctrine of Epicurus, of which you express such a horror, a doctrine which he borrowed, as you borrow it, from Plato. He, like you, denied a Deity, and, like you, came very near it, then you are. You deprive God of all inherent, original, creative, conservative power; whereas, my idea of God is, the Cause of that series of phenomena which we call nature, (which phenomena alone it is the province of philosophy to investigate,) among the rest, the Cause, too, of these distinctions which we call moral distinctions, and which may indeed in this sense be called the laws of God,—just as the laws of chemistry may be called so—but I would insist upon the strict propriety of phrases, because they can only lead to the same confusion of ideas, and the same systematic false pretences, which make up the staple of your teachings.

So it seems, sir, you are the atheist, not I. Your Deity, deprived of all conservative, creative power, reduced to the control of a superior law, a being of the same nature with man, may well be conceived of under the idea of a person, because the idea we have of a person is the idea of a being of power, equal to support natural laws. But as I conceive of the Deity as the ultimate uncaused Cause of all, I cannot apply to him a term, which must of necessity depress him of his creative character, and reduce him to what you represent him to be, the mere creature of a higher necessity. The application to God of the term person, is a mere figure of speech. Grant this, and among many other instances, the example of Christianity itself shows, that to conceive of God under a human form, to confound the idea of God and man, to make God an object, or man, God, to represent God by images and pictures not merely material, but material, in a natural and invisible man, is, it is only as the Protestants go back, to the idea of the impersonality of God, that they excape a tendency to the Romish idolatry, a tendency which few of them have as yet, so far removed, that they ceased to worship God under the image of Jesus.

It is the same with the term action. What we mean by action is something very different from what you call by that term. But God, to my mind, is not a part of nature; he is above, beyond, before nature, the Cause of nature. He, therefore, cannot be said to act, in the sense in which we apply the term to man, or even to the control of an overruling necessity, or fate.

The conception of God, as 'a sovereign law-giver,' is a notion derived from the idea, that, in a nation natural enough in a theocratic government, familiar enough to church members; but which never seemed to have any influence in the direction of the existing population of the globe, and which does not, and never did, exercise the slightest influence upon the conduct of one man in a million. It is, in fact, the prevailing idea on which is the sole foundation of moral distinctions; and further yet, that no man can have an idea of goodness, nor do any good act, until he has first learned to fear God, (not the Father, as the case may be, and the subject of a miraculous change of heart! This is the bold imposture of the schoolmen, the Protestant schoolmen, who, well that nobody can see, except by looking through his cracked, dirty, misshapen glasses; whereas, their only effect is to distort and confuse those objects which they pretend to magnify, but from eyes. This theory, consistently carried out, ends inevitably, as we shall presently see, in the *Antinomian*, Popish, and Mohammedan doctrine, that, without the church commands and sanctions, and at most regards, a doctrine which has done more to confuse the moral sense of Christendom, and perpetuate Christianity in blood, than all other causes united; a doctrine which must be scouted from the earth, before we can hope for any great improvement in moral knowledge.

Our Cambridge critic is aware of this difficulty; let us see how he escapes it. Why, he escapes it, just as I do, by repudiating moral distinctions in that sense in which they are generally understood, though he has neither the sense nor the honesty to avow and adhere to it. It is true, he differs from me in maintaining, that right and wrong are *not* subjective distinctions, as regards the individual moral agent, growing out of his peculiar degree of moral knowledge, capacity or motive; but he adds, 'nor yet are they arbitrary distinctions created by the legislation of supreme and absolute power.' He is not content to seek for moral distinctions in the nature of man. More magnificent in his ideas, he is determined to find them in the nature of the universe. 'These moral distinctions,' he tells us, 'may be said, without irreverence, to exist by an *a priori* necessity, independently of the Deity. They are the law of God. God's decrees and acts are not right because they are made by the Deity, but they are made right; and with regard to certain moral precepts emanating from him, his laws do not render certain acts right, and certain others wrong; but by their laws he declares certain acts right, and certain acts wrong, because they are so in their own nature.' This is not Christianity, in any shape; no such thing; it is the doctrine of Confucius, of the Greek philosophers, of the Buddists. It is borrowed by our critic, second or tenth hand, from Plato. By this theory, God is reduced from a moral lawgiver, a sovereign law-giver, to a mere herald and publisher of the law. He is as much a law-giver, as the lawyer who announces it, or the printer who prints it; as our critic himself, and his reviewer, are the lawyers, the printers, who dare to charge me with attempting, reducing God to a mere instrument, a mere part of nature, to a level with man. Must law, are the law of God. Why? Because God is obliged to obey them. Are they not the law of man, for the same reason? And is not the professor, who conceals his opinion under this *double-entendre*, and attempts to impose himself upon the simple, as an orthodox believer in the Christian doctrine, that morality consists in obedience to God, while he holds all the time, that it consists in obedience to something above God, to something which God himself is obliged to obey;—is not he, in fact, endeavoring to speak plainly, little better than a sneaking hypocrite? I do not wish to use hard words; but, upon my conscience, I cannot see that he is any thing else.

But what is this something, alike binding upon the actions of God and man? What are these moral distinctions, which, even the Deity is represented controlled? 'They are,' says our critic, 'intrinsic and essential qualities of actions, eternal and unchangeable, though it pleases the Deity to make them necessarily result from the properties and relations of every being and object in the universe.' Now, Mr. Critic, had God at any time any control, or had he now, over the properties and relations of the beings in the universe? If he had, and has, does he not necessarily control moral distinctions too? If he has not, what is he but a mere cypher, a supernumerary, a nobody, a nothing? This, sir, is your conclusion, not mine. But what do you mean by 'intrinsic and essential qualities of actions?' Is not every action essentially subjective in its origin, the combined result of some peculiar degree of moral knowledge, capacity or motive? And have you the assiduity to minimize, that things wholly antagonistic in their origin, and which change totally with the change of that in which they originate, have yet intrinsic and essential qualities, eternal and unchangeable, though the heavens fall? You tell us, 'that every being or object must *necessarily* have its own laws of being, its peculiar adaptation, its nature or finities, its appropriate relations to other beings, its end or object, with reference to other beings and objects. Every intelligent being, in every conscious act, either acknowledges or disowns the relations of his nature, either recognizes or disowns the relations of his physical and moral being. Hence, every conscious act of such a being, has a moral character or quantality or moral character: it is in itself right or wrong. Now, tell me whence come these 'laws of being,' these 'adaptations,' these 'finities,' these 'ends,' these 'relations' most necessarily have? Has God any thing to do with them? Did he appoint them? Then he makes moral distinctions. But that you deny. Then they are eternal, and some high or law of moral obligation, which controls him as it does us. He is, then, like ourselves, a mere instrument; he has no discretion, no will, no power, so that our business ought to be, not to investigate his will, which is secondary, but the superior primary law by which fitt will of necessity, which, by the way, you call Providence? Why, sir, it is thevery doctrine of Epicurus, of which you express such a horror, a doctrine which he borrowed, as you borrow it, from Plato. He, like you, denied a Deity, and, like you, came very near it, then you are. You deprive God of all inherent, original, creative, conservative power; whereas, my idea of God is, the Cause of that series of phenomena which we call nature, (which phenomena alone it is the province of philosophy to investigate,) among the rest, the Cause, of these distinctions which we call moral distinctions, and which may indeed in this sense be called the laws of God,—just as the laws of chemistry may be called so—but I would insist upon the strict propriety of phrases, because they can only lead to the same confusion of ideas, and the same systematic false pretences, which make up the staple of your teachings.

So it seems, sir, you are the atheist, not I. Your Deity, deprived of all conservative, creative power, reduced to the control of a superior law, a being of the same nature with man, may well be conceived of under the idea of a person, because the idea we have of a person is the idea of a being of power, equal to support natural laws. But as I conceive of the Deity as the ultimate uncaused Cause of all, I cannot apply to him a term, which must of necessity depress him of his creative character, and reduce him to what you represent him to be, the mere creature of a higher necessity. The application to God of the term person, is a mere figure of speech. Grant this, and among many other instances, the example of Christianity itself shows, that to conceive of God under a human form, to confound the idea of God and man, to make God an object, or man, God, to represent God by images and pictures not merely material, but material, in a natural and invisible man, is, it is only as the Protestants go back, to the idea of the impersonality of God, that they escape a tendency to the Romish idolatry, a tendency which few of them have as yet so far removed, that they ceased to worship God under the image of Jesus.

It is the same with the term action. What we mean by action is something very different from what you call by that term. But God, to my mind, is not a part of nature; he is above, beyond, before nature, the Cause of nature. He, therefore, cannot be said to act, in the sense in which we apply the term to man, or even to the control of an overruling necessity, or fate.

The conception of God, as 'a sovereign law-giver,' is a notion derived from the idea, that, in a nation natural enough in a theocratic government, familiar enough to church members; but which never seemed to have any influence in the direction of the existing population of the globe, and which does not, and never did, exercise the slightest influence upon the conduct of one man in a million. It is, in fact, the prevailing idea on which is the sole foundation of moral distinctions; and further yet, that no man can have an idea of goodness, nor do any good act, until he has first learned to fear God, (not the Father, as the case may be, and the subject of a miraculous change of heart! This is the bold imposture of the schoolmen, the Protestant schoolmen, who, well that nobody can see, except by looking through his cracked, dirty, misshapen glasses; whereas, their only effect is to distort and confuse those objects which they pretend to magnify, but from eyes. This theory, consistently carried out, ends inevitably, as we shall presently see, in the *Antinomian*, Popish, and Mohammedan doctrine, that, without the church commands and sanctions, and at most regards, a doctrine which has done more to confuse the moral sense of Christendom, and perpetuate Christianity in blood, than all other causes united; a doctrine which must be scouted from the earth, before we can hope for any great improvement in moral knowledge.

Our Cambridge critic is aware of this difficulty; let us see how he escapes it. Why, he escapes it, just as I do, by repudiating moral distinctions in that sense in which they are generally understood, though he has neither the sense nor the honesty to avow and adhere to it. It is true, he differs from me in maintaining, that right and wrong are *not* subjective distinctions, as regards the individual moral agent, growing out of his peculiar degree of moral knowledge, capacity or motive; but he adds, 'nor yet are they arbitrary distinctions created by the legislation of supreme and absolute power.' He is not content to seek for moral distinctions in the nature of man. More magnificent in his ideas, he is determined to find them in the nature of the universe. 'These moral distinctions,' he tells us, 'may be said, without irreverence, to exist by an *a priori* necessity, independently of the Deity. They are the law of God. God's decrees and acts are not right because they are made by the Deity, but they are made right; and with regard to certain moral precepts emanating from him, his laws do not render certain acts right, and certain others wrong; but by their laws he declares certain acts right, and certain acts wrong, because they are so in their own nature.' This is not Christianity, in any shape; no such thing; it is the doctrine of Confucius, of the Greek philosophers, of the Buddists. It is borrowed by our critic, second or tenth hand, from Plato. By this theory, God is reduced from a moral lawgiver, a sovereign law-giver, to a mere herald and publisher of the law. He is as much a law-giver, as the lawyer who announces it, or the printer who prints it; as our critic himself, and his reviewer, are the lawyers, the printers, who dare to charge me with attempting, reducing God to a mere instrument, a mere part of nature, to a level with man. Must law, are the law of God. Why? Because God is obliged to obey them. Are they not the law of man, for the same reason? And is not the professor, who conceals his opinion under this *double-entendre*, and attempts to impose himself upon the simple, as an orthodox believer in the Christian doctrine, that morality consists in obedience to God, while he holds all the time, that it consists in obedience to something above God, to something which God himself is obliged to obey;—is not he, in fact, endeavoring to speak plainly, little better than a sneaking hypocrite? I do not wish to use hard words; but, upon my conscience, I cannot see that he is any thing else.

But what is this something, alike binding upon the actions of God and man? What are these moral distinctions, which, even the Deity is represented controlled? 'They are,' says our critic, 'intrinsic and essential qualities of actions, eternal and unchangeable, though it pleases the Deity to make them necessarily result from the properties and relations of every being and object in the universe.' Now, Mr. Critic, had God at any time any control, or had he now, over the properties and relations of the beings in the universe? If he had, and has, does he not necessarily control moral distinctions too? If he has not, what is he but a mere cypher, a supernumerary, a nobody, a nothing? This, sir, is your conclusion, not mine. But what do you mean by 'intrinsic and essential qualities of actions?' Is not every action essentially subjective in its origin, the combined result of some peculiar degree of moral knowledge, capacity or motive? And have you the assiduity to minimize, that things wholly antagonistic in their origin, and which change totally with the change of that in which they originate, have yet intrinsic and essential qualities, eternal and unchangeable, though the heavens fall? You tell us, 'that every being or object must *necessarily* have its own laws of being, its peculiar adaptation, its nature or finities, its appropriate relations to other beings, its end or object, with reference to other beings and objects. Every intelligent being, in every conscious act, either acknowledges or disowns the relations of his nature, either recognizes or disowns the relations of his physical and moral being. Hence, every conscious act of such a being, has a moral character or quantality or moral character: it is in itself right or wrong. Now, tell me whence come these 'laws of being,' these 'adaptations,' these 'finities,' these 'ends,' these 'relations' most necessarily have? Has God any thing to do with them? Did he appoint them? Then he makes moral distinctions. But that you deny. Then they are eternal, and some high or law of moral obligation, which controls him as it does us. He is, then, like ourselves, a mere instrument; he has no discretion, no will, no power, so that our business ought to be, not to investigate his will, which is secondary, but the superior primary law by which fitt will of necessity, which, by the way, you call Providence? Why, sir, it is thevery doctrine of Epicurus, of which you express such a horror, a doctrine which he borrowed, as you borrow it, from Plato. He, like you, denied a Deity, and, like you, came very near it, then you are. You deprive God of all inherent, original, creative, conservative power; whereas, my idea of God is, the Cause of that series of phenomena which we call nature, (which phenomena alone it is the province of philosophy to investigate,) among the rest, the Cause, of these distinctions which we call moral distinctions, and which may indeed in this sense be called the laws of God,—just as the laws of chemistry may be called so—but I would insist upon the strict propriety of phrases, because they can only lead to the same confusion of ideas, and the same systematic false pretences, which make up the staple of your teachings.

So it seems, sir, you are the atheist, not I. Your Deity, deprived of all conservative, creative power, reduced to the control of a superior law, a being of the same nature with man, may well be conceived of under the idea of a person, because the idea we have of a person is the idea of a being of power, equal to support natural laws. But as I conceive of the Deity as the ultimate uncaused Cause of all, I cannot apply to him a term, which must of necessity depress him of his creative character, and reduce him to what you represent him to be, the mere creature of a higher necessity. The application to God of the term person, is a mere figure of speech. Grant this, and among many other instances, the example of Christianity itself shows, that to conceive of God under a human form, to confound the idea of God and man, to make God an object, or man, God, to represent God by images and pictures not merely material, but material, in a natural and invisible man, is, it is only as the Protestants go back, to the idea of the impersonality of God, that they escape a tendency to the Romish idolatry, a tendency which few of them have as yet so far removed, that they ceased to worship God under the image of Jesus.

It is the same with the term action. What we mean by action is something very different from what you call by that term. But God, to my mind, is not a part of nature; he is above, beyond, before nature, the Cause of nature. He, therefore, cannot be said to act, in the sense in which we apply the term to man, or even to the control of an overruling necessity, or fate.

The conception of God, as 'a sovereign law-giver,' is a notion derived from the idea, that, in a nation natural enough in a theocratic government, familiar enough to church members; but which never seemed to have any influence in the direction of the existing population of the globe, and which does not, and never did, exercise the slightest influence upon the conduct of one man in a million. It is, in fact, the prevailing idea on which is the sole foundation of moral distinctions; and further yet, that no man can have an idea of goodness, nor do any good act, until he has first learned to fear God, (not the Father, as the case may be, and the subject of a miraculous change of heart! This is the bold imposture of the schoolmen, the Protestant schoolmen, who, well that nobody can see, except by looking through his cracked, dirty, misshapen glasses; whereas, their only effect is to distort and confuse those objects which they pretend to magnify, but from eyes. This theory, consistently carried out, ends inevitably, as we shall presently see, in the *Antinomian*, Popish, and Mohammedan doctrine, that, without the church commands and sanctions, and at most regards, a doctrine which has done more to confuse the moral sense of Christendom, and perpetuate Christianity in blood, than all other causes united; a doctrine which must be scouted from the earth, before we can hope for any great improvement in moral knowledge.

Our Cambridge critic is aware of this difficulty; let us see how he escapes it. Why, he escapes it, just as I do, by repudiating moral distinctions in that sense in which they are generally understood, though he has neither the sense nor the honesty to avow and adhere to it. It is true, he differs from me in maintaining, that right and wrong are *not* subjective distinctions, as regards the individual moral agent, growing out of his peculiar degree of moral knowledge, capacity or motive; but he adds, 'nor yet are they arbitrary distinctions created by the legislation of supreme and absolute power.' He is not content to seek for moral distinctions in the nature of man. More magnificent in his ideas, he is determined to find them in the nature of the universe. 'These moral distinctions,' he tells us, 'may be said, without irreverence, to exist by an *a priori* necessity, independently of the Deity. They are the law of God. God's decrees and acts are not right because they are made by the Deity, but they are made right; and with regard to certain moral precepts emanating from him, his laws do not render certain acts right, and certain others wrong; but by their laws he declares certain acts right, and certain acts wrong, because they are so in their own nature.' This is not Christianity, in any shape; no such thing; it is the doctrine of Confucius, of the Greek philosophers, of the Buddists. It is borrowed by our critic, second or tenth hand, from Plato. By this theory, God is reduced from a moral lawgiver, a sovereign law-giver, to a mere herald and publisher of the law. He is as much a law-giver, as the lawyer who announces it, or the printer who prints it; as our critic himself, and his reviewer, are the lawyers, the printers, who dare to charge me with attempting, reducing God to a mere instrument, a mere part of nature, to a level with man. Must law, are the law of God. Why? Because God is obliged to obey them. Are they not the law of man, for the same reason? And is not the professor, who conceals his opinion under this *double-entendre*, and attempts to impose himself upon the simple, as an orthodox believer in the Christian doctrine, that morality consists in obedience to God, while he holds all the time, that it consists in obedience to something above God, to something which God himself is obliged to obey;—is not he, in fact, endeavoring to speak plainly, little better than a sneaking hypocrite? I do not wish to use hard words; but, upon my conscience, I cannot see that he is any thing else.

But what is this something, alike binding upon the actions of God and man? What are these moral distinctions, which, even the Deity is represented controlled? 'They are,' says our critic, 'intrinsic and essential qualities of actions, eternal and unchangeable, though it pleases the Deity to make them necessarily result from the properties and relations of every being and object in the universe.' Now, Mr. Critic, had God at any time any control, or had he now, over the properties and relations of the beings in the universe? If he had, and has, does he not necessarily control moral distinctions too? If he has not, what is he but a mere cypher, a supernumerary, a nobody, a nothing? This, sir, is your conclusion, not mine. But what do you mean by 'intrinsic and essential qualities of actions?' Is not every action essentially subjective in its origin, the combined result of some peculiar degree of moral knowledge, capacity or motive? And have you the assiduity to minimize, that things wholly antagonistic in their origin, and which change totally with the change of that in which they originate, have yet intrinsic and essential qualities, eternal and unchangeable, though the heavens fall? You tell us, 'that every being or object must *necessarily* have its own laws of being, its peculiar adaptation, its nature or finities, its appropriate relations to other beings, its end or object, with reference to other beings and objects. Every intelligent being, in every conscious act, either acknowledges or disowns the relations of his nature, either recognizes or disowns the relations of his physical and moral being. Hence, every conscious act of such a being, has a moral character or quantality or moral character: it is in itself right or wrong. Now, tell me whence come these 'laws of being,' these 'adaptations,' these 'finities,' these 'ends,' these 'relations' most necessarily have? Has God any thing to do with them? Did he appoint them? Then he makes moral distinctions. But that you deny. Then they are eternal, and some high or law of moral obligation, which controls him as it does us. He is, then, like ourselves, a mere instrument; he has no discretion, no will, no power, so that our business ought to be, not to investigate his will, which is secondary, but the superior primary law by which fitt will of necessity, which, by the way, you call Providence? Why, sir, it is thevery doctrine of Epicurus, of which you express such a horror, a doctrine which he borrowed, as you borrow it, from Plato. He, like you, denied a Deity, and, like you, came very near it, then you are. You deprive God of all inherent, original, creative, conservative power; whereas, my idea of God is, the Cause of that series of phenomena which we call nature, (which phenomena alone it is the province of philosophy to investigate,) among the rest, the Cause, of these distinctions which we call moral distinctions, and which may indeed in this sense be called the laws of God,—just as the laws of chemistry may be called so—but I would insist upon the strict propriety of phrases, because they can only lead to the same confusion of ideas, and the same systematic false pretences, which make up the staple of your teachings.

So it seems, sir, you are the atheist, not I. Your Deity, deprived of all conservative, creative power, reduced to the control of a superior law, a being of the same nature with man, may well be conceived of under the idea of a person, because the idea we have of a person is the idea of a being of power, equal to support natural laws. But as I conceive of the Deity as the ultimate uncaused Cause of all, I cannot apply to him a term, which must of necessity depress him of his creative character, and reduce him to what you represent him to be, the mere creature of a higher necessity. The application to God of the term person, is a mere figure of speech. Grant this, and among many other instances, the example of Christianity itself shows, that to conceive of God under a human form, to confound the idea of God and man, to make God an object, or man, God, to represent God by images and pictures not merely material, but material, in a natural and invisible man, is, it is only as the Protestants go back, to the idea of the impersonality of God, that they escape a tendency to the Romish idolatry, a tendency which few of them have as yet so far removed, that they ceased to worship God under the image of Jesus.

It is the same with the term action. What we mean by action is something very different from what you call by that term. But God, to my mind, is not a part of nature; he is above, beyond, before nature, the Cause of nature. He, therefore, cannot be said to act, in the sense in which we apply the term to man, or even to the control of an overruling necessity, or fate.

The conception of God, as 'a sovereign law-giver,' is a notion derived from the idea, that, in a nation natural enough in a theocratic government, familiar enough to church members; but which never seemed to have any influence in the direction of the existing population of the globe, and which does not, and never did, exercise the slightest influence upon the conduct of one man in a million. It is, in fact, the prevailing idea on which is the sole foundation of moral distinct