THE LIBERATOR,
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY,
AT THE ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE, 21, CORNHILL.
ROBERT F. WALLCUT, 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 00 per annum, payable in advance; or $2 50 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 one 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. XVII.--NO. 10.

THE LIBERATOR

OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD--OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND.

BOSTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 5, 1847.

☞ All men are born free and equal—with certain natural, essential and unalienable rights—among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

☞ Three millions of the American people are in chains and slavery—held as chattels personal, and bought and sold as marketable commodities.

☞ Seventy thousand infants, the offspring of slave parents, kidnapped as soon as born, and permanently added to the slave population of Christian, (!) Republican, (!!) Democratic, (!!!) America every year.

☞ Immediate, Unconditional Emancipation.

☞ Slaveholders, Slave-traders and Slave-drivers, are to be placed on the same level of infamy, and in the same fiendish category, as kidnappers and menstealers—a race of monsters unparalleled in their assumption of power, and their despotic cruelty.

☞ The existing Constitution of the United States is a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell.

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.

J. BROWN YERRINTON, PRINTER.

WHOLE NO. 843.

REFUGE OF OPPRESSION.

SPEECH OF A DEMAGOGUE AND TRAITOR TO THE CAUSE OF LIBERTY.

On the evening of February 18th, there was a meeting of the war spirits in and around Boston, held in the Melodeon, for the purpose of presenting a sword to that unprincipled adventurer, Colonel Caleb Cushing. The notorious yet '*Honorable*' (!) David Henshaw presided on the occasion, and made the following villanous speech:—

We are assembled here, ladies and gentlemen, to pay a well-merited compliment—the presentation of a sword, from our public spirited citizens, to the commander of the regiment of volunteers from Massachusetts, for the Mexican war.

The services rendered the country by Col. Cushing, in the halls of legislation, and in one of the most important and delicate foreign missions, his high character and well-known talents, command our respect, and offer a guarantee for his success and fame in his new military career. But it is not for personal considerations alone, highly as we appreciate him, that this compliment is paid. It is offered to him, the head of the volunteers, as a compliment to the whole regiment—it is given as a token of approbation—as the voice of commendation and encouragement to the whole regiment, to cheer onward in their patriotic and perilous enterprise, the brave men who go forth in defence of the rights of our country, to sustain the honor of our flag, the glorious stars and stripes of the Union, and especially to maintain the lofty character for wisdom and valor that our beloved State gained in the revolution, and which her sons have always since maintained when called to fight the battles of their country, whether on the land or the wave.

If our present State rulers are recreant to their duty, thank God the spirit of the people can remedy the defect—will ride over and put to shame these almost shameless men. One prominent excuse for opposition to this war is, that it is a war for the extension of slavery. You will, I trust, pardon me a few remarks on this subject. The origin of slavery in the United States is founded in British cupidity while we were her colonies. The attempt to abolish it at this time, is traceable to a like source. If there be any one thing deserving the execration of the world, the utter execration of mankind, it is the hypocrisy of Great Britain, the government and people of Great Britain, on the subject of slavery. They forced negro slavery upon us—they allowed white slavery in their own homestead till within less than three score years—until 1790, the coal mines of Scotland were worked by white slaves, who, like the cattle and coal, were bought and sold with the mines—since then, their emancipation has taken place, without much improvement in their condition, which is inferior to that of the negroes of the South. To a much later period, if not at present, she made slaves of her seamen, and kidnapped ours, under the name of impressment. Our philanthropists could denounce Bonaparte's conscription, and rail against Southern slavery, but never a word of censure against the impressment and slavery of seamen.

Great Britain desires the existence of the slave trade. She could stop it, if she chose. Governor Nichols wrote from the coast of Africa to the British government fifteen years ago, that he could suppress the slave trade in six months, if they would furnish him with two steamers. They were never furnished. Instead, they offer a bounty to slave-dealers—they give five pounds sterling per head for re-captured slaves, and sell the captured vessels back to the slave-dealers as long as the vessels last. These slaves, thus taken by the British cruisers, are never conveyed back to their own country—they are sent to some British possession—often to Sierra Leone, on the coast of Africa.—This colony was founded about 1790, by sending there some twelve hundred slaves she stole from this country during the war of the revolution, and has been since increased to its present size, some fifty to sixty thousand, by the slaves she has re-captured, stolen from her co-slave traders, and for which she has paid, not to the traders, but to her own naval officers, some five pounds per head. These re-captured negroes exist at Sierra Leone, in the most deplorable condition—without social or political rights, and on the scantiest subsistence.

Contrast this colony with that of Liberia—the latter founded, mainly, by the truly philanthropic from the slaveholding States. Liberia has raised the colored man in his social, political and official condition, to an equality with the whites. She is suppressing slavery, and is diffusing civilization and Christianity among the surrounding tribes—she is marching onward with rapid strides to the entire redemption of Africa—and yet, this colony, the offspring of the purest philanthropy,—doing only good, encounters the deadly hostility, thinly disguised, of philanthropic England. Her assumed aversion to the African slave trade, means simply a monopoly of the commerce of Africa, and a control over the commerce of the Atlantic. Let us turn now to the philanthropy of her people, as distinguished from that of her government—to her Clarksons, Thompsons and the like, who are affiliated with the abolitionists of this country, and are meddling with slavery at the South, a matter that concerns them not. Where was the philanthropy and love of justice of these men, when England was manning her fleets with the kidnapped seamen of all nations? Dormant in the waters of Lethe. What must be the character of that man, who leaves his own household in disorder and destitution, that he may, unasked and impertinently, meddle in his neighbor's affairs? What can be thought of the philanthropy of the Clarksons of England, who interfere to change the condition of our negroes, about which they know little—while leaving unnoticed at home, more than ten millions of their fellow-subjects in a more abject condition, morally, intellectually and physically, than that of our slaves—a condition, not the result of bad harvests, but of a long course of vicious legislation? Let that government and that people, if they are Christians, turn to the Bible, and read the parable of the beam and the mote.

If the British deserve our scorn for their hypocrisy and injustice, what shall we say of their spawn, the abolitionists of this country? What shall we think of those here, who are ready to trench on the fundamental principles of our institutions—the right of each State to manage its own internal affairs—who are ready to break up this Union in accordance with the pseudo philanthropists of Great Britain? Be not deceived in this matter. Abolitionism in Great Britain is founded in cupidity—here, at the North, it rests not on philanthropy, but is based on treason. It conceals, and hardly conceals, a deadly hostility to the union of the States—to the very foundation of our republican institutions. The states alone, individually, can manage understandingly this entailed curse. Massachusetts was the first to abolish slavery—accidentally, rather than by design. At the adoption of the federal constitution, New Hampshire and Massachusetts were the only free States. Pennsylvania had a short time before abolished it prospectively. We have now fourteen free States, and with little Delaware, about to assume that rank, and Wisconsin just entering the Union, there will be sixteen free, to fourteen slave States. Slavery is doubtless an evil to those where it exists, but an evil that we at the North have no right to correct. The States where it exists will in their own good time apply the corrective. Sudden and entire emancipation would benefit neither master nor slave.

But we must oppose the war, because it is a war for the extension of slavery! We must not acquire California, except with the prohibition of slavery! Though Mexico had given great and repeated provocations that would have justified the United States in declaring war, yet they did not declare war. Mexico early announced that the annexation of Texas would be considered an act of war, and in conformity to that declaration, and with no further announcement, she made war. Congress has deliberately and solemnly announced that war existed between the two countries by the act of Mexico, and it is this war thus commenced that we are called upon by every consideration of honor, interest and patriotism to sustain.

A military despot usurped the government of Mexico, and attempted to subject to his will and power the independent and confederate State of Texas. A civil war between Mexico and Texas ensued, resulting in the defeat of Mexico, the capture of her military usurper, and the independence of Texas, which independence was recognized by the United States, France and England. Texas wisely sought a union with the United States, and they with equal wisdom admitted her. This was a voluntary act of two independent nations, a marked homage to the value of our political institutions, and gave no cause of war. The United States desired no war—they offered ineffectually conciliation and peace—they have since, again and again, extended the olive branch, which the Mexicans spurn. We have no alternative, then, but a vigorous prosecution of the war, or a craven abandonment of the rights and honor of the country. Being thus forced into a war, and to continue the war, we should wisely avail of all the advantages which war will give us. The war has been prosecuted by the administration with marked vigor and unparalleled success. In a campaign of less than a year, we hold possession of more than a third of the territory claimed by Mexico. Some of this is of vast importance to this country—the ports of California, on the Pacific.

In the hands of a people inert and semi-barbarous as the Mexicans, those ports and that beautiful region, the blest of God's works, are of little use to mankind. In our hands, they would diffuse blessings over the whole world. But these regions, which God in his infinite wisdom and goodness has vouchsafed to us, we must not retain, certainly not retain, say the enemies of the war, unless conditions are annexed that strike down the fundamentals of our institutions—the right of States to manage their internal affairs. Pray who, the North, or the South, is most to be benefitted by the acquisition? A thousand Northern ships now speck with their white canvass the green billows of the vast Pacific, and need shelter in the ports of California. The Sandwich Islands are, in fact, little else than a Northern colony, and call for the settlement of that proximate coast. It is the commerce of the North—the fabrics of the North—the people of the North, who have a vast, almost boundless interest in the acquisition of California. And yet those who do not vote for the Wilmot proviso—who will not thus consent to defeat this acquisition, and assail the vital principles of our institutions, are stigmatised as 'dough faces.' Their stigmatisers should be called 'dough heads.'

And yet these men who demand the recal of our arms—men who cry peace—peace—mean *no* peace—want *no* peace—they mean war—they want war—war with crippled means—war with disgrace—if they cannot level themselves up to the country, they would level the country down to their own grovelling standard. But they mistake the public sentiment. The people know their rights—they see their interests—they have marched forward with alacrity in defence of both: they have not only sustained the honor of the country, but have added never fading, triumphal wreaths to the brow of the nation. The patriotic spirit shown in the volunteers for this war—the unparalleled valor, fortitude and skill exhibited in the conflicts with a brave but misgoverned people—have spread the fame of the Union over the whole world. The people will sustain an administration that has done so well for our country; and they will hold to a rigid responsibility those who, under whatever pretence, would weaken in any way the arm of our defence.

Valiant and bright have been the deeds of our soldiers in this war. The favored sons of Massachusetts, who have participated in these conflicts, have nobly sustained the martial character of the State—they have shed lustre on her name, and she is proud to own them. The regiment now going forth to the conflict, are charged to sustain the well-earned fame, the high military reputation of the old Bay State—they have bright examples to beckon them on—they have the cheering voice of the wise and the patriotic to sustain them—and sure I am, the State will yet feel proud of these brave men, whom our State rulers have so wantonly neglected.

From the Cleveland (Liberty party) American.

FOSTER FLOURISHING.

Our quondam friend Foster, (Stephen S.,) has recently had the good fortune to get *persecuted* in a way that will enable him to perpetuate his notoriety for a while, if not longer. At two recent Conventions at Boston, one a *Liberty party*, and the other a *Church Member* Convention, he obtruded himself, being neither a Liberty party man, nor a Church member, but as far as possible the antagonist of either. A farther account of the affair will be found in an article we copy from the Charter Oak.

So far as we know, these Disunionists are the only class of people in the world, who hold it good manners to thrust themselves upon Conventions of men to whom they do not belong, to which they are not invited, and where they know they are not wanted. For Whigs to attend and disturb a Democratic meeting, or Democrats a Whig meeting—for Baptists to disturb a Presbyterian, or Presbyterians a Baptist meeting, &c., &c., these are regarded the height of impudence and ill-manners, as it undoubtedly is. But our Disunion friends scout all such notions of propriety, and hold in the most supreme contempt the rules which, by common consent, govern the refined and civilized masses, the world over

And it is amusing to see with what complacency they magnify their own importance, in such cases. Why, they seem not to allow that any body else has any business, or right to transact any business, except such as they bear forth in their mission, or choose to introduce. For instance, when S. S. F. and his wife went to Oberlin, and the Oberlin people requested that they should defer their labors till the close of a religious revival then in progress—'Why,' said Foster, in his account of the great 'outrage,' 'why, they thought the conversion of a few souls was of more importance than the temporal and eternal salvation of three millions of slaves!' (We give the sentiment, not the language, as we quote from memory.) He thus *begged the question*, by taking it for granted that the emancipation of all the slaves was as sure to follow his labors there, as the 'conversion of a few souls' was, to be the result of the revival at Oberlin. So they and their friends represent the importance of his intrusion into the Liberty and Church meetings at Faneuil Hall. No matter *what* the business of the Convention proper, or how limited the time in which to transact it—unless they are allowed to introduce *their* business, and occupy as much time as they choose, they are *persecuted*, and the Convention are enemies of *free discussion*, and all that. We saw how it was, at the Madison meeting, last 4th of July; and we can realize how the patience of the Conventions at Boston must have been tried. Of course, all the Disunion lecturers, from Dan to Beersheba, will make the most of it.

THE LIBERATOR.

[Reported for the Liberator.]

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.

At the evening session of the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, held in Faneuil Hall on Wednesday, Jan. 27th, the resolutions on the Dissolution of the Union being under consideration, Dr. D. S. GRANDIN said—

We know that the word 'revolution' always sounds harsh in the ears of those who are not prepared for it; and we know that the people will never be prepared for a revolution, however necessary it may be, until it has been agitated and agitated, till it can no longer be resisted. Men are rather disposed to submit to evils which they now endure, than to suffer those which they know not of. But we are suffering under evils which are no longer endurable by those who know anything of liberty or of human rights. Ever since the commencement of our movement, we have been obliged to point out to the people, things which were to come. And what is the answer, which we have received continually? Why—'You are extravagant! radical! fanatical! revolutionary!' We told you, the people, fifteen years ago, that a plot was in embryo to increase our territory, and to add new States to perpetuate slavery. You did not believe it; you would not believe it. You scoffed; you sneered; you laughed at the idea. But it was known in the city of Washington; it was known by all the wise ones throughout the whole South; it was known even here in Boston.

By and by, we saw a movement making in Texas. It was a war with Mexico professedly for independence. We told you that it was to wrest the territory from Mexico and to re-establish slavery upon it. But, no—you did not believe it. You would not look at the evidence which was presented to you. You would only believe that the Texans were bone of your bone, and were really, as they pretended, protesting against the overreaching, military power of a despotism. No sooner, however, had Texas declared her independence of Mexico, than it was recognized by this country; and immediately the subject began to be agitated, of the annexation of Texas to the United States

The whole North, without regard to party, professed to be entirely opposed to that measure. It was at length presented to the Congress of the U. S., and it was rejected. And why? It was upon precisely the same principle, that one Mr. Napoleon Bonaparte at first refused some measures which were proposed to him, 'because the pear was not yet ripe.' That measure was not then adopted by this country, because 'the pear was not yet ripe,' and ready for plucking. Whigs declared that it was abominable, outrageous; Democrats declared that it would be the ruin of the country, that there was no event which the country had so much to dread as the success of that infamous plot. But we told you all that time, that the event would be accomplished, and by your assistance too! You did not believe it. You did not believe there could be found men, who would be so recreant to the principles of that liberty which has always been professed to be cherished in New-England, that they would ever consent to it. But what did your southern overseers tell you? Why, that you should not have a President, unless he was in favor of that measure. Time passed on, and you were told that James K. Polk, instead of Martin Van Buren, was to be the Presidential candidate, and was to come in distinctly with the intention of annexing Texas to the United States. Then you, who had so long opposed, began to cry out, 'Great is annexation!' But the Whigs would not believe that the deed could be effected. They were ready to take issue with the annexationists upon this very question. The election came, and what was the result? By an overwhelming majority, it was consummated; and now you all sanction it. We now tell you that THIS UNION MUST BE DISSOLVED, and you do not believe it. I tell you that it must come, and *you will be for it*. You have turned your coats time after time, and you will turn them again. * * *

It is said that the dissolution of the Union can never take place without bloodshed, without civil war. One would think, from the manner in which people talk upon the subject, that they thought that a few abolitionists, a handful of fanatics, were going to turn the Union upside down, and divide the States, whether the people would or no; that a few hundred abolitionists were going to do it all! Remember, friends, that it takes a majority of a State to carry a measure; and that, although a very large minority are in favor of it, it cannot be effected until the majority are won over to it. The people are every day becoming more and more prepared for it, and more and more convinced that it is the only way in which slavery can be abolished.

DR. GRANDIN was followed at some length by Mr. ADDISON DAVIS, who said—

In advocating the dissolution of the Union, I take it, that we ought to give a candid answer to the people, when they ask why the Union should be dissolved. We are now a great number of States banded together, and living in comparative harmony. We ask you to break this Union, and to dissolve the bonds which unite the North and the South. Of course, you ask a reason in return; and I think, as candid men, we are bound to render to you a just reason for this dissolution; and I say to you, friends, that unless we give you good and sufficient reasons for it, you are under no obligations to do it.

One of those reasons is, that the policy of this government has always been in favor of the institution of slavery. It commenced in its very cradle. On the 4th of July, 1776, the day on which the nation declared its independence of the power of Great Britain, it committed a pro-slavery act. Do you ask, what that act was? The Declaration of Independence, as it came from the pen of Thomas Jefferson, contained a most scorching rebuke against the slave traffic, and that passage was stricken out at the instance of slaveholders. I think I am not mistaken when I say, that there are now thousands who never knew that there was such a passage in the original draft of the Declaration of Independence. Slavery laid its vile and polluted hands upon the very fairest portion of that immortal document, and tore it out. So I say, that while this nation lay in its cradle, on the 4th of July, 1776, it commenced its downward career—it started in the road to its present deep and damning infamy.

Having fought through the Revolution, our people assembled for the purpose of adopting a Constitution, and in that instrument they made full and ample provision for that chiefest of sinners, Slavery. They gave it all it could possibly ask. Twenty-years were given to it, in which the slaveholders might import just as many slaves as they pleased. Then, in order that their slaves might be secured, the whole physical power of the nation was pledged to keep them in subjection; and it is because the people of the North are in favor of slavery, and their physical force is pledged to keep them in slavery, that the slave clanks his chains to-night. For if there is a slave who has a desire for liberty, he looks at the North, and sees us with our bayonets glittering in the sun; and he is told that if he dare to carry out the principle which gave rise to that desire, we the people of the North, will roll down upon him like an avalanche, and put him beneath the yoke again.

They made another provision. They made the whole North a hunting ground, so that in this whole land there is not a solitary inch in which a fugitive slave can stand and say, 'I am a free man.' Even should he stand in old Faneuil Hall, the slaveholder can come here, and take him before you all; and if you should prevent him, it would be by mob-law against the Constitution. Should the panting fugitive climb to the very summit of Bunker Hill monument, the slaveholder can drag him thence, and no law but mob law can prevent it. Then you know that there is a three-fifths representation for the slaves in Congress, so that full provision is made for the perpetuity of slavery, in every respect. Now, if this government has so long been in favor of slavery, then we say that it is time for the old Union to be abandoned, and a new and better government erected on its ruins.

ANTI-SLAVERY IN WORCESTER.

FRIEND GARRISON:

There is a revival in Worcester—a genuine anti-slavery revival. They call this town '*the heart of the Commonwealth*.' If it be so, (and I see no reason why it should not, then, surely, the State, in the set language of the church, 'has met with a change of heart.'

Never have I witnessed a more thorough and searching work, than has been wrought within the last few months. Last October, I spent a Sunday here, and spoke on slavery and kindred reforms, to miserably small audiences through the day, and to a by no means large one in the evening. The next Saturday and Sunday, the Worcester South Division County Society held its quarterly meeting in the same hall. In the evening of Sunday, the assembly was crowded. But, owing to the wicked and gross attacks upon us, by some of the newspapers, and other agencies in league with slavery and the government, I felt it my duty, at the solicitation of some of the abolitionists, to come a third Sunday.

By this time, the interest was awakened to a pretty high pitch. All day, we had a large and highly intelligent audience; and in the evening, the spacious Brinley Hall was crowded, aisles and all, and many went away, unable to gain admittance.

At half past 10, in the midst of one of the most hopeful discussions ever witnessed, we adjourned. This was the third Sunday.

Before I left town the next morning, the friends of the cause waited on me, with a request that the discussion might be resumed the next Sunday, and that I would attend; assuring me that the excitement in town was greater than ever before.

I consented; and such a meeting as we had, it has very seldom been my good fortune to witness. Brinley Hall never was more thronged, and by the best of the population too. Hundreds came and left, unable to get in. I will attempt no description of the meeting. Suffice it to say, that measures were taken to continue the meetings. Brinley Hall was hired for the *ten successive Sundays*, and a committee was raised to engage speakers. One of these meetings you attended yourself, I am informed, and you can judge of its character.

Yesterday, it was my happiness to be here again; and it was a day long to be remembered. By invitation, I delivered a Lyceum lecture, though not to the Lyceum,) on Saturday evening, on the causes which led to the French Revolution. This also was in Brinley Hall, and was well attended. The lecture was an attempt to rescue the Revolution from the horrible odium which European tyrants and their servile minions, and American despots and their blind vassals, have heaped upon it, until, in the wild accent of Carlyle, 'the universal world has screamed itself hoarse in cursing it.'

Yesterday, notwithstanding the pitiless snow storm, we held a meeting through the day; and in the evening, the house was nearly full of men; for the storm and the depth of snow kept nearly all the women away. Had the weather been fair, probably hundreds would have been compelled to return home for the want of room. Our new but indefatigable friend Bliss, disposed of a great number of anti-slavery books, and we procured six new subscribers to the Liberator; and a committee of fifteen men and women was appointed to take immediate measures to continue the Sunday meetings.

Mr. and Mrs. Foster held a series of meetings here a few days ago, continuing over one Sunday, with most brilliant results. Nearly all of our lecturers have also been here a Sunday each, and their labors have received the hearty approval of all the friends of humanity.

Among the further results of these recent labors, it may be said that Worcester sent down eighteen delegates to our late annual meeting in Boston, has subscribed for twenty-five copies of the Liberator, besides a large number of Standards, has circulated three hundred copies of the 'Forlorn Hope of Slavery,' besides very many other anti-slavery books, and has sent a Dissolution of the Union Petition to the Legislature, signed by a hundred and seventy men, ALL LEGAL VOTERS! May we not joyfully exclaim, 'What hath God wrought' by the power of his truth?

I could give you good accounts of my meetings, last week, at Upton and Uxbridge, but forbear at this time. Upton put seventy-five names to the Disunion Petition, and, by the way, holds a crowded meeting every Sunday night, to the great grief of the pious minister and church, who exultingly boast of 'no change for the last fifty years.' It is a just boast; but *the world*, thanks to God, is changing, slowly and for the better, though all agree with that church as to its own character.

Yours, to change yet more,
PARKER PILLSBURY.

The Journal des Debats pronounces our war with Mexico unjust, and says that all Europe deplores it, not from sympathy with Mexico, but out of respect for the United States. The French Government refuses to allow its citizens to take letters of marque under Mexico.

AN ADDRESS TO THE OFFICE-BEARERS AND MEMBERS OF THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,

On her present Connexion with the Slaveholding Churches of America. FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE FREE CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

THE FREE CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY is composed of members and office-bearers of that church, who are opposed to communion with the slaveholding churches of America. The persons originating that Society, are decidedly and ardently attached to the Free Church—they believe, and profess, and love her principles. Believing the connexion into which our church has been brought with the slaveholding churches of America, to be peculiarly inconsistent with the genius of her constitution, and utterly alien to the spirit displayed in her immortal contendings, both in recent and more ancient times, against the encroachments of power on her God given liberties, we are solicitous to have this foul blot upon her fair fame removed, and to see her lost purity restored.

A calm and solemn sense of duty, and no factious motives—no restlessness of disposition—no despicable love of singularity, constrains us to adopt the very painful, but necessary step, of framing a Society for the express purpose of opposing, and endeavoring to procure the repeal of the recent decision of our General Assembly, on the subject of slavery. As nothing less than the discharge of a great public duty would warrant us to take this step, we would, for our own exoneration, as well as for the satisfaction of our brethren throughout the country, submit a brief and simple statement of what we consider to have been sinful in the conduct of the leading party in our church in this whole matter.

And, in the first place, we think that, in sending a deputation to solicit aid from the slaveholding churches, the Free Church was guilty of great inconsistency and sin. This will appear, with resistless evidence, to any one who candidly considers the state of the churches in the slaveholding States of America, and, in connexion with this, thinks on what was due to the principles, the position, and the character of the Free Church of Scotland. On the horrors of American slavery, it is unnecessary to dwell. It is well known to be such an exhibition of sin and misery, as words are inadequate to describe. There 3,000,000 of human beings are held in bondage, bought, and sold, and bred, and treated like cattle. From these miserable beings, their inhuman masters jealously exclude all light, whether human or divine. For the sake of a good bargain, they scruple not to separate parents and children, husbands and their wives, and they are allowed by law, to treat them in the most inhuman manner, yea, even to put them to death, provided this be done, only, in the presence of negroes, who are incapable of bearing testimony where a white man is concerned. In short, when we consider that it exists in a land of freedom, and has sprung up in the midst of gospel light, it is not too much to say of American slavery, that it is the most ungodly and inhuman, the most loathsome and revolting of all the scenes presented on the footstool of God.

Now, in what relation do the churches, in the slaveholding States, stand to slavery? Once they had a faithful testimony against it, in which slaveholding was declared to be man-stealing; but this testimony they have blotted out, and thus they are placed in the position of persons who had light, which, with their own hands, they extinguished. Having thus entered on the path of apostacy, they have made rapid advances, and it would now be difficult to say, whether the laws of the slaveholding States, or the diluted Christianity of the slaveholding churches, is the greatest obstacle to the abolition of slavery. Because the system of slavery is sanctioned by the State, almost all parties are of opinion, that it becomes an '*organic sin*,'—a sin that is chargeable on the society, and not on the individual; all classes also agree, that slaveholding is no bar to church communion, and the opinion is held in all the slaveholding States, that slavery is not an accursed thing, that the Bible does not condemn slavery, and that they who denounce it as sinful and accursed, are stricter than Jesus Christ and his Apostles. We are aware that the sentiments expressed in the deliverances of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church are a shade, though only a shade, lighter than the above representation; but that decision is the compromise between the extreme slavery views of the South, and the more modified slavery views of the North, while we are speaking only of the sentiments of the churches within the slaveholding States; and if any one challenge the incorrectness, we are ready, with our facts, which we do not insert, because they are well known, and our statement must be brief.

This, then, is the position of the American Church in the slaveholding states; it is a church which had a testimony against slavery, which it expunged; it is a church which teaches, that because slavery is authorised by the State, there is no sin in having slaves, provided they are well treated; it is thus a church which palliates the sin of slaveholding to the planter's conscience, and concerning which we can have no hesitation in saying, that it is one of the main pillars of that accursed system. Now, we ask, was it for the Free Church of Scotland, which had been honored to raise such a noble testimony for truth and liberty, to place herself on an equality with those who were so basely betraying the cause of humanity, and so foully misrepresenting the doctrines of Scripture? Was it for that church, while the shout of her recovered freedom was still resounding through the world, to stretch out her hands to churches, some of whose ministers, and elders, and people, were enslaving their fellow-men in soul, body, and spirit? Was it, especially, for those mighty men who had burst the shackles of Erastian control, and hewn them link from link, was it for them to sit down and hold fellowship with those who had stooped to become the armor-bearers of slavery, and who, everywhere went before it, like the man before Goliath, bearing for its defence the broad and sacred shield of Scripture? There was something more than an ordinary act of inconsistency in such conduct. It was sin committed in the very midst of a gracious deliverance, of a wonderful manifestation of Divine love and mercy,—to find anything resembling which, we must go back to the case of Israel, who, 'at the sea, even the Red Sea, provoked him grievously.' The sin of the Established Church was a sin against the light of Scripture, but the sin of the American churches is a sin against the light of nature. Was it, then, for those who had bidden 'farewell to Egypt,' on account of her corruption, to stretch out the hand to Sodom? Had it not been for the temporary charm which great talents, united with great actions, impart, even to the most palpable inconsistencies of distinguished men, the for this conduct never would have been listened to apologies for a moment, in a land filled with the monuments of freedom; but the time will come, when the spell shall be broken, and truth will vindicate her own supremacy.

A second thing, which we consider to be wrong, in the position assumed by the leaders of our church on the question of slavery, is this—that they have begun to remonstrate with the Americans, without confessing the sin of which we ourselves were guilty, in sending a deputation to solicit fraternal sympathy and aid, unaccompanied by a single hint about the sin of the American churches on the subject of slavery. When a party falls into sin, the proper course is *to confess* and *to forsake*. It is not enough that a man confess, if he do not also forsake; but neither is it enough that he forsake in the future, unless he also confess in regard to the past. It is quite common with men to confess, and not forsake; but our leaders appear to be acting as if they wished to forsake, to some extent, in the future, without making any confessions respecting the past. They have begun to remonstrate with the Americans, while they deny that there was anything wrong in our former intercourse. Now, with all deference, such a remonstrance seems to us very inconsistent. The simple fact, that our church is now remonstrating with the American churches, is a proof that it would be sinful to have any communion with them, without remonstrance. But no change has taken place, in the American churches, for the worse, since they were visited by our deputation. If, therefore, it be right to remonstrate now, it must have been sinful not to remonstrate formerly; and, on the other hand, seeing no change has taken place, if it was right to send a deputation, without a remonstrance, it is uncalled for to remonstrate now. Unaccompanied by a confession of our sin, in having had intercourse with them, in the very formal manner that we had by our deputation, any remonstrance we may now send must stand out before the world, an inconsistent, self-condemning document. Besides, to say the least of it, is it not likely that, had any remonstrance preceded the deputation, the money contributed by the slaveholding churches would never have been given? It is not, therefore, over courteous to our American brethren, now that their money is in our coffers, to begin to remonstrate with them, while, at the same time, we maintain that there was nothing sinful in our former unconditional communion. And, moreover, seeing no change has taken place in the American churches, since they were visited by our deputation, to begin to remonstrate with them now, without confessing the guilt of that former intercourse, has somewhat the appearance of deserting our American allies, when they have become unpopular, and of seeking to propitiate public sentiment towards ourselves, by witnessing against them, so far as we may deem it expedient.

In the third place, without entering, at present, on a consideration of particular sentiments contained in the remonstrance, sent by our last Assembly to the American Churches, we consider its whole form and substance to be too loose, vague and indefinite, to answer any practical purpose. We think the plain course of duty would have been, to discuss the present state of the American Churches, with a view to ascertain whether this was really such, that, unless some alteration took place upon remonstrance, all farther communion with them would be sinful. If it had been found, as it will be found, we have no doubt, whenever the actual state of the American churches is discussed in our Assembly, that they are in such a condition, that farther communion with them will be sinful, unless a decided change take place upon their conduct, then, a remonstrance, founded on this decision, and intimating it to our trans-atlantic brethren, would, in our opinion, have been a tangible, definite, faithful measure. But has this, or anything like it, been done? No! the actual state of the American Churches, in regard to slavery, has never been discussed in our Assembly. There has been abundance of discussions about imaginary cases, in which slavery would not be sinful; and there has been a great deal of legislation *in nubibus*, for cases, one of which cannot be shown to exist in all America; but slavery, as it does exist there, slavery as a reality, and the manner in which it is interwoven with the churches, has never been discussed, with a view to determining whether it be sinful to continue communion with these churches, unless they change for the better. It may be right, or it may be wrong, to continue in fellowship with the American Churches, although no change takes place upon them; but our Assembly has not decided the matter. They give no opinion in the case. They resolve to remonstrate, without determining what ground there is for such an act, and what issues it shall take, if neglected. That remonstrance, therefore, gives no certain sound. It commits the Assembly to nothing. It is one of those politic measures, which are framed on the principle of the sliding-scale. It is capable alike of ascending, or of descending—of ascending, under sufficient pressure, to the highest point of extreme abolitionism—of descending, should the present pressure cease, to unconditional, unremonstrating communion. Meanwhile, however, this scale indicates nothing, either as to the true state of the American Churches, or as to the precise course which the leaders of our church mean to adopt, if our trans-atlantic brethren refuse to listen to this remonstrance. This scale has, however, one good property—it can slide—and we would call upon all the friends of humanity and liberty, within the Free Church, to use their influence to make it slide in the right direction.

And we would have such to consider, in the fourth place, that this remonstrance is not only most indefinite, but the principles which it embodies are so insufficient, that, although they were acted upon to their fullest extent, by the American Church, in her judicial capacity, and by all her slaveholding members, they would not lead to the emancipation of one single slave. That remonstrance, as every one may see, who chooses to peruse it, proceeds upon the principle, that, while the present laws respecting slavery remain, persons may *have slaves, without sin*, who treat them well; yea, that it is even the duty of such persons to retain their slaves, to prevent them falling into the hands of more oppressive masters. Although, therefore, the slaveholders in the American churches hearken to this remonstrance, though they act on it, to its fullest extent, what would be the result? Why, the result would be, that, though they might treat their slaves more mercifully, they would be under no obligation to liberate one of them; nay, it would still be their duty to retain them, lest they should fall into worse hands. This remonstrance, if carried out, might be a contribution to the cause of *mercy*, but it would do nothing for the cause of *liberty*. Although it was acted upon, it would not break a single chain, it would not emancipate a single slave. The three millions of unhappy bondsmen, whose wrongs cry incessantly for redress to the humanity of earth, and the vengeance of heaven, might cease to be in the hands of *slaveholders*, but they would find themselves held, just as firmly, in the chains of *slave-havers*. And is this all the contribution the Free Church of Scotland is called upon to make, in behalf of much injured men? Do the descendants of martyrs, and saintly patriots, consider that they do enough when they call upon their fellow-Christians in America merely to *line the fetters* of their slaves? Do they not consider, that if this render their chains softer, it would also have a tendency to render them more enduring? Would it not be more accordant with the spirit of our country, and more in harmony with the principles of our church, and more obedient to the commands of our God, to tell our brethren in America, that they ought, at once, come what will, 'to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, to let the oppressed go free, and break every yoke'?

These, then, are the principal things which we consider to be wrong in the conduct of our church in this whole matter. There was sin in sending a deputation to solicit aid from the slaveholding churches—our remonstrance is inconsistent, while this sin is unconfessed—that remonstrance is too indefinite to be of any practical value—and the principles upon which it is framed are so insufficient, that our American brethren might agree to all its demands, without liberating a single slave.

(To be continued.)

☞ Here is the speech of Col. Cilley, of N. H. on the Mexican war, in the U. S. Senate, *as reported by himself* in the National Era. This is Liberty partyism, with a vengeance! Compared with the speeches of D. P. King, J. R. Giddings, and other Whigs, this speech is not merely contemptible, but atrocious. Nothing can be more cold-blooded than its suggestions as to drilling and augmenting the U. S. troops.

CORRECTED REPORT OF MR. CILLEY'S REMARKS IN THE SENATE.

Mr. Cilley's resolution requesting the President to withdraw the army from Mexico, being under consideration, Mr. C. addressed the Senate as follows:

Mr. President: I have my reasons for introducing the resolution; and I will, briefly as possible, state some of them. Sir, we are at war with Mexico. As to the manner in which we got into that war, I shall not now undertake to inquire; but I will state that I think the war unnecessary and unjust, and all wrong. If Mexico had wronged us, we should have foreborne. There was no necessity for hurrying into a fight for very small causes. The President proposes a vigorous prosecution of the war, for procuring an honorable peace, yet it seems that peace is no nearer than it was at the commencement of hostilities. Sir, how are we to get peace? The President says we must 'conquer a peace.' How shall we do it? The taking possession of her territory will not give us peace. We may keep an army in the Mexican territory for a long time without obtaining peace. We cannot get a peace without negotiation. Well, sir, why not bring our army out of her unhealthy climate into our own country, where we can *reinforce*, ORGANIZE, and DISCIPLINE THE ARMY, and have some plan of operation that will be efficient, instead of scattering our forces all along the frontier, from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific ocean? Sir, it costs too much to prosecute the war in this way, and what is the effect? We are expending a large sum of money in the purchase of Mexican produce, paying them high prices for all that is wanted for our army, enriching her citizens in a large extent of country. Is this the way to obtain peace? I think not, sir. The commanding general has said, that he considers it impracticable to proceed to Mexico by the way of San Luis Potosi. Sir, if this is the case, why not withdraw the army, and make AMPLE PREPARATION TO CARRY OUT OUR PLANS, if we have any? The Senator from Ohio, in the proposition which he submitted to the Senate, I believe, intimates a desire that large reinforcements should be raised and forwarded immediately for the prosecution of the war; but the *great objection* which rests upon my mind in regard to this sudden increase of the army, is that the troops thus hastily raised must necessarily be *undisciplined and unexperienced*; and if they were enlisted with the utmost dispatch, they could not be concentrated upon the field of military operations before the commencement of the sickly season. Will you send them into Mexico, to contend with their deadly climate, and sacrifice our soldiers to no purpose? I think my plan better, to withdraw our forces to some healthy place within the boundaries of the United States, where the subsistence of the army could be more readily obtained, and then if it is necessary to increase the army to any desirable extent, *to have the soldiers well-drilled*; let them become inured to service, so that when a blow is to be struck, it may be SUCH A BLOW AS WOULD HAVE THE DESIRED EFFECT. What object is intended to be effected by this war, *I have yet to learn*; but if it is only to obtain a peace, honorable to both countries, I think that can be obtained as well with our army in our own country, *until we can have time to have them properly organized and drilled*, and have some plan of operation. Sir, it appears that this war is not to be a short one; it will be a protracted war; and why peril the lives of our men, why sacrifice OUR GALLANT LITTLE ARMY, by obliging them to fight against superior force as to numbers, in strongly fortified towns? I am not for any such hair-breadth escapes as at the battle of Monterey, where General Taylor tells you that it was wonderful that he should have succeeded; and I consider it almost a miracle that he did succeed against such odds. And what would have been the consequence had he not succeeded? Who would or ought to have borne the blame, General Taylor or the Administration? I believe he tells you it was not his plan, but he did it to sustain the Administration. If Vera Cruz is to be occupied in order to march to the city of Mexico you must have at least 50,000 men. No prudent general would undertake to conquer the city of Mexico with less than 50,000 efficient men. Well, sir, will you collect that number of newly levied forces, and send them into Tampico, or any other place in the Mexican territory, to be drilled and disciplined? For they must be disciplined before they will become efficient to contend with the black vomit or the yellow fever. Or do you think that men are soldiers as soon as they enlist? A different opinion, once prevailed. Sir, it will be a new business to the men and also new to the officer. It requires some little time to become accustomed to the camp, as well as to learn the duty of a soldier. Sir, the Senator from Michigan yesterday avowed the opinion that it was unconstitutional for Congress to direct the President as to the course which he should pursue in the prosecution of the war; that the only duty of Congress was to provide him the means he asked for, in the way that he should desire it; and he alone had the right to direct the operations of the army in the way he thought proper. I differ from the Senator in this opinion. I think that it is clearly our duty to deliberate upon the subject, and to propose such measures as we may deem advisable. If we believe those who have the charge of the war are going wrong, it is our duty to propose a better plan. Sir, have we not a right to think on this awful subject of war? Have we nothing to do but to vote all the men and money that the President tells us he wants, without inquiring into the matter, because that war exists, or, as the Senator from Michigan said, that it was all summed up in one short word, and that word was war; that we had no constitutional right to do anything, but to do all the President may require, and make him responsible, thereby clearing ourselves of all the responsibility? Is that all that is expected of us by those who sent us here? I differ from the honorable Senator in this opinion. I, for one, am willing to be held responsible for all my votes in this body on all subjects.

The honorable Senator from New York the other day had stated, that we were in possession of two-thirds of the Mexican territory, and one tenth of her population. What are we to do with this territory? Are we to annex it to this Union, and oblige that population to send delegates to this Senate, and to be subject to our laws by compulsion? One republic compelling another to adopt her form of government; is that agreeable to our free principles? Or shall we drive them out of the territory that we have conquered, or annihilate them? What can be done with the territory under our form of government? I admit, sir, for the sake of argument, that the people residing in that territory were willing to come into our Union, and we should make a treaty with Mexico to that effect, it comes in as Texas was brought into the Union or by treaty. Sir, could such a treaty be ratified by this Senate, or could it now be brought into this Union by resolution?—Would a dispute arise whether it should be free or slave territory? No, sir; the time has gone by for admitting any more slave territory into this Union. It cannot be done. If admitted, it would be a bone of contention that would divide the Union.

Sir, I think we are in a bad condition. We are in a war with Mexico; we are in possession of a large portion of her territory. How are we to extricate ourselves from this war, which has already cost us much blood and treasure, and bids fair to cost a great deal more? How long this war is to continue, God only knows. Sir, I think by withdrawing the army, and, if necessary, *by reinforcing it*: and then, when Mexico sees that we have *a force that would look down all opposition*, she would be willing to treat for peace. I think we can obtain a treaty much sooner in this way, and with less cost of blood and treasure, than attempting to put forward an unexperienced army into their unhealthy country. Sir, if we are to hold on to this territory that our army now has possession of, it will take a large army to garrison so long a line of frontier, and keep the communication open with our own country. I say, sir, it will take a large army to do this, which will be in addition to the army that is to march to the city of Mexico, to 'conquer peace,' as the President tells us we must do. And sir, if we must fight before Mexico will treat, I AM DISPOSED TO STRIKE AT THE HEAD, and let the limbs go. I hope anything that I have said will not be considered as rendering aid to the enemy, for that is not my desire. I look to our own comfort.

From the Anti-Slavery Standard.

WEST WINFIELD (N. Y.) FAIR—SERIOUS ACCIDENT AND NARROW ESCAPE.

West Winfield, 2d mo. 10, 1847.

The anti-slavery women held a Fair here last year, at which they raised in one evening, by their own unaided efforts, the snug little sum of sixty dollars. This year they somewhat enlarged their operations, but two of their number being confined by severe sickness for many weeks, put them back considerably; they, however, struggled on, determined to do their best, and three days ago, their hearts were cheered, and their hands strengthened, by the reception of a box of beautiful things from the pioneer women of Boston. Never was anything more opportune. How much their value was enhanced by coming *just in the right time*. The Fair is in the large upper hall of our friend L. G. Thomas, who is the keeper of a Temperance House in this place, which does honor both to the keeper, and the temperance cause. I have not been able to visit the hall, but have been informed by Remond, (who is certainly a good judge,) and several others, that it is trimmed in the most exquisite manner—the tables beautifully arranged, and the variety and beauty of the articles entirely beyond description. Everything was in perfect keeping. The Fair opened at one o'clock, this afternoon, all eyes beaming with delight, and all hearts beating with joy. The flag is floating gracefully in the free air, the day as fine as heart could wish, the sleighing superb, and everything promising.

Evening.—They did a fair business in the afternoon, and now the people are pouring in from all quarters, from the surrounding neighborhoods. At an early hour the hall is filled—all is joy and rejoicing. The blessed hour of fruition is at hand; and now the good women, blessings on them, are repaid for all their toil.

7 3-4 o'clock.

TERRIBLE CRASH!! THE HALL HAS GIVEN WAY!! NO LIVES LOST!

A messenger has this moment arrived, informing me, that two-thirds of the floor of the hall has just given way, and that men, women, and children, tables, and all their beautiful contents, all went down together in one confused mass. It was all the work of a moment—the terrible crash of the timbers—the bursting of the camphene lamps—the smoke—and the screams of many voices, all conspired to render the scene fearful and terrific. That part of the floor which gave way was over the shed, which was filled with sleighs and horses, and the side which gave way, was toward the street, so that all went down on an inclined plane into the sleighs and snow, all piled up together. The only wonder is that many lives were not lost. *Laura Turner* was the most injured—no bones broken, or dislocated, but severely bruised and in a helpless condition. One woman was bereft of her senses by a severe blow upon the head, added to her fright. Some had arms—some limbs—some faces—some heads—some other parts of the body more or less bruised, but only three or four seriously.

All the tables containing the dry goods and fancy articles were in that part of the hall which gave way—and delicately wrought card-baskets, and beautiful needle-work, and rich embroidery—and the thousand numberless articles of exquisite workmanship were indiscriminately trampled under foot. Those in the hall above, found themselves unconsciously clinging to each other, without regard to age, condition, sex, or color, while topmost of those below, were relieving as fast as they could, the prostrate mass of humanity beneath them. One good old man, in his fright and haste, fell backwards head foremost into a large watering tub full of water, but was extricated without any injury, save the ducking. The universal question was, 'Are you hurt? are you hurt? are you hurt?' To this question, one young lady responded, 'I have lost my shoe,'—'are you hurt?'—'I can't find my shoe'—'are you hurt?' 'Don't talk to me now, for I tell you I have lost my shoe, and can't find it.' Thus will the ludicrous and laughable oftimes intrude itself upon the serious and solemn. One little bright-eyed, fair-haired boy, as soon as he was released, jumped up scratching his head, which had received a very severe bump, saying, 'I don't care, it didn't hurt me any, but I want my cap.' One man caught by the window-sill as the floor receded, and hung there in safety until relieved.

The most melancholy part of the whole affair, is the fact, that the *out-door gentry* immediately rushed to the scene of action, and amid the general confusion bore off nearly all the money which had been taken, which lay upon the tables in purses and bags, and came down amid the common wreck—and also carried off more than half the goods. It ought not, perhaps, to be wondered at, that in a community where the teachers of the people make a merit of robbing those who stand up in behalf of the perishing bondman, of their good name and character, and at the same time fellowship those who enslave our own Father's children, that some of the citizens should not scruple to rob, even under the most aggravating circumstances, the slave's friends—circumstances, that would have secured the sympathy of the *common* pirate, and the aid of the *common* highwayman.

At a safe calculation, if nothing had occurred to interrupt the progress of the Fair, from $300 to $500 would have been realized.

11th. The wounded are all doing well. It is a sublime sight to see how heroically these women stand up under their misfortunes. The fragments of the wreck have been overhauled—some washed—some ironed—some cleaned, and others straightened and 'put to rights,' and they are going on as bravely as though nothing had happened; and have also expressed their determination to have a Fair next year, even better than this *promised* to be. A subscription was commenced yesterday, for a bed-quilt, worth $8 00, to be presented to Abby Kelley Foster—and more than $5 00 subscribed and paid in, but the paper and money fell into the hands of the freebooters, and already a new subscription is opened for the same purpose. The only fear is, that as the news of the disaster has spread far and wide with great rapidity, that the people will not come in to-day, under the impression that the Fair is closed.

Truly, and faithfully,

J. C. HATHAWAY.

From the National A. S. Standard.

THE 'STREAK LETTER.'

We have hoped that the irrefragable evidence we published last week, in relation to the manner in which the 'Streak Letter' became public, would have brought from the editors of the Chronotype, the Emancipator, and the Charter Oak, a manly acknowledgment, at least, that they had been mistaken. Honorable men, men possessed of proper self-respect, and who hope to deserve the respect of others, could do no less than this. Neither of these persons, however, have done so. They have heretofore asserted that this letter was *stolen* from the hat or the bed-chamber of Mr. Stanton. The positive testimony of men whose veracity cannot be impeached, is produced, proving this assertion to be *absolutely false*. It is certain that Mr. Stanton has never contradicted it, though he must have known that it was a downright lie. It is possible, but very improbable, that Messrs. Leavitt and Wright may not have known from Mr. Stanton the exact truth in the premises. If, however, it be the fact that they did not know it, then the guilt and shame of hitherto permitting so infamous a falsehood to be told rests with Mr. Stanton alone. But now that it is proven one beyond contradiction, the guilt and shame belong equally to Messrs. Leavitt and Wright, since they take no measures to contradict a falsehood which they have been the chief instruments in propagating.

So stands the case at present. These men have been guilty, as editors, of an act which, if committed in the private relations of life between man and man, would mark them as only deserving of contempt, and unworthy of the slightest confidence. We make no distinction, however, between the man as an editor and as a private individual. What one does as an editor, he is responsible for as a man.

If we were ever disposed to use 'hard language,' we are not in this case. It is one which needs only a clear and plainstatement. The severest epithets and the acutest arguments cannot make so contemptible and base an act appear worse than it must seem to be at first sight in the eyes of all right-minded people. On the other hand, no sophistry can palliate it.

The Charter Oak has condescended to notice the letters which have been recently published. Its flippant bravado is even more disgusting than the silence of the Emancipator and Chronotype. The editors of those papers, we may hope, at least understand their position. Mr. Burleigh, it seems, is absolutely incapable of understanding that even a detected lie is anything to be ashamed of. We copy his paragraph:

'The "Streak Letter" Forever! The Liberator, a fortnight since, contained two tolerable long communications concerning this famous letter, aiming to prove that the man who stole it was not "Old Organization," at a time when there was no other, and did not steal it from Mr. Stanton's hat,—but copied it from a letter left by accident among business papers in a committee room. A. S. Standard asks very civilly, "Will the Charter Oak find place for them in its weekly hodge-podge of cant and billingsgate?" We certainly would, brother Gay, if we had such an assortment, and think better of your sagacity for assigning them so proper a department.'

From the U. S. Gazette.

SLAVERY.

A public meeting has been held at Richmond, upon the subject of Wilmot's resolutions, that have passed the House of Representatives at Washington. Resolutions were adopted, declaring the spirit of Mr. Wilmot's proviso in opposition to the Constitution of the United States; declaring it to be the duty of the Government to disregard the proviso, and resolving 'that, upon this absorbing question, all differences of political opinion should be forgotten, and all Virginians and Southern men should unite, heart and hand, in resisting, even unto death, the doctrines of said proviso.'

In addition to the above, which is pretty plain, a Mr. Scott offered a resolution, which left the member unpledged upon the question of war or peace:

'This meeting now holds and affirms the constitutional right of all citizens of the United States to take their property, of every description, whether the same be slaves or in any other form, into all the territory which is now within the boundaries of the nation, south of 36 30, north latitude, and into all the territory which may be hereafter acquired south of that line, and that this meeting will hold any attempt by the Congress of the United States to limit this right as in violation of the Constitution of the United States, and absolutely void and of no effect, and that it will, by all peaceable means, and this failing, BY ARMS, if necessary, sustain such of our fellow-citizens as may elect to settle within any such territory hereafter acquired, in the maintenance of their rights thus to settle and take with them their slaves.'

The above was unanimously adopted. It, of course, will be read with interest. The determination to take up arms against the Government of the United States is openly expressed. This is a part of the evils of annexation; and the nation is likely to be placed before the world in a character of prosecuting a war for territory, and acquiring territory to increase the *area* of slavery, and, it may be added, of sustaining the principle of slavery by a *civil war*.

From the American Missionary.

VALUE OF THE 'UNION.'

In a former number of our paper, we gave some extracts from a letter received a short time before, from the Rev. S. T. Wolcott, a missionary of this Association to the Island of Jamaica. Mr. W. wrote from Charleston, into which port the vessel in which he sailed had put for repairs. A part of that letter we refrained from publishing, while the writer was yet at Charleston. The vessel lay in the stream about thirty hours before she came to the wharf. During this time, Mr. Wolcott went on shore to find a boarding-place for himself and wife while the vessel remained in port. Through the Christian courtesy of some clergymen, this was soon found. On returning to the boat, to his great surprise, he found Mrs. W. unwilling to try the hospitality of the good people of Charleston.

The city authorities, in the faithful discharge of their duties had boarded the boat in search of any passengers or seamen who might not be of the favorable color, and the result was such as to be very trying to her Christian feeling. We leave Mr. Wolcott to tell his own story.

'We had with us a colored cook, and a Spanish boy with, as they said, some negro in him; both free men. These had to go to jail at once. One of our fellow passengers also, a prominent Spanish merchant, but a colored man, who owned a large portion of the brig's cargo, and who had won our favor by his gentlemanly deportment, was deemed worthy of the same place. But by the efforts of our Captain, it was decided that he might have the liberty of leaving the State, if he would do it at once. Passage was sought on board a steamer bound to Wilmington, but refused.—With a sad heart, he bound up his matress and quilts, and proceeded towards the jail, escorted by the Sheriff. But one more effort of Captain Roberts, procured his release till such time as he could take ship direct for New York, on condition that he should keep close in his own cabin. The gentleman left us after a few days, and is now probably in New York.'

Leavitt, Colver, Lovejoy, & Co.—*Revs.* in the Orthodox church—seem determined to shield the popular religion of the country from just censure, even though slavery should stand forever. They lately gagged S. S. Foster in one of their Liberty party meetings, and had him dragged out of their clerical meetings. The truth is, they are afraid of free discussion, and afraid of the Christian arguments of old organized anti-slavery. May the world never come under the rule of such *Rev.* sectarian politicians! *They* would be worse than Whigs or Democrats.—*Practical Christian.*

THE LIBERATOR.

BOSTON, MARCH 5, 1847.

THE RANSOM OF DOUGLASS.

We admit into our columns, with considerable reluctance, two more communications on this subject, though both of them agree with us as to the rightfulness and expediency of paying this ransom. Our reluctance proceeds from the conviction, that there is really no principle involved in the case; and where it is merely a question of policy, which does not relate to moral action, and on which there may be honest variances of opinions, according to the imagination or judgment of different persons, we do not feel inclined to excite or continue a protracted discussion.

If there are those who believe that it is wrong, *per se*, to extricate a human being from a horrid doom by paying a ransom, we can only say, that we think their heads are confused by confounding things which bear no analogy to each other. Human liberty is of incomparably greater value than money; and to secure the former, who would hesitate to part with the latter, if it should be extorted by the tyrant as a *sine qua non* to the enjoyment of the former,—provided the necessity seemed urgent, not to say overwhelming? No father would hesitate to ransom from slavery his son—no mother, her daughter—no husband, his wife—no wife, her husband—if the means could be obtained. They would not lose a day, not an hour, in effecting the liberation of the captive; and no amount of logic, no quantity of rhetoric, would be able to make the slightest impression upon their minds, that they had done a wrong act. They would need no argument to convince them that their beloved one could not be justly held in captivity, or that the enslaver had no right to exact a ransom from them; but they never would be able to understand how they were wrong-doers, in being willing to submit to an unjust demand, in order that they might extricate from the house of bondage a parent or a child. Nature has no voice of condemnation in such a case.

But it is said, in the case of Douglass, that he had already escaped, and a wide ocean intervened between him and his legal owner: it was needless, therefore, to pay, and especially to proffer, a sum for his ransom. It is a sufficient answer to say, that Douglass did not wish to be exiled from his native land, but intended at all hazards to return to his wife and children. As soon, however, as he had landed at Boston, he could have been legally seized, and carried back to his exasperated master; and he could have been rescued only by the intervention of mob violence, and *the overthrow of the U. S. Constitution*.

It is said, his master would not have dared to have laid his grasp upon him. Perhaps so—but who knows? Nobody!—it is all supposition. The liability was justly deemed too great, the risk too perilous, by the benevolent friends in Great Britain who contributed towards his ransom; and therefore they felt moved to secure his freedom in accordance with the laws of Maryland, and the constitution of the country.

It is said, if he had been carried off, a tremendous excitement would have followed, such as the country had never before witnessed, and the anti-slavery cause would have reaped the benefit of it. This is not improbable—but who wants to be kidnapped, and put to torture and a lingering death, in order to create an excitement? It is very easy to give up another to such a doom, by philosophically speculating upon the excellent consequences attending it—but it is not quite so easy to put ourselves in the place of the victim. That alters the case amazingly! No doubt, if Abby Kelley Foster should be kidnapped, and carried to the South, her abduction would do more for the overthrow of slavery than all her powerful labors—but who can complacently speculate upon the results of such a seizure? If she were in as great danger as Douglass would have been, or under the same legal liability to be dragged off at any moment, who would feel like raising an objection to extricate her from that danger, to remove that liability, by the payment of a paltry sum of money?

It is said, the 'free papers' of Douglass are worthless: he will be in as much danger as ever. Who seriously believes this assertion? Nobody! Somebody may think that he does—but he doesn't! He either deceives himself, or is trying to deceive others, or is determined to cavil with an evil object in view. If Douglass were to travel South, we admit that his 'free papers' might afford him very little protection; but this he has no intention of doing—this it is not necessary for him to do. Throughout the North, those papers will be safe, and may be in the highest degree serviceable. At least, this is certain—his freedom is attested on the records of Maryland; the claim of his late master has been fully and satisfactorily cancelled; he cannot be seized or held as a slave, under any law of the United States or of Maryland; if taken at all, it must be by kidnapping.—Whereas, unless that ransom had been paid, it would have been the legal prerogative of 'master Auld' to have taken him in any part of the country. Is all this no security? Is it nothing? Then is nothing something, and that something is a great deal! Ask Douglass himself—and he is the best able to decide the question—whether it has not removed a mighty incubus from his heart, and caused it to leap for joy. There are thousands of colored persons at the North, who have been ransomed in a similar manner. Ask them, whether they set any value on their 'free papers'? How many of them, in all probability, would have been claimed as fugitives, even after paying for their freedom, if it had not been for the protection afforded them by those papers!—But, if it be true that Douglass's papers will not enhance his safety, then we shall have the benefit arising from his abduction, in case it should be attempted, which some so coolly calculate, but almost seem to fear the ransom will entirely frustrate!

It is said, it was highly effective for Douglass to stand up before a public assembly, and exclaim, 'I am a slave!' On Bunker Hill, in Faneuil Hall, every where on the American soil, I am a slave!' This he can no longer say, and his appeals will consequently lose much of their effect. Very cool and calculating, to be sure! As if it were the finest thing in the world to occupy a most perilous position; and as if a man ought to occupy such a position, though offered a chance to escape from it, chiefly for the sake of effect! But who would run such a hazard, for such a purpose, if he could help it? Not one of those, we believe, who, oddly enough as abolitionists, lament that Douglass is no longer able to say he is a slave! Doubtless they think they would, but they're mistaken. Certainly, we shall be better satisfied that they would not accept 'free papers,' when they are placed in Douglass's situation before he received his! It is *so* easy to say what another should be willing to suffer, to promote a good cause, or to produce an electric effect! It alters the case *so* prodigiously when we are to be the sufferers! No doubt if a fugitive slave could stand before an assembly, and show the warm blood dripping from his lacerated back, with ghastly wounds all freshly made, it would create a powerful sensation; but who would say that he ought not to allow those wounds to be healed, or that blood to be washed away, because it would render his appeal less powerful, and diminish the sympathy felt in his own case? Another slave, in trying to escape, dislocates his arm, or breaks his leg. The sight of a limb in that condition, with a recital of the manner in which the grievous calamity occurred, would certainly excite much indignation in a popular gathering in New-England; but it would be quite extraordinary to hear objections raised against his having the limb mended, on the score of abating the popular effect of its exhibition!

Again. We are inclined to think, when Douglass returns home, that though he will not be able to tell the people that he is yet a slave, his proclamation of the fact, that he obtained his freedom only through British philanthropy, and by British money extorted in view of American ruffianism, will produce a most humiliating sensation, and be sufficiently effective to answer all the ends of popular agitation. But his power does not chiefly lie in the fact, that he was a slave, or that he has been ransomed by the friends of freedom across the Atlantic, (though this is incidentally impressive,) but in himself—in the strength of his intellect, in the greatness of his spirit, in the force of his eloquence, in the sublimity of the cause he advocates, aside from all the accidents of his birth, complexion, and education.

It is said, there is no difference between paying for the release of Douglass, and that of any other slave, or of all the slaves. True—and when any other slave is placed in precisely similar circumstances, we should be glad to see a similar deed performed in his behalf. As to ransoming a single slave, and seeking to buy the freedom of the entire slave population, there is a wide difference in these cases,—not as to principle, we admit, but as to sound policy. It might be highly expedient to redeem one slave by purchase, but quite as inexpedient to negotiate for the purchase of three millions. Still, we would rather—if this must be the alternative—that the most exorbitant pecuniary exactions of the slave tyrants should be complied with, than that their victims should never be set free. We do not think this alternative is presented, in regard to the slaves as a body; we are certain it sometimes is, as affecting the release of the slave as an individual.

It is said, this is to sanction the holding of property in man, and to endorse Henry Clay's doctrine of compensation. It is no such thing, but is as far removed from it as the East is from the West. The assertion is logically absurd, and morally untrue. He who submits to be robbed, while he denounces the robbery, is not to be charged with sanctioning the conduct of the robber. To save a fellow-being, it is no crime sometimes to comply with even unjust demands. To be the victim of extortion, is one thing; to sanction it is another. To say that the slaveholder is morally entitled to compensation, is to concede that a man may justly be held as property; but to purchase his *legal* title, in order to redeem a slave, can never be tortured into crime.

Finally, it is said, the money paid for Douglass will be expended by 'master Auld' in buying another slave, or causing a new victim to be added to the number in bondage. This may or may not be so: it is easy to predict evil consequences arising from the performance of an act, innocent and merciful in itself. We do not believe, however, that this ransom will be productive of evil to any one.

PRODUCTS OF SLAVE LABOR.

Having been requested by several friends in Pennsylvania, to express our views in regard to the use of articles raised by slave labor, we shall endeavor to do so in a very few words, as indicative, on our part, of the comparatively small importance we attach to the discussion of a subject, which is entangled with inextricable difficulties, and which cannot, therefore, be made a test of moral character.

At an early period of the anti-slavery enterprise, we were led, for a time, to regard the use of slave productions as personally involving a direct support of the slave system; but we were soon satisfied that we erred in judgment on this subject, that it was wasting time upon what no man could strictly reduce to practice, and that nothing would be gained by pressing it upon public attention. There were a thousand strong and vital issues that could be made with the Slave Power, and we deemed it far more important to grapple with these, than to raise questions of conscience, which no casuistry could settle like a moral axiom. It is for this reason that we have said so little in the Liberator on this subject.

We greatly respect the truly conscientious scruples of those who endeavor to abstain from the use of slave-grown articles; and far be it from us, at any time, either to condemn them for entertaining such scruples, or to prevent them from making as many proselytes as possible. If we have given them no special encouragement, they cannot charge us with waging any opposition against them. We have felt it to be one of those cases, which do not admit of clear demonstration, and hence must be left to the individual conscience. 'To him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean. He that doubteth is condemned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith. One man believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.'

We have not found the same spirit of charity manifested toward those who do not see that duty requires them to abstain from the use of slave produce, on the part of those who do. In the various reports and essays, which have been given to the public by the latter, from time to time, we have seen severe criminations of the former, as though they had little or no regard for principle, were unwilling to deprive themselves of any luxury or comfort to redeem the slave, were doing more to perpetuate than to abolish slavery, and thought more of the gratification of their appetites than of principle! To all such unkind, or at least unfounded charges, we have made no reply, but have allowed them to be freely circulated, believing that they have proceeded from a zeal not according to knowledge, however well intended, and that they needed no formal refutation. The non-abstaining abolitionists,—such, for example, as the Jacksons, the Phillipses, the Quincys, the Fosters, the Pillsburys, the Wrights, and the Chapmans,—need no certificate from any persons, that they are as willing as others to bear heavy burdens in the anti slavery cause, and heroically to discharge all the duties they perceive devolving upon them. They need only to be convinced that they are on the wrong track, and, cost what it may, they will instantly rectify their course, and pursue it unflinchingly to the end.

It is, perhaps, somewhat singular,—in a cause like ours, which embraces all classes of persons, without regard to sect or party,—that this zeal for total abstinence from slave-grown productions is almost exclusively confined to a particular locality, and to members of the Society of Friends. There are a very few exceptions, but they only prove the general rule. For the consciences of some of these, we entertain very little respect. They are those who strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel. They have no scruples against upholding the pro-slavery position of the Society with which they are connected, or against voting for pro-slavery Whigs or Democrats, or against supporting the oppressive and war-making Constitution of the United States. But they wear linen, instead of cotton; they eat free labor sugar and rice; and they thank God that they are not like those anti-slavery publicans and sinners, whose garments are made of slave-grown cotton, and whose tea is sweetened with slave-grown sugar. These are of the race of Pharisees and hypocrites, who flourished eighteen hundred years ago; and as no persecution is the consequence of their choice of food and wearing apparel—as it subjects them to no opprobrium—as it creates no disturbance in the community—as it leaves their cherished Society unharmed—as it calls forth no denunciations from the slaveholders—as it has the form of abolitionism (but without the power)—and as it furnishes them with a pretext to do nothing more for the slave, because they do so much (!)—they find it much easier to pursue this course, than to engage in any 'fanatical agitation' of society, after the manner of the 'ultra' abolitionists.

On the other hand, there are others who abstain in the manner stated, who are among the most intellectual, the most courageous, the most self denying, and the most sincerely conscientious anti-slavery men and women in the land. While we do not see eye to eye with them, as to the principle involved in the use of slave-grown articles, or the importance of making abstinence from the same a part of the anti-slavery movement, we nevertheless cherish toward them the highest personal esteem, and honor them for their stern fidelity to their convictions of duty. Not to obey those convictions would certain ly involve them in condemnation; while we think it is no evidence of blindness of vision, or insensibility of heart, not to have any such convictions.

If whatever is raised by slave cultivation, or is tainted with fraud and oppression, is to be rejected for that reason, then there is scarcely any thing in the world that it is allowable to use, as pertaining to money, food and clothing. True, if the duty of abstinence be imperative, it is idle to talk of consequences. But that is a point neither conceded, nor to be taken for granted. Those, however, who advocate the affirmative of the question, are bound to be rigidly consistent. Are they so? They reject slave grown productions; but do they decline receiving the money obtained by the sale of those productions, if it is proffered to them as an equivalent for goods delivered to the Southern planters? All the currency in the land has been many times earned by the slave population, and many times handled by the slaveholders, and much of it is constantly in possession of the latter. Is it therefore accursed?—What man has ever rejected a dollar on that account, in the form of a *quid pro quo*?

Again. If those productions are to be rejected, on the ground that the laborers have not been justly compensated, (for in themselves they are of great benefit to the human family,) then all those productions which come to us from the old world are to be refused, for a similar reason. The cries of the laboring classes, in all countries, are continually ascending to Heaven for redress, because they are ground down to the dust by extortion, fraud and tyranny. The cunning are more than a match for the simple; the strong are too powerful for the weak; the rich are too mighty for the poor. Yet, because English operatives are not fairly remunerated, shall we buy no English broadcloth? Because the laborers of India have scarcely the semblance of justice meted out to them, must we be deprived of the results of their industry? It is true, of all the laboring classes in the world, none are in so pitiable a condition, none are so unblushingly and completely plundered, as are the slave population; but the principle of morality is the same in all these cases, and we may not innocently sanction its violation to any extent.

The soil of a vast portion of this great nation is cultivated by slave labor. The principal staple raised is cotton; the subordinate ones, sugar and rice. These are all good—the gifts of a beneficent Creator. If their consumption tended to injure the health and degrade the morals of the consumers, then, by the law of self-preservation and by the rule of moral obedience, they could not be innocently used. It is sad to think how much of violence and injustice enters into their cultivation; but, it seems to us,—other things being equal,—they may be innocently used by those who abhor oppression, who are earnestly endeavoring to overthrow it, and who maintain that 'the laborer is worthy of his hire,' *and innocently by no other persons.*

These productions are so mixed up with the commerce, manufactures and agriculture of the world—so modified or augmented in value by the industry of other nations,—so indissolubly connected with the credit and currency of the country,—that to attempt to seek the subversion of slavery by refusing to use them, or to attach moral guilt to the consumer of them, is, in our opinion, alike preposterous and unjust:—therefore it is that we have refrained from entering into a discussion in our columns, on this subject, that threatened to be as interminable as it is incapable of any signal benefit to the anti-slavery movement. We have too many practical measures to carry forward,—measures which are causing the slave system to tremble to its foundations,—to be willing to have our own attention, or desirous that the attention of others should be, diverted to one of at least such doubtful and inferior character.

ANTI-SLAVERY IN CONGRESS.

A very few years since, any discussion of the subject of slavery, on the part of Northern representatives in Congress, was sure to stir up all the ire of the Southern hotspurs in that body, and to lead to the most disgraceful outbreaks. It must be in the highest degree gratifying to the friends of the slave to perceive how wonderful is the change that has been effected in both houses of Congress, in regard to this 'delicate question.' Now, any Northern senator or representative may rise in his place, and utter the severest denunciations against slavery at the South, and against its extension even under the Missouri compromise, and back up his words by his votes, and he is no longer in danger of being assassinated—he is no longer clamored down—he is no longer insulted and brow-beaten; but he is heard without violent interruption, and with a degree of calmness that is as surprising as it is encouraging. This has been demonstrated, during the present session of Congress, in a most remarkable manner.—More earnest, able and fearless speeches have been made, in opposition to the Slave Power, within the last two months, than have been delivered in that body during the preceding ten years. Almost every mail brings us an anti-slavery speech from some one in the Senate or House, who has summoned his manhood to enable him to dash to the earth the long-dreaded whip of the Southern overseer, and to stand erect in defence of liberty and free institutions. Among these, Severance of Maine, King, Ashmun and Hudson of Massachusetts, Culver, Wilmot and King of New-York, Gidding, Root, Corwin, of Ohio, Smith and McGaughey of Indiana, have made themselves conspicuous.

As yet—so excessively crowded have been our columns with other interesting matter—we have made scarcely an extract from any of these speeches—(and the same remark is true of the various excellent speeches that were made in the House of Representatives of this State, in opposition to the resolve, appropriating $20,000 in aid of the volunteers in the dastardly and wicked war against Mexico—but we have carefully preserved them all, and intend hereafter to give at least the gist of them in the Liberator, as a convincing proof of anti-slavery progress, and for historical reference.

In the U. S. House of Representatives on the 9th ultimo, a speech was delivered by the Hon. Daniel P. King, of this State, on the General Appropriation Bill and the Mexican War, which, for its manly pleading, its clear and emphatic utterance, its free and humane sentiments, has not been surpassed by any that has yet been delivered in either of the two houses of Congress. The present war he brands as 'unconstitutional, unnecessary and unjust;' and as to the blood that may be shed in it, he says—'Not on my hands, nor my conscience, Mr. Chairman, shall be this "damned spot"; for, with my views of the origin and purposes of this war, not all the waters of the ocean could wash the stain away. . . We are now the aggressors. The Mexicans are defending their altars and homes, their wives and children.' Again he says—'I am not accountable to the President for my opinions or my votes. My voice is free, and so shall be my vote. I do not submit to his dictation. I was sent here to exercise my independent judgment, *not to be the mere instrument of registering the Executive will.*' Once more—'An honest, independent freeman will ask, is the measure right; not, will it be popular. Popularity is a frail staff. The consciousness of meaning right, and doing right, will sustain a man in this life, and at its close, be the ministering angel of peace and hope.' These are excellent sentiments, and uttered under circumstances calculated to make a salutary impression upon those who listened to them, and upon the public mind generally. Mr. King is a high-minded man, and no demagogue. We thank him for his timely and able speech.

ACTION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE.

After eight weeks of criminal *do-nothingism*,—with the Mexican war hourly involving the land in pollution and blood-guiltiness, with the prospect that a vast slaveholding territory is ere long to be annexed to the Union, and with the Wilmot proviso against the further extension of slavery needing all the sanction that any of the free States could give to it, to strengthen the hands of its friends in Congress,—the Legislature of this State have adopted the following Resolves, after considerable discussion:—

RESOLVES,

Concerning the existence and extension of slavery within the Jurisdiction of the United States.

Resolved, that the Legislature of Massachusetts view the existence of human slavery, within the limits of the United States, as a great calamity—an immense moral and political evil which ought to be abated and abolished, as soon as that end can be properly and constitutionally attained; and that its extension, at least, should be uniformly and earnestly opposed, by all good and patriotic men throughout the Union.

Resolved, that the people of Massachusetts will strenuously resist the annexation of any new territory to this Union, in which the institution of slavery is to be tolerated or established; and the Legislature, in behalf of the people of this Commonwealth, do hereby solemnly protest against the acquisition of any additional territory, without an express provision by Congress, that there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in such territory, otherwise than for the punishment of crime.

Resolved, that his Excellency the Governor be requested to transmit a copy of the foregoing Resolves to each of the Senators and members of the House of Representatives of this Commonwealth in the Congress of the United States.

The vote was UNANIMOUS, which indicates that the Resolves contain nothing vital, nothing demanded by the exigencies of the times. The Special Committee on the Mexican War, (of whom the pro-slavery editor of the Boston Atlas was chairman,) deserve censure for their dilatory action on this subject. We presume the Resolves did not reach Washington in season even to be presented before the final adjournment of Congress, and certainly not to do any good; and we are inclined to think there was some design in this delay. As for the people of Massachusetts firmly resisting the addition of new slave territory to this Union, it is all wind. They have swallowed the camel Texas—why should they now strain at a gnat? They will consent to any thing Slavery demands, so long as they remain in the Union.

WHOLE NUMBER DCCCXLIII.

THE LIBERATOR.

REV. DR. DURBIN'S PLAN.

We again allude to the plan of the Rev. D.D. for the abolition of slavery. It is—1. Demonstration to the shareholders from the Treasury of the U. States that it is unjustifiable; 2. This appropriation to be made constitutionally, by an amendment to the Constitution to that effect. 3. The removal of the Confederation from the country; because they conceptated slaves from our Christians (?) and Republican (?) without being either subdued or exterminated!

As in the aggregate value of the slaves, he computes it at 450 millions of dollars. Several years ago, Henry Clay, in a pro-slavery speech in the U. S. Senate, estimated their value at 1200 millions of dollars; and they have increased numerically very rapidly, since that time. With the annexation of Texas, and the prospect of additional slave territory taken from Mexico, the slaves in all the slaveholding States have increased in value, and, consequently, are to be estimated accordingly. The calculation of this 'divine' man, therefore, is at least one third short of the actual market value of the property. But this is of no consequence. His scheme is impracticable, and absurd.

The idea of so amending the Constitution as to give to Congress the power of abolishing slavery throughout the country, by the purchase of the slave population, is equally preposterous.

The project for banishing this population to the coast of Africa, suggested by Durbin, is the old colonization one, which has long since been shown to be impracticable, as it is nefarious. His 'horrid distinction,' that two distinct races of men cannot live on the same soil, in the enjoyment of equal political and social rights and privileges,' is the same as the American Colonization Society has been eternally inculcating ever since that anti-christian body was organized; and the effect of it has been so disastrous upon the free colored and slave population, as well as upon public sentiment. It has served to discourage the emancipation of those who are pending in the house of bondage, to induce the enactment of cruel laws against free colored persons in the slave States, and to remove the pressure of guilt from the American conscience for our national iniquities. What can more clearly demonstrate the spuriousness of the religion of any man, whether of Rev. Dr. Durbin, who proposed to banish from a Christian country, to a land of darkness and heathenism, across a stormy ocean, thousands of his fellow-creatures, or of the Pope, who, in the name of God has given them 'a skin not colored like mine?' But this is the religion of Dr. Durbin—that ecclesiastical sheet, in the guise of Christianity, the New York Observer—and of the American Church, the bulwark of slavery.

'Let not a man of the devil,' Dr. Durbin deals in the most out of such persecutors, by saying that this expulsion of the colored population would result in the creation of a Christian State in Africa, more worthy of an existence, than would diffuse the gospel of Jesus Christ throughout that vast continent.' So he neglects to add, that if such an expulsion were possible, another result (not fanciful, but certain) would be, the outpouring of many a vial of retribution upon this incorrigible land, and the everlasting shame and infamy of the American people.

ANNUAL REPORT.

The Fifteenth Annual Report of the Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society is just published. Every member of the Society is entitled to a copy, which may be obtained by calling at the Anti-Slavery Office, 21 Cornhill. To others, the price is 25 cents. The Report is handsomely printed and occupies, with the proceedings of the annual meeting, 96 octavo pages. It discusses the prominent events, connected with our cause, that have occurred during the past year, both at home and abroad, and with much ability. The labor of preparing such a Report, from year to year, is very great; but, for many years in succession, Mr. Quincy has gratuitously performed it, in addition to his other valuable efforts, with great alacrity. Most lovely is the cause which can thus, by this vigilant, untiring and disinterested advocate.

BURTON UNDER A MASK. An Liberty party convention recently held in Ohio, George Bradburn drew the following vexatious resolution, which was adopted:—

Resolved, That the assertions of slaveholders and their abettors, that our national Constitution gives guarantees of slavery, is a gross perversion of the character of that instrument!!

There is a great deal of folly and effrontery exhibited in the adoption of such an untruthful resolution. The Liberty party professes to be as warmly attached to the Union as either the Whig or the Democratic party; yet it puts a construction upon the Constitution, which should any party forcibly attempt to carry it into execution, would separate this the Union 'city high.' We are indignant at the dishonest mode of dealing with the Constitution, and thus joining, with southern slaveholders and their northern allies in affected veneration for the American Union, and in denouncing straightforward abolitionists!

THE FARMER AND THE SWORD. We have read, with much pleasure, the copy of a sermon which has been sent to us, preached in the South Congregational Church in Boston, Feb. 21, 1847, by F. D. Huntington, on the Famine and the Sword, at the turning condition of Ireland, and the unjustifiable war with Mexico. Its language is clear and expressive, and its sentiments such as the great idea of the brotherhood of nations' is calculated to inspire. We say, Mr. H. says.—We are keeping in mind, amongst upon a poor sister republic, and violating the everlasting laws of Almighty God, by maiming, and killing, and shooting his children.' And in regard to what this nation might have done to mitigate the horrors of the famine abroad, he adds:—'Had all the wealth that has been worse than wasted in the iniquitous war, been poured into the cottages of the Irish and Scotch peasantry, what joy and comfort would glisten those desolated homes!' Surely, a charge like this,—which must naturally suggest itself to every intelligent reader of the turning point—in the present war, in addition to its great cost to extend and eternize slavery, criminal and terrible beyond all parallel. In one year, it will have cost, probably, one hundred millions of dollars. This sum would have been sufficient to avert all the horrors of the famine now raging across the Atlantic.

ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTIONS IN BARNSTABLE COUNTY. The Cape is to be the seat of operations for the next campaign. Stephen S. Foster, Addison Davis and Parker Pillsbury will conduct it. Let our friends there, endeavor to make it a successful one, by promptly securing the best places for the meetings, giving extensive notices, persuading their neighbors to attend, and aiding the agents in passing from town to town. An effort will be made to procure subscribers to the Liberator. Notice of the conventions will be found in another column.

READ IT. We have commenced, on our first page, the publication of the able and cogent Address of the Officers-bearers and Members of the Free Church of Scotland, on her present connexion with the Slaveholding Churches of America—issued by the Committee of the Free Church Anti-Slavery Society. It is as important as well as ably written paper, and represents that Church for the evil course it pursued in relation to American slavery, with boldness and a truly excellent spirit. We hope all will place the Church to SEND BACK THE MONEY.

THE UNITARIANS AND SLAVERY.

BROOKLYN, (Ct.) Feb. 23, 1847.

MY DEAR SIR:

In the 'Liberator' of Friday last is a letter, with the heading 'The Unitarians,' which requires, I think, a few words of explanation, in justice to the individuals mentioned therein; although, in this letter, I have no right to speak for more than one of them.

I do not regret the publication of that letter; it may do good; I think it will. So far as it may be thought to contain a just rebuke of myself, I do not object to it. If I am in any error, and especially in one so serious as to be doing anything to sustain slavery, I will consider him my truest friend, who, in the spirit of friendship, will point out to me that error. I know not who your correspondent 'A.' is; but I think, with his understanding of the facts, he has shown no more than a just astonishment, and expressed no more than a just rebuke.

But, as he represents the facts, they do not separate us at all.

J. B. Whittridge, M. D., of South Carolina, is not the 'Vice President' of the American Unitarian Association, but one of fifteen Vice Presidents—not a very material distinction, indeed; but the reason of my making it will by and by appear.

This gentleman was elected one of the Vice-Presidents of the A. U. A. in May last, for the first time.

The matter of choosing officers, and most other business indeed, has been the merest formality in that body, ever since I have been a member of it (12 or 13 years),—it being generally arranged beforehand. No want of confidence in this way of proceeding has manifested itself till recently. Last year, for the first time, the members of the Association resolved to elect their whole officers more directly into their own hands, and they spent some time in deciding what candidates they would support for the principal officers. Whether the list of Vice Presidents was then canvassed by the meeting, I do not recollect; if it were, the name of Dr. Whittridge made no impression on my mind; and I think I may venture to say that the name passed, with the other Vice Presidents, without any knowledge, on the part of many present, of the individual bearing it. I think it probable the majority of the members were so situated. I know that some present would have strenuously objected to his election, had it been known, or suspected, that he was a slaveholder. The first intimation I had of this fact was from a paragraph in a number of the Liberator in August last, I think. That paper I laid aside for future reference.

The above statement will, I think, absolve the most of the members of the Association from a *intentional* participation in the election of a slaveholder to office. That it may show them not sufficiently watchful, not sufficiently jealous of the honor of the religion they aim to serve, perhaps I must admit.

The 'Protest' of the 173 Unitarian ministers, of which 'A' speaks, was signed in 1845. Dr. Whittridge, if I am not mistaken, was not elected until 1846; and then in a manner not likely to call particular attention to his case, his name standing with fourteen others on a list, which it had been the custom for a long series of years, only to read to the meeting, and to pronounce elected, without a scrutinizing vote. It is not correct, then, to say to the signers of that protest, as 'A.' does, that 'they very next act they do,' after signing the Protest, is to choose a slaveholder for the Vice President; especially do I believe that the charge, that they *knowingly* voted for such an individual, is very unjust to the signers of that Protest generally.

Nevertheless, I am bound to state, that the name of the Hon. James M. Wayne, of Georgia, has stood on the list of Vice Presidents of the A. U. A. for many years; and the question, 'Is he a slaveholder or?' has never been raised, to my knowledge. I can only account for it on the supposition of the little attention given to choosing their officers.

I must further say, that the Rev. Orville Dewey, D. D., of New-York, is the present PRESIDENT of the A. U. A. If it is true, that he has been recently at Washington, what he is publicly reported to have said, respecting slavery and abolition, I think the principles of our body are more dishonored, and the views we profess to hold more outraged, in the person of the *President* of that Association, than in those of any one of its other members.

I am, with sincere esteem,
Your friend,
SAMUEL MAY.

THE PRODUCTS OF SLAVE LABOR.

PLYMOUTH, Feb. 27th, 1848.

FRIEND GARRISON:

I perceive among other interesting matters in the Liberator of the 19th, a communication from Lea. H. Gause, of Pennsylvania, soliciting your views and opinions in regard to the products of slave-labor by yourself and other advocates of the anti-slavery cause. Seeing no reply in the last number, as intimated, and supposing it to be crowded out by other matters, and having given the subject considerable reflection myself, without being able to arrive at any given point to which conscience would say, 'This far shalt thou come,' (with a strict,) and no farther—and being desirous of more light, as well as others, on the subject, I should be glad if you or some others would freely express your views.

Friend Gause says—'To me, there has been no anti-slavery duty more clear, than that of abstaining from the use of slave labor produced.' I would signify as he has practically adopted the motto of 'No Union with Slaveholders'—meaning to be understood, no doubt, as giving no voluntary aid to the system of slavery whatever.

Whether the writer keeps clear from any participation, and in any way from contributing to the support of slavery, because in more favorable circumstances, than many others who do not entirely shun—or from fixed principles to abide the consequences, cost what it may—is a very different thing, in my opinion. But as that duty is clear to the writer of the communication, I hope its rays will shine into the minds of all the haters of slavery.

I think there are few persons, if any, in this section of the country, who have suffered more for the slave than myself; and I am yet suffering, in some degree, pleasing as I do, to be a sufferer for Christ in behalf of the down-trodden; and if there is any thing more that I can do, than what I am doing, to benefit the cause, I am anxious to be made acquainted with it. I have, for a long time, made use of free labor produce, when it came in competition with slave labor produce, if it could be had at higher prices for the former. But, as slave produce and taxation for slavery comes in so many forms, I think it is very difficult for me to avoid participating in it altogether. For instance—I have, for the last year and a half, spent much time and money in my time lecturing on the subject of slavery, in different sections of this country. Much of the food placed before me, I have reason to believe, is mixed with the products of slave labor. If I ask whether it is free or slave labor, I get no satisfactory answer. At night, the only bed I can sleep in, may be composed of the produce of slave labor. Most of the means by which I sustain myself and family, are the little profits I derive from the sale of anti-slavery publications, printed on slave-grown cotton. I have a family to clothe and feed, with my limited means, which compels me to procure the cheapest articles, to meet their necessities as well as I can, and it is mixed with the products of unpaid labor.

I subscribe for an anti-slavery, or any other reformatory periodical. It comes to me through a post office, managed by a slaveholder, printed on slave-grown cotton paper.

I write a letter to my wife, or to you, friend Garrison; and what do I write on, but paper manufactured from cotton raised by slave labor? And it reaches its destination by the direction of a slaveholder—&c. &c.

Again, if we try to evade the use of those slave grown articles, and substitute imported articles in their place, we are paying a tax to support a slaveholding government, all steeped in innocent blood, and now carrying on a cruel war against a feeble government, for the sake of establishing permanently the traffic in helpless men, women and children on its soil, where it had been abolished by a half civilized people.

I pray God for the annihilation of slavery and war by all means.

JONATHAN WALKER.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

The ransom of Douglass has drawn out Lindley Coates, with a host of others, in opposition to the course the Editor of the Liberator has taken in this case. But I think the Editor is right, and Lindley Coates and others wrong. The Editor, if I am not mistaken, has never reasoned in this way before, on the subject of compensation; and I presume never would, if circumstances had not compelled him. He was set in a narrow place. His dear friend, the noble-spirited Douglass, was in slavery; and compensation was the only means that could release him. He then could reason correctly; he could then make himself believe that it was right to buy a slave.—But he has to remember the act with the Declaration of Sentiments of 1833, in his face, or there is no meaning in words. The error that makes the difficulty is in the Declaration of Sentiments, and not in the reasoning of the Editor to justify the purchase of Douglass. The only objection I see is in the amount. I think it is seven times more than he could have been bought for, if an agency had been employed in Wilmington or Baltimore; but it is an evidence of high-toned generosity in those who paid the money, or who justify the act, which I feel it right to sustain and support.

Lindley Coates reasons very logically; and if his position is admitted, that it is wrong to buy a slave at all, there can be no doubt but his conclusions are correct. But I deny the position. The right or wrong of buying a slave depends upon circumstances; and a case might occur, in which it would be wrong not to buy a slave. There is, in his position, no discretionary power for necessity; and every body knows that necessity has no law, for that its mandates are superior to all law.

If Lindley Coates's wife or child was in the grasp of an unprincipled villain of despotic power, and there was nothing but silver or gold would soften his heart, does anti-slavery body believe, he would hesitate a moment of time under such circumstances would convert him into a slave-buyer?

The erroneous doctrine which supposes we know how to act in such cases, independent of circumstances, is the cause of all the inconsistency and controversy, respecting the propriety of buying a slave. It is a doctrine founded on a false theory. Man is a finite being, of limited powers; and if he cannot do all he would, he ought to do all that he can.

This opinion is not founded on the belief, that there is no stability or permanency in the great principles of right. It assumes that no man can say, whether an act is right or wrong, by an abstract view. The circumstances of the case must be placed before his mind, or he can never chose the right. What is right to-day, will be right to-morrow, under similar circumstances, and so in all future time. But the right and wrong of human actions depend on circumstances. A man in good health and spirits to-day, would be right in eating, drinking, and enjoying life; but to-morrow he may be sick, and then eating and drinking would produce pain; in the place of enjoyment, and, of course, would be wrong.

When there is no necessity, it is wrong to take the goods of another without consent; but, in a town of want of food and raiment, it might be wrong not to do it.

To buy a slave, in order to increase your own enjoyment, is wrong; but to buy him, in order to increase his enjoyment, is right in the abstract. This is the true criterion to judge of right and wrong, good and evil. All abstract notions of right and wrong serve only to distract the human understanding, and create disputes, as we see in the present case. What is it, but vague and indistinct ideas of the principles of right, that could make such men as Lindley Coates and the Editor of the Liberator misunderstand each other in so plain a case?

If a system of ethics, or a constitution of obligations, is so loosely framed as to throw men of the best talents and purest motives into confusion, what must it do with minds of a lower order, with similar motives and ungovernable passions?

Old organization abolitionists show to the world a rare specimen of the best men, with the highest attainments, possessing the most impracticable notions of morals and politics, with a religion as pure as that of any other sect, but so overburdened with puritanical zeal, that it destroys much of the good fruits of expanded and liberal views.

It is to be hoped that the present dispute about the right or wrong of buying a slave, will advance the cause of pure religion and human governments, and, above all, in charity for those who differ with them on those important subjects. For it cannot be supposed, that principles so unintelligible to the mass of mankind, that upon the least jar are liable to bring such men as Lindley Coates and the Editor of the Liberator, are the best calculated to advance the cause of emancipation, and to increase the sum of human happiness in the world, by cementing all hearts and all hands in the bonds of universal brotherhood.

The rule to judge of right and wrong, in human actions, appears to me to be, 'do unto I believe it is,' 'that a way-faring man, though a fool, shall not err therein.' It should appeal to the feelings and senses, and not to the imagination. I do not object to the spiritual-minded man indulging in all the reveries of spiritual imaginations, but let all this be a private affair between him and his Maker. To his fellow-man, let him speak in the language of his senses. It can be of no use to urge the abstract principles of right and wrong as a rule for human actions. There is perhaps, no better way than to judge a man, who is willing to suffer that others may enjoy, to be a good man; and he who is willing that others should suffer for his enjoyment, to be a bad man.

All mankind agree about things that are obvious to themselves; and when agreement is important, individuals should not obstruse and metaphysical reasoning should be avoided. I am willing to award great merit to the Declaration of Sentiments of 1833, and the purest and best motives to its framers, I am constrained to say, that its want of clearness has been the cause of many refusing to place themselves under the restrictions that may be justly inferred from its language. I will terminate my article by quoting a sentiment from some strictures made upon it many years ago:—'That the slave has a right to immediate and unconditional emancipation, there can be no doubt; but the right of compensation, either to the slave or his master, must depend upon circumstances, and is consequently conditional.'

B. WEBB.

Wilmington, Delaware, 24 mo. 26th, 1847.

☞ As to the insinuation contained in the above ornamental letter, that we have abandoned the doctrine of compensation, as laid down in the Declaration of Sentiments, because we found ourselves 'in a narrow place' concerning our dear friend, the noble-spirited Douglass, we have only to say that it is utterly false. Our views on this point are precisely the same as they were in 1833.—*Ed. Lib.*

THE CASE OF DOUGLASS.

FRIEND GARRISON:

I say read, with much interest, the arguments, pro and con, respecting the purchasing of Frederick Douglass. When I first heard of the transaction, I was truly rejoiced that so useful an instrument in the anti-slavery cause was released from the liability of being again reduced to slavery. Some have said that he was already free. But was there a place in these United States, where he could have protected him from the claims of his master? True, it might be said, he was north of Mason and Dixon's line. But, was he less legally a slave on that account? H. C. Wright, in his letter to F. Douglass, gives us a specimen of the arguments Lindley Coates reasons very plausibly, and discourses about its being wrong to compensate the slaveholder. Let these worthy friends put put themselves in the slave's stead; let them be subject, to the caprice of Thomas Auld, or toiling in hopeless bondage in the rice swamps of Georgia; let them know that either of them would object to being released by the ransom of some kind friend? Would they, under such circumstances, reason about the abstract propriety of paying for their freedom? If the slaveholder or the highwayman wrongfully take my liberty or purse, let him look to it. I think it right to redeem myself or my brother—to restore ourselves to ourselves, or to our families.

L. Coates says, if attacked by a highwayman, much good might be done by expostulating with him on the wickedness of his conduct. That might be so; but there is some difference in the relative positions of the man-stealer and the money-stealer. The first may have his conscience quieted by the customs with which he is surrounded. He finds himself supported by Church and State; he is allowed by many to be a good Christian. The latter is an outcast from society, and is a subject for the gallows or state prison.

One of these self-emancipated slaves has informed us, that he once expostulated with his master, and said, 'Have I not served you these nine years, master Clay?' The answer was, 'You impudent fellow! did I not buy you when you was a boy?' He followed this injunction to the *overseer*:—'That fellow must be brought to a sense of his situation'—a most severe flogging was then given to him. And such, I suppose, would usually be the result, if a slave should attempt to expostulate with his master.

An ordinary runaway slave might come to the North, and be comparatively safe from being returned to slavery, by his obscurity. Not so with Frederick Douglass. Thou said truly—his case is *sui generis*.

H.

Worcester, 2d mo. 23, 1847.

ANTI-SLAVERY LABOR.

FRANKLIN CITY, Feb. 17, 1847.

DEAR SIR:—

Inclosed, you will find the Dissolution petition, for publication in the Liberator, and publishing signatures. I have done what I could to that end, and you will perceive by the number of names affixed, is not much. The cause of anti-slavery in this vicinity is yet in its infancy. Lamentable ignorance pervades the minds of the people, with regard to their individual, state and national relations to the 'peculiar institution.' The measure proposed in the petition being of so new and startling a character—being emphatically a *do something* measure, not an *all talk and no work done*—it is not a matter of surprise to me that I have found so few ready to bear the reproach of being known to be in favor of this revolutionary movement. Before I could obtain signatures to the petition, I knew of but one individual in the whole town that would affix his name to it. I have obtained some half dozen voters, and about as many women and non-voters. But the interest of this measure does not end here. It has caused discussions without number, in this town; and discussion is what the truth, especially anti-slavery truth, most needs, and always invites. Although this measure is too radical altogether for people here to swallow, yet the discussion it has elicited and the attention it has turned to the subject, will be productive of good.

Do with this petition as you see fit. If worthy of presentation with others to the Legislature, let it be presented; but if the number of signatures is so small as to render it entirely insignificant, let it be cast aside, though much time and much exertion has been used to obtain these few, *here*, as there has in other places where you can count by scores instead of units, because of their having less rocky and barren soil on which to labor.

Respectfully yours,

J. T. CARTER.

☞ We wish there were many more such working abolitionists in this Commonwealth as the writer of the above letter appears to be.—*Ed. Lib.*

INTREPID ACTION AND NARROW ESCAPE.

Our amiable and worthy friend, LORENZO MOORY, whose residence is in East Boston, performed a very gallant act on Monday afternoon last, at the imminent peril of his life, and much to his bodily injury and must for some time be confined to his house, in consequence. The following handsome editorial notice of this act appears in the Morning Post of Wednesday, and we believe accurately gives the particulars:—

A NOBLE NON-RESISTANT. On Monday afternoon, two horses, attached to a sleigh, upon runners without a driver, came dashing along at the top of their speed up the ferry wharf from the Eastern railroad depot, causing the greatest alarm to the many whom were several military gentlemen, to get shelter in stores and doors to avoid being run over. Several children were playing at the head of the wharf, who seemed in imminent peril of being trampled under foot, when a man started from among those who were looking for a place of safety, and placed himself in the road immediately before the horses, with the intention of arresting their progress. On they came at full speed, and seeing the present danger the man had, who had thus thrown himself before them, especially as the road was covered with ice, which rendered his footing uncertain, they picked up the stout his ground nobly, and as the horses dashed upon him, seized one of them by the bridle with such effect that he tripped and fell upon the ice, but the man was also thrown down by the sheek, and the other horse continued plunging with such force that he drew the sleigh over the prostrate body upon the shaft, leaving the carriage still upright on the runners. At this danger over, the crowd came to the rescue, and secured the horses, and picked up the man, who was lying on the ground almost insensible, with his body much bruised and his clothes torn. In the carriage was a lady, who was thrown into fainting fear, but had sustained no bodily injury. The individual who had thus exposed his life, and thereby had unquestionably saved several children from serious injury, not to speak of the passenger in the coach, was Mr. Lorenzo Moody, a resident of East Boston, a well-known non-resistant. He was taken to the Eastern Exchange Hotel, where medical aid was procured, and he was then carried home in a carriage, and is now confined to his bed. Though a strong non-resistant, this act evinces a nobleness of nature that cannot but be admired by many, who others was at stake. We regret to state that Mr. Moody is not overburdened with the good things of this life, and that his family are dependent on his labors, he can ill afford the loss of time which his generous daring has entailed upon him.

Our readers will be glad to know the sequel of this touching story. Their friends are aware, that Mr. Moody's devotion to our cause has left him wholly dependant on his own exertions for support. His dress was entirely destroyed. The lady in the coach was the daughter of Col. Pierce, of Portsmouth, N. H., reputed to be a very wealthy man. Although close to the spot, he never took the trouble to come near Mr. Moody during the scene; but, a day or two after, waited on him at his house, thanked him for the bold feat, which, he said, had saved his daughter's life, and presented him a folded bill—which, we understand, proved to be two dollars! The young lady will hardly feel flattered to learn at what price her life was valued by her father. We really hope, for his own credit, as well as to evince his approbation of so laudable act, that the person would at any time have the courage to perform, that Col. Pierce will yet take Mr. Moody's case into consideration—his destitution, the situation of his family, his bodily bruises and sufferings, his narrow escape from instant death, while saving the life of Col. Pierce's daughter, and the loss of time of limbs of others, his confinement to his bed, and the expense of his illness—and make such a donation as so remarkable a case demands. Surely, he cannot have been aware of Mr. Moody's real situation.

☞ There are doubtless many generous-minded persons, who, on reading this account, and learning the true situation of Mr. Moody, will feel a desire to convey to him some token of their sympathy, and appreciation of his benevolent intrepidity. Any thing left for him at the Anti-Slavery Office, 21 Cornhill, or addressed to him at that place, will be immediately put into his hands. Of course, he has no knowledge of any such intimation on our part; but a case like this presents itself not in the light of a favor or gratuity on the part of contributors, but as a debt of generous self-sacrifice which ought at once to be cancelled, with interest.

☞ We hope as many of the friends of Non-Resistance in Massachusetts, as are able to do so, will attend the following meeting, which we are confident will be a highly interesting one.

NON-RESISTANCE MEETING.

A Quarterly Meeting of New England Non-Resistance Society will be holden at Mechanics' Hall, Providence, R. I., on the 10th day of March, commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M. The friends of the cause, and all who desire to understand the principles of Christian Non-Resistance, are affectionately invited to attend. ADIN BALLOU.

LECTURES IN LEOMINSTER.

William Lloyd Garrison will lecture in the Town Hall in Leominster, on Sunday next, March 7th,—forenoon, afternoon and evening, at the usual hours, —on Slavery, and kindred topics of Reform.

CAPTURE OF C. M. CLAY AND OTHERS.

MOUTH OF THE RIO GRANDE, February 3, 1847.

The fate of Col. May's rear guard and baggage train have already been published in England and reached this place, too painfully true and well authenticated, which proves that the enemy have pressed on us in earnest, and that their hatred is mortal.

On the 19th January, I met Lieut. Ritchie, of the 4th Infantry, then on the road to the 2d Dragoons, on his way from Saltillo, with ten dragoons, as Victoria, bearing important despatches to Gen. Taylor, from Gen. Scott and Santa Anna, and these despatches contained the whole plan of the operations in which we are about to engage. While on the road between Monterey and Victoria, at a place called place I cannot learn, the party was attacked, young Ritchie was lassooed and dragged across a cornfield, and the despatches carried off. The 2d Dragoons were taken prisoners. Lieut. Ritchie was one of the most distinguished and excellent young officers in the army. His conduct at Palo Alto and Resaca won the admiration of the army, and he was much esteemed for his talents and the excellence of his private worth.

A few days ago, an officer of the 2d Ohio Regiment, Lt. Miller is believed to be his name, was murdered at Victoria, and I understand, that the heart was cut out and hung upon a shrub, to show us, I suppose, how deeply seated was their hatred towards us.

The following letter reached General Worth last evening. Of course, there is no doubt about its correctness. It is from Capt. Scott, of the 2d Dragoons:

SALTILLO, Jan. 25, 1847.

I have only time to write a word. Major Borland, of the Arkansas cavalry, with 50 men, and Major Gaines and Cassius M. Clay, with 30 men, were surprised at Encarnacion, on Monday night, 45 miles beyond Saltillo) on the morning of the 23d, Gen. Minon, who he heard that Borland was there, and marched from Matamoras with 2000 cavalry, and took them without firing a gun. This is no *stampede*.

Yours, truly, W. W. CHAPMAN.

The ships Statesman, Prentice and Catharine were off the Balize, on the 16th of Feb. with 1500 fresh troops. The 2nd Regiment Mississippi Volunteers on board the Statesman were suffering terribly by sickness—they were sick and numbers daily.

Tampico dates of the 5th have been received at New Orleans, with intelligence of the loss of the Alvo Ondiaks, about thirty miles south of Tampico, having on board the Mississippi under Col. De-Russy. The troops and crew got safely on shore, and have since arrived at Tampico, except the Captain of the ship. It is not known that he left the ship at all.

Feb. 7. Lieut. Gibson, of the 2d Artillery, died last night, of fever. He had been sick but a few days.

Life in Washington.—A correspondent of the New York True Sun writes:—

Fifteen hundred young men are in Washington, soliciting commissions. The hotels are full and boarding rooms crowded: Nothing is talked of but nominations and appointments. All kinds of characters are attending and pressing their claims, especially young men of high qualifications; but the greater number are destitute of decent coats, money and manners. Hundreds are inevitably doomed to disappointment.

Asiatic Cholera.—The last accounts from our missionaries in India give the most painful intelligence of the ravages of the Cholera in Bombay. In the city of Tabreez alone, 6000 persons had died in the course of six months; 500 sometimes had perished in the course of a day. Ibid.

Freights.—The N. O. Bulletin estimates that the advance of a half a penny per pound freight on cotton, would make a difference on the entire crop, of $1,000,000 in favor of the ship owners. The rise in freight on corn meal and flour is a per centage than that on cotton.

U. S. Senator from Kentucky. The Hon. Joseph R. Underwood, Whig, was on the 12th ultimo, on the 12th balloting, elected to the Senate of the U. States for six years from the 4th of March instant. He succeeds Morehead, of the same politics.

Appropriations for the War.—The Army Appropriation Bill, as it finally passed the House of Representatives last week, appropriates $4,205,064 dollars for pay, subsistence, and clothing of the regular and volunteers, expenses of recruiting, transportation of troops, and of transports, &c. &c. Also appropriates $7,392,537 to supply deficiencies in appropriations before made.

Mortality on Shipboard. The ship Venice, from Liverpool for New Orleans, on Monday evening, had on board 170 steerage passengers, twenty-one, whom died at sea. Many of the survivors are represented as being in a deplorable condition.

Church Burnt.—The beautiful Congregational Church in Brimfield, was destroyed by fire on Sunday forenoon last.

Death in a Cab.—A young child died of the croup in a cab, on Monday, while being conveyed in a cab from the Lowell Railroad Depot, to attend the Worcester Rail Road Depot, a few days since.

Melancholy Suicide.—Capt. Samuel P. Bayley, a native of Newburyport, and South Boston, was found dead in his barn about noon, on Sunday.

Fast Day.—The Governor has appointed Thursday, the 8th day of April next, to be observed as a day of Fasting, Humiliation and Prayer.

Grain-loaded Vessels. The New York Commercial Advertiser gives a list of forty-one vessels loaded with grain, which have been lost at sea, or compelled to throw part of their cargoes overboard to save vessel and cargo, between the 26th of October and the first of February. The main causes of these disasters have been severe weather and storms.

Famine in Germany.—Accounts from Prussia are almost as distressing as those from Ireland. In the manufacturing districts, the destitution is alarming. According to official reports, several thousand families are in danger of starvation before the spring.

National Ship for Ireland.—Forty-six petitions to Congress, by a respectable number of citizens of New York, were sent to Washington on Saturday evening, asking a national ship to carry donations to the famishing poor in Ireland.

Indian Corn, for which more than two dollars per bushel is paid in England, can be bought, or could have been lately, in Illinois, for *nine cents!*

RELIEF FOR IRELAND.

$500 were raised among the passengers of the Cambria, for the benefit of Ireland.

Concord has given $400 for Ireland's relief, in money, and about $100 worth of provisions. She has done honor to herself nobly, and we wish we could say as much of all the towns in the State.

The Catholic Society of Worcester have paid in $300, and promise to make up $1000 for Ireland.

Between three and four hundred dollars has been raised in Cabotville, for the relief of the poor in Ireland.

The Pope has given a thousand crowns towards the relief of the suffering British. He wears three crowns himself.

General Tom Thumb was one of the passengers by the Cambria. He has given, in all, about $500 for the relief of the Irish.

Wellington Farnum, Esq. of Blackstone, in Worcester county, has given $1000 for the relief of the Irish. A noble-hearted man.

An unknown lady has presented $1000 to the N. Irish Relief Committee.

Providence, R. I. has contributed $6000 for the assistance of the Irish.

Buffalo and Syracuse have raised $1700 for Ireland—the former $1100, and the latter $600.

The subscription in the Town Armory, at Springfield, have subscribed $400 for Ireland.

Bishop Fitzpatrick, in the Catholic Cathedral, in Franklin Street, Sunday, stated that the amount collected in the Catholic Churches of Boston, last Sunday for the relief of Ireland, exceeded some what sixteen thousand dollars.

The Boston Relief Committee sent two hundred barrels of flour and meal to Ireland, in the Cambria; $145,000, mostly in small sums, being the private subscriptions of individuals for the relief of their friends in the old country, sent through Handel & Co.; Ballard Vale, which contains 600 inhabitants, $200; Cabotville, $300; Chicopee, $300; Schenectady, N. Y., $1000.

DONATIONS FOR THE STARVING PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

Amount acknowledged in last Liberator,	$620 00
Charles F. Hovey, Lynn, 25c; Leach & Co. 25c,	50
Wm. H. Channing 5, Samuel Hall, Jr. 5, John Rogers 6, Geo. M. Rogers 3, Boston,	42 00
W. B. Dana 5, G. W. Wood, Lincoln Centre, Me. 1,	6 00
Friends in Holliston, by Hiram A. Morse,	28 00
Mrs. Sophia Bradford, Cambridge,	5 00
F. and C. M. Field, Lowell, Mass.	2 00
Dr. Fifield and wife, Weymouth,	5 00
Susan C. Cabot, Cambridge,	3 00
Martin W. Bateman, 3, Charles Dwelly 50c. Benj. Josselyn 50c, George Macomber 25c, Mary Manning 2, Isabella Brisenham 2, Hannah Spencer 25c, Mary Ann Cushing, Cohoes, Mass.	4.85
Rev. Edwin Thompson, Dedham,	2 00
Thomas Bigwood, Manchester, Mass.,	2 00
Peter F. Spencer, Springfield, Vt.	2 00
Wm. H. & Almira B. Humphrey, Millbury, Ms.	5 00
James Soule 1 50, James L. Cortheil 1, Rufus Davy 1, Caleb Davy 1, Asa Cook, Jr. 25c, Allen Healy 25c, S. Vining 25c, Wm. Bonney, Jr. 25c, E. A. Robert 25c; Jacob Hersey 25c, Rev. Jos. M. Bates 25c, G. G. Dyer 25c, S. R. Smith 25c, A. F. 13c, B. Curtis 50c, A. Keen 25c, A. Alden 25c, L. Thompson 40c, Rev. D. Bowers, Warren Cortheil 1, Jno. Noyes, Jr. 50c; John Corthell 50c; E. Sharp 25c; Cyrus Gurney 25c; Samuel Dyer 1; Columbus Dyer 50c; Jos. Gurney 50c, Horace Reed 25c, W. L. Reed 50c, E. Bourne 25c, Oakes Reed 25c, T. Bourne 25c, John R. Reed 25c, Alfred Brown 50c; five friends 1 35, Mary Ramsdell 25c, Lydia Brown 25c, Asaph Whitmarsh 25c, Rufus Reed 25c, Sarah Whitmarsh 25, Mercy Ford 50, D. Cook 6, T. J. Cook 23, J. M. Pool 30, L. L. Pool 20, Jacob Pool 30, O. G. Bailey 25, Nathaniel Bailey 25, Sam'l Norton 25, S. Corthell 35c, Davis Gurney 50c, Wm F. Corthell 1, A. Holmes 50c, Nath'l Reed 50c, Isaac Reed 1—South Abington	26 00
Abington Sabbath School, Newburyport,	7 50
Amos Sargent, Danvers, 25; a friend, by letter, 12,	37 00
James Eddy, New York city, 30, in addition to $2 given before,	20 00
Wm. A. White, Watertown, 10, Horatio G. Wood, Middleboro', 3,	13 00
W. A. Gammon, Lynn, 27.50, John Cummings 5, North Dartmouth, Mass.	32 50
Stephen Potter 1, Patrick Potter 1, John W. Cook 1, Mary Ann Cook 1, Sarah Parkman 1, Walter Trumbull 1, D. W. Marfield 50c, W. Howland 1, ditto,	7 50
H. Sanborn, Sanborton, N. H. 1; Edward Ohleman, Milton, 8,	9 00
Parker Pillsbury and Sarah H. Pillsbury, Milford, N. H.	5 00
F. H. Drake, Leominster, 1 75; James N. Buffum, Lynn, 10,	11 75
Judson J. Hutchison 50, John { Hutchinson 50, Ass Hutchinson 50, Ass Hutchinson 50, Joseph Hutchinson 50, } for Ashby, Mass.	200 00
John Burbank, Ashby, Mass.	5 00
Gilchrist & Peabody, two poor shoemakers, McIndoes Falls, Vt.	3 00
	$1313 25

By the steamer Cambria, which sailed on the 1st instant, I sent two bills of exchange on London to Richard D. Webb, Richard Allen and James Haughton of Dublin, for the benefit of the starving People of Ireland, amounting to £200 (one hundred pounds) at 4.85 each, as per bill of exchange, $972 15—Total, 1314 15

Errors Excepted,

FRANCIS JACKSON.

Boston, March 4, 1847.

Extracts from some of the letters enclosing donations.

'I am a poor widow, with six young children, who are dependant on my efforts for their support; but I have a mite to spare, and I feel it my duty, in a time of such dreadful calamity.'—(From N. H.)

'May we lay aside all prejudice, be united in this labor of love, and make a mighty effort to save life.' (Co. of Plymouth.)

'Wife and I have been kept low indeed, for the slave's sake; but we never were reduced to the condition of starving Ireland.'—(From N. H.)

'My four little children, after hearing the account of the suffering Irish in the last Liberator, at their own request, send four half dimes. I feel bad, express my own feelings in the language of my little son, who was hardly able to speak, viz. say, 'Dear mother, send all my suppers to those poor Irish children, and I will go without, and be glad to, so they shall not be hungry.' (Co. of Plymouth.)

'O! how heart-rending are the accounts from Ireland! May America do her duty!'—(Co. of

POETRY.

From Burritt's Christian Citizen.

FAME.

My father says to me one day, 'I have enough to do, boy,
The younger ones to clothe and feed, without the care of you, boy;
So here's a dollar for your purse; your head's not over hollow;
See, yonder is the road to wealth, which you may straitway follow.'

The road to wealth lay duly East, and brought me to a city,
In which I thought to stay awhile, and labor, more's the pity;
For there, while strolling down the street, I met a drum and fife, sirs;
It was the finest tune they played, I'd heard in all my life, sirs.

A sergeant came to me and said, 'You are a sturdy youth, sir;
And such a brave and martial air, I never saw, in truth, sir;
Now if you wish a merry life, and lots of fame and glory,
Just sign this paper, and, my friend, the way is straight before ye.'

I signed the paper; they began to drill me and to train me,
And with a crowd of other fools, I marched to join the army;
They dressed me in a uniform of red and blue and white, sirs;
We walked all day in heat and dust—slept on the ground at night, sirs.

At length we met a host of men, who seemed much such as we, sirs?
Folks said it was the 'enemy;' thinks I, 'What can that be, sirs.
They drew us up upon level land, according to a plan, sirs;
The enemy began to point their guns at every man, sirs.

'Hallo!' cried I, 'don't fire this way, this field is full of people!'
But fire they did, and smoke rose up high as a village steeple!'
The bullets whistled past our ears, the small arms made a rattle,
A cannon ball took off my leg, and left me *hors du* battle.

The infantry ran over me; behind, a pack of horsemen,
Who rolled me as they'd roll a leg; I thought my self a lost man;
But when enough of fame was made, they stopped the agitation,
And sent me to the hospital, to suffer amputation.

Now, friend, if e'er the road to wealth lies straight and free before ye,
Keep safe your legs to travel there, and shun the way to glory;
This glory is a famous word for those who love to tattle,
But quite another thing for those who're shot at in a battle.

From the Worcester Evening Budget.

WAR.

All those who have the power to kill,
Without a heart to fear,
Can bid adieu to home and friends,
And volunteer!

All those who love the wildest shrieks
And dying groans to hear,
Can satisfy their fiendish thirst,
And volunteer!

All those who wish to die in youth,
With none but strangers near,
Can sever every kindred tie,
And volunteer!

Worcester, Feb. 8, 1847. HANNAH.

THE POOR MAN'S SUNDAY WALK.

BY CHARLES MACKAY.

The morning of our rest has come,
The sun is shining clear;
I see it on the steeple top;
Put on your shawl, my dear,
And let us leave the smoky town,
The dense and stagnant lane,
And take our children by the hand,
To see the fields again.
I've pined for air the live-long week;
For the smell of new-mown hay;
For a pleasant, quiet country walk,
On a sunny Sabbath day.

Our parish church is cold and damp;
I need the air and sun;
We'll sit together on the grass,
And see the children run.
We'll watch them gathering buttercups,
Or cowslips in the dell,
Or listen to the cheerful sounds
Of the far-off village bell;
And thank our God with grateful hearts,
Though in the fields we pray;
And bless the healthful breeze of heaven
On a sunny Sabbath day.

I'm weary of the stifling room,
Where all the week we're pent;
Of the alley filled with wretched life,
And odors pestilent.
And long once more to see the fields,
And the grazing sheep and beeves;
To hear the lark amid the clouds,
And the wind among the leaves;
And all the sounds that glad the air
On green hills far away;—
The sounds that breathe of Peace and Love,
On a sunny Sabbath day.

For somehow, though they call it wrong,
In church I cannot kneel
With half the natural thankfulness
And piety I feel,
When out on such a day as this,
I lie upon the sod,
And think that every leaf and flower
Is grateful to its God:
That I who feel the blessing more,
Should thank him more than they,
That I can elevate my soul
On a sunny Sabbath day.

Put on your shawl, and let us go;—
For one day let us think
Of something else than daily care,
Of toil, and meat, and drink:
For one day let our children sport,
And feel their limbs their own;
For one day let us quite forget
The grief that we have known:
Let us forget that we are poor;
And basking in the ray,
Thank God that we can still enjoy
A sunny Sabbath day.

THE RECONCILIATION.

O, in a world all reconciled to God,
Nor din of arms, nor garments rolled in blood,
Shall shock the peaceful soul. The oppressor's rod
Shall he lay down; and where abhorred he stood,
Loved shall he stand: for in fraternal mood
Shall he embrace the brother he oppressed,
Each find his joy in doing others good—
Man reckon him the greatest who is best,
And God be glorified when all on earth are blest.

REFORMATORY.

FAMINE IN IRELAND—WAR AND PEACE.

LONDON, January 20, 1847.

To the Editor of the Liberator:

Yesterday, we had our Queen's speech from the throne, or rather the ministers' formal nothings, and slightest possible indication of the prominent political or social exigencies of the day; it being customary to avoid, if possible, saying anything that should render an amendment upon 'the humble, dutiful and loyal address' to the Throne, which it is usual to pass upon these occasions,—being a formal echo back to the executive, of their intention to do as they are requested. I send you the speech. You will see it draws attention to the starvation in Ireland, caused by the potatoe blight; which implies, as we know the fact is, that Ireland had been so governed by her legislators and landlords,—who are, to a great extent, the same persons,—that her people had long been reduced to that cheap production, which Cobbett, (1) looking to the use which our land-owners were making of it as a minimum food root, called the soul-degrading root. It is pigs' food, when used as the main sustenance of the people! The people of Ireland raise provisions of all kinds in abundance, and of the best sort, and the practical result of the system under which they exist, stands thus—that those who raise the abundance, are compelled to raise it for their landlords—for tax-eaters—for a standing army and a permanent navy, used to keep the producers quiet, and supply the rent for the landlords and the commissions, and places and good quarters for the younger branches of these legislators and landlords, and the tithes for the State priests, appointed by these same landlords.

Thereupon arises a talk; and a repeal for one year of the 4s. duty, still imposed upon the importation of corn, is proposed, and the consequences of these iniquitous laws now being palpable, all parties begin to discover them.

The Whigs, the present party in power, talk of repealing for one year this 4s. Sir Robert Peel tells them—'You know you supported the continuance of this 4s. to stop the mouths of the Protectionists'—that is, the landlords who had refused to support Peel in repealing the Corn Laws,—and Lord George Bentinck and others, who now lead that section of the late Tory party, speak of the 4s. duty as a matter they no longer care about, and did not want. That is, they see they can no longer keep it, and affect to say the grapes are sour.

The marriage of the Infanta of Spain and the Duke of Montpensier, and the extinction of the free State of Cracow, are spoken of as a violation of the treaty of Vienna. It is stated, nevertheless, that the Queen —that is to say, the Ministers—have the fullest confidence in the maintenance of peace. As friends of peace, you and your friends will be glad of this. As to the marriage of the French boy and the Spanish girl, I had not any expectation that that would lead to a war. Dynastic wars are going out of fashion. Princes and their family politics are no longer of the same importance in men's minds, that they once were.

You know the saying, 'War is a game,' that if subjects were wise, kings would not be allowed to play at.

This is an instance, showing that the people at least are getting wiser than they were. As to Cracow, who but must regret the fate of this lately called free city? You will observe we have protested against the conduct of Russia, but we have little ground for doing so, after consenting, by the treaty of Vienna, to give the Duchy of Warsaw to the Russian empire, with authority to do with the people as the Czar pleased.

The first article of that treaty stipulates as follows —and pray pay attention to the italics:—

ARTICLE 1. 'The Duchy of Warsaw, with the exception of the provinces and districts which are otherwise disposed of by the following Articles, is united to the Russian Empire, to which it shall be irrevocably attached BY ITS CONSTITUTION, and be possessed by His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, his heirs and successors in perpetuity. His Imperial Majesty reserves to himself, to give to this State, enjoying a distinct administration, the interior improvement which he shall judge proper. He shall assume with his other titles that of the Czar, King of Poland, agreeably to the form established for the titles attached to his other possessions. The Poles who are respective subjects of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, shall obtain a REPRESENTATION AND NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, regulated according to the degree of political consideration, *that each of the Governments to which they belong, shall judge expedient and proper to grant them.*'

'Thus Poland,' to quote the words of the most powerful advocate of the Polish cause, the late Mr. CUTLAR FERGUSSON, 'was to be bound to Russia, not by hereditary descent, not by conquest, not by right of any description on the part of Russia, but by its constitution secured to it by treaty. By the same article, the other Polish Provinces were to receive a representation and national institutions; thus stipulating, for the security of Europe, that the Duchy of Warsaw should form an independent kingdom under the Emperor of Russia, but protected and guarded by its constitution, and strengthened by a powerful mass of nationality contained in the other Polish provinces, to whom a representation and national institutions were to be given.'

I have taken this extract from an address of the Literary Association of the friends of Poland to the people of Ireland, drawn up by Lord Dudley Stuart.

Now, what can we, as parties who consented to place different parts of Poland under Russia, Austria and Prussia, with a declaration that they should obtain only such a representation and national institutions, regulated according to the degree of political consideration as to the power to which they were assigned should judge expedient and proper to grant them—what could England, I ask, say against their seizing Cracow? England had sacrificed all the rest by contract, and said, do with them as you like.

Suppose that any power or party in your country should say to the slaveholders of the United States, when disposing of a conquered country—Mexico, for instance—'that you shall give the people such a representation, and such domestic institutions, as you shall judge expedient and proper'—would you be surprised, and would you be entitled to complain, if they took another slice of the same country, without your leave, and did again the same thing—that is, make slaves of the people?

No, no—we must wait another twenty-five years of peace, and rail-roads and intercourse, that will do more to instruct, elevate and harmonize the people, and improve their princes and nobles, than any armed intervention can accomplish.

EDWARD SEARCH.

(1) The following is the remarkable prophecy of Cobbett, respecting Ireland and the mortality of the Potato, made in 1826, as communicated in the following letter to the editor of the London Economist, in December last, by a correspondent.—*Ed. Lib.*

'LEAMINGTON

MY DEAR SIR:

Last evening, I met at dinner, a Roman Catholic priest, a Dr. Smith from Connemara County, Galway, who related the following conversation he had with that extraordinary man, Cobbett, in 1826. While speaking of Ireland, Cobbett said, that the dirty weed, alluding to the potato, would be the CURSE of Ireland. 'How so?' replied Dr. Smith, 'what must the people do without it? They live upon it. They have had it in cultivation 180 years.' Cobbett answered, 'they must go back to the same food they were accustomed to live upon previously to the general cultivation of the dirty weed; and that is to grain, as wheat, oats, rye, &c. You have four millions of souls in Ireland, and eight millions of uncultivated ground. This ground must be drained, and be brought into cultivation, and you must again grow wheat, oats, rye, &c. The potato will not last more than 20 years, when it will work itself out, and then you will see to what a state Ireland will be reduced. You MUST return to grain crops: and Ireland, instead of being the most degraded, will become one of the finest countries in the world. You may live to see my words prove true, but I never shall.'

Dr. Smith made a note of the above in 1826, and the same opinion and prophecy concerning the potato, occurs in one of Cobbett's books, Cottage Economy or Cottage Comforts, I forget which.

☞ A correspondent of the New-York Journal of Commerce says—

Cobbett's prediction as to the state to which the Irish nation would be reduced when the potatoe crop failed, called to my mind what he had said in his little work called 'Cottage Economy,' on the comparative advantages of bread and potatoes as food. After giving particular directions for making bread, he says:—

'And what is there worthy of the name of plague or trouble in all this? Here is no dirt, no filth, no rubbish, no litter, no slop. And pray what can be pleasanter to behold? Talk, indeed, of your pantomimes and gaudy shows, your processions and installations and coronations! Give me, for a beautiful sight, a neat and smart woman, heating her oven and setting in her bread; and if the bustle do make the sign of labor glisten on her brow, where is the man that would not kiss that off, rather than lick the plaster from the cheek of a duchess? And what is the result? Why, good wholesome food, sufficient for a considerable family for a week, prepared in three or four hours. To get this quantity of food fit to be eaten, in the shape of potatoes, how many fires, what a washing, what a boiling, what a peeling, what a slopping, and what a messing! The cottage everlastingly in a litter; the woman's hands everlastingly wet and dirty, the children grimmed up to their eyes with dust fixed on by the potatoe-starch, and ragged as colts, the poor mother's time all being devoted to the everlasting boiling of the pot! Can any man who knows any thing of the laborer's life deny this? And will, then, any body, except the old shuffle breeches band of the Quarterly Review, who have all their lives been moving from garret to garret, who have seldom seen the sun, and never the dew, except in print; will any body, except these men, say that the people ought to be taught the use of potatoes as a substitute for bread?'

Cobbett advocates the use of home-made bread. He says:—

'I have never quite liked baker's bread, since I saw a great heavy fellow, in a bake-house in France, kneading bread with his naked feet! His feet looked very white, to be sure: whether they were of that color before he got into the trough, I could not tell. God forbid that I should suspect that this is ever done in England! It is labor; but what is exercise other than labor? Let a young woman bake a bushel once a week, and she will do very well without vials and gallipots.'

☞ The following letter from George Combe, Esq. the celebrated phrenologist and philanthropist of Edinburgh, is in reply to one requesting the author's opinion of the principle of Association, as expounded by Fourier and others, or what the laboring mass of mankind can do for their own elevation. It will, of course, be read with much interest.

LETTER FROM GEORGE COMBE, ESQ.

EDINBURGH, 25th November, 1846.

MR. EBEN. AVERY,
South Reading, Mass., U. S. A.:

Dear Sir,—Your letter dated in July, reached me only in October, and I beg to thank you for it, and the translation of Fourier's work which accompanied it.

I agree in your view of Fourier's system, so far as I understand it, and regard it as impracticable in the present state of society. You ask, 'What else can the laboring population do for their own elevation and improvement, and the removal of the iron hoof which at present grinds them into the earth?' In answering this question, I submit two views to your consideration.

1st, *individuals* cannot change suddenly the condition of the society in which they live. Even Peter the Great of Russia, and Joseph the IId of Austria, although sovereigns armed with despotic power, and men of great energy of character, could not succeed in reforming the administration of their own governments, and civilizing their own people. And the reason of their failure was, that the individuals who composed these nations were rude, ignorant, and superstitious, and preferred modes of life and action which were in harmony with their own low mental condition, to higher habits which would have been at variance with it. The only way to produce a great social improvement, is by degrees to infuse new principles into the mass, and to teach them to the children. It requires three generations at least, to operate an important social change.

This, you will say, presents a poor prospect to individuals who, like yourself, perceive the imperfection of the present state of things, and suffer from it. I acknowledge that it does so, and wish it were otherwise; but the cause of the evils which you endure lies in the moral and intellectual condition of the *class* to which you belong. The great majority of them are still low in their moral and intellectual attainments, and prefer their present external condition to the pain of preparing themselves for a higher. There is only one unsurmountable obstacle, for example, to all the operatives in a Lowell cotton-mill, forming themselves into a joint-stock company, performing all the work themselves, and dividing the profits,—and this one obstacle is the low condition of their moral and intellectual faculties, which would render them incapable of a rational, moral, and efficient co-operation. Were such a scheme tried, you would see the ambitious men aiming at power in the management, for their own gratification, irrespective of their real capacity to direct the work with advantage to the general interests; you would find the selfish men aiming at some extra advantage to themselves, jealous of others, and discontented; the indolent men, idle; and the profligate men, reckless. This occurred at Orbiston, where Mr. Owen's system was tried; and would probably happen again at Lowell, if now tried. I state this as the only *unsurmountable* obstacle to the success of the supposed scheme; because I am convinced that if the operatives had only full confidence in each other's intelligence, business talents, and good faith, there is capital enough among themselves to set up and manage such an establishment. The sums in the savings' banks belong chiefly to the laboring class, and why do they prefer a low rate of interest from one of these banks, to a higher rate from a joint-stock association of their own people, except that they have not confidence in their honesty and business talents? Moreover, I am satisfied that only the same want of confidence stands in the way of ordinary capitalists lending money to such associations.

Is there, then, any remedy for these deficiencies in the working classes? There is none that I know of, except education, or intellectual instruction and moral training. Your Board of Education, with the Hon. Horace Mann at its head, is using the most effectual means that can be devised to promote the elevation and improvement of the people of Massachusetts. The working-classes scarcely see the benefits tendered to them in education in a sufficiently strong light.

For my own part, I can discover no cause why capital and its advantages are found so exclusively in the hands of the middle and higher classes, except their superior intelligence, business talents and good faith. Wherever these qualities have been wanting in them, ruin has overtaken *them*, just as it has overwhelmed associations of the operatives. In this country, the benefit societies, for providing against sickness and death, too often fail in the hands of the operatives, while those in the middle classes, under the name of Life and Annuity offices, they accumulate enormous wealth. The causes of the different results are easily traced. The poor man's club is founded in a tavern; the landlord is often the treasurer; the rates adopted are not calculated on any accurate data in proportion to the risks; and the whole scheme is too often managed by ambitious busy-bodies, whose vanity far exceeds their intelligence; and so the scheme perishes. The life Associations of the middle classes have no connection with the tavern; they are managed by men of the highest intelligence in that department who can be found, and who are adequately paid in proportion to their skill; their rates are founded on data scientifically ascertained; the funds are scrupulously invested in good securities; and the managers conduct the whole concern in good faith for the benefit of all the members; and hence their success.

I may take another example. In some of your States, joint stock Banks were instituted in great numbers. In many instances, the cashiers and directors applied the funds to their own use, lost them, and the Banks failed. Want of *intelligence* and *honesty* was the cause of their ruin. Wherever on the other hand, these qualities prevailed in the management, the Banks prospered. In Massachusetts, you had fewer Bank failures than in other States, and why? Solely because moral and intellectual cultivation was farther advanced there among the class who make and manage Banks, than in the other States. In Scotland, only four or five joint stock Banks have failed since 1800, and I know the history of every one of them. They were small provincial establishments, and the managers of them applied the funds to their own purposes, and lost them. In short, all these Banks perished *through dishonesty*.

In the course of my experience during thirty years in the profession of the law, in connection chiefly with the middle class of society, I had abundant proofs that those who prospered were active, intelligent, and *moral*; and that those who failed were deficient in these qualities, or in one or other of them.

There is, therefore, in my view, no system, theory, or combination of circumstances that will confer on the operative classes, while they continue ill-educated, unskilled in the business habits which fit men for intelligent co-operation,—and deficient in systematic honesty,—the advantages which the middle classes derive from a higher moral and intellectual cultivation. Again, I repeat, the remedy appears to me to lie in a higher education of the people. Place them on a level in point of moral and intellectual attainments with the higher orders, and the discrepancies in the fortunes of the two will be greatly lessened, or altogether disappear.

Secondly. While this change is in progress, the only remedy for an intelligent and moral member of the lower class, is to endeavor to enter into the middle order. There is no unwillingness in the latter to receive and assist the former to rise, wherever they see the necessary qualifications possessed. Among my friends and acquaintances there are, at least, half-a-dozen of men who have risen from abject poverty to wealth, before my own eyes, by the sheer force of their talents and honesty.

What some operatives desire, is to enjoy the advantages of high qualities without taking the trouble to acquire them; but this is as much adverse to nature, as it would be to expect to reap a rich harvest without sowing in spring. Another error into which they are apt to fall, is to imagine that, if the entire profits of their labor were divided among them,—say among the operatives of a Lowell Mill, —*each* of them would receive as much as falls to the lot of the single capitalist to whom it belongs. This is obviously a mistake. It is probable that they would not receive above $100 each of extra gain, supposing the capital all their own; and this would not essentially change their condition.

You ask whether I anticipate the realization of a higher state of society than that which now exists? I do! because the present condition of things does not satisfy man's highest faculties. You may wish me to describe it, and to point out how it may be attained. Here, however, I become painfully conscious of the imperfection of my own knowledge. All that I discern is—1st. The tendency of Capital constantly to increase; this will diminish the difficulty of obtaining the use of it, and also diminish its value. 2dly. The tendency of skilled labor, using machinery, to supersede unskilled labor; this is a penalty imposed by Providence on ignorance, and a premium offered to skill and intelligence. The only thing farther necessary to bring the operatives within the beneficial operation of these two tendencies, is, that they shall abandon their ignorance, and increase their moral and intellectual cultivation. By bringing the condition of their own minds into accordance with the scheme of Providence, they will certainly rise in their outward and inward enjoyments; but what the precise forms of the results may be, my intellect is incapable of foreseeing.

As you mention that there are other individuals, in your State, beside yourself, who desire to know my views on these topics,—and it gives me great pleasure to keep up my connection with your countrymen,—you are at perfect liberty to publish this letter in any form you please. With best wishes for your improvement and welfare,

I remain, dear sir,
Your faithful servant,
GEORGE COMBE.

P. S. I do not mean to charge the operative class with general dishonesty, in their present circumstances; but what I have remarked, *in this country*, is this,—that when responsibility to a master is withdrawn, and when large interests are committed to their discretionary management, with no check except that imposed by their own intelligence and sense of justice, they often make shipwreck of the concern through ignorance and incapacity, and not unfrequently find their moral principles, which sufficed to keep them honest as workmen, upset and inadequate to guide them as managers in trust for others. Until they learn to combine intellectual capacity with unbending integrity, capital cannot remain in their possession.

GOV. BRIGGS—THE VOLUNTEERS.

If George N. Briggs has any conscience or any sense of shame, he must feel terribly condemned and unspeakably mortified, every time he passes through the streets of Boston, and meets those strolling volunteers, whom he has officially called into the service of the Prince of Darkness. Most of them have probably come, at his bidding, from various sinks of vice and iniquity, and by going into the war with Mexico, will doubtless make themselves 'two-fold more the children of hell than before.' How can Gov. Briggs think of this fact, and have any sort of respect for himself as a Christian and a man? And then he has been the voluntary instrument of breaking many a widow's heart, and perhaps of embittering the remainder of her days on earth, by enticing away her sons, and making drunken soldiers of them! Noble work for an Hon. man to be engaged in!—and it is not the least excuse, if he has done it at the dictation of President Polk. Yet, he *professes* to be a Temperance man, a Peace man—ay, a Christian! Such a professor calling upon all sorts of rowdies and foolish boys to go and fight the battles of Slavery! O, shame, where is thy blush! O, humanity, where is thy conscience! Whoever does such a thing, must not only lack the spirit of a Christian, but the manliness of a man. We think Gov. Briggs will have *personal* reasons for cursing this war to the day of his death. It has already been a terrible calamity to him, having drawn him into acts which have indelibly disgraced him. We are sorry, and we dare say he is. If he is, let him manifest his sorrow by a manly and Christian repentance. The way is open to him, and it is the only way in which he can retrieve his character before God or good men. Has he the nobleness to adopt it?—*Practical Christian.*

FANEUIL HALL was occupied a week ago last Thursday, by the Volunteers who have been called into the service of his satanic majesty, by his 'Excellency, the Governor of Massachusetts;' and upon entering it on the morning following, we found it so full of the fumes of alcohol, that it was exceedingly unpleasant to be there. The atmosphere was almost as loathsome and nauseating as that of the most miserable grog-shop or bar-room. Many of this company of our 'noble citizen soldiery,' must have been mere rum-casks, to have tainted, by their breaths, that great hall. But how can men fight without being, at least, half drunk? Must not *Hon.* Geo. N. Briggs, *Hon.* Caleb Cushing, and *Hon.* Isaac H. Wright, be proud of their positions as leaders of these *patriotic* volunteers?—*Ibid.*

☞ Pottsville, Pa., is a very patriotic place. They have lately had some war doings there, of which the N. American says:

'Pottsville has acted gloriously on this occasion. Its citizens have subscribed over three thousand dollars in cash, REVOLVERS and BOWIE KNIVES, and every knapsack will contain a BIBLE!! The ladies give a festival and fair to-day and to-morrow, the proceeds to be devoted to the support of the families left behind. There is not a wife or child, parent or dependent relative left behind that Pottsville has not adopted 'for the war,' or longer if the chances of battle should so order it. *This is the true spirit—the noble spirit.* We have ever loved Pottsville—there are a thousand most pleasant associations connected with its past, to which we often revert, but now we love its dear, dingy, delightful locality, and its noble, chivalric, patriotic citizens more than ever!'

There! see what renown is obtained by espousing the war for the extension and perpetuity of slavery.

DEFERRED SUMMARY.

Two Railroad accidents occurred recently in our vicinity, which are calculated to excite some inquiry. One was at the Randolph station on the Fall River Railroad. The passenger train from Boston was struck in the rear by a plow attached to a train for clearing the snow from the track, and the collision was so powerful as to break the woodwork of every seat in the rear car. The following persons were injured by this collision: Dr. Hitchcock of Middleboro, had both legs crushed and broken, one of them in a most shocking manner, and he is since dead. Mr. Kennison, road master, had one leg crushed, and a severe contusion in the bowels. He is also dead. Mr. J. W. Appleton of Boston was injured in the leg; Sanborn Davis of do. in the hand; James Littlefield of Worcester and Ephraim Willey of Boston in the leg; Mr. A. A. Snow of Dover in the head; Jerome D. Snow do., internally; Reuben Bennett, brakeman, in the leg. The car was pretty effectually broken up by the collision, and it is wonderful that the remainder of the passengers escaped as well as they did. The accident was no doubt caused by the carelessness of the engineer of the locomotive.

The other accident was on the Worcester Railroad at Westboro' the evening previous, which proved fatal to Mr. George H. Haven, one of the gravel train conductors. Mr. H. was on the snow plough at the time it was thrown off the track, and he inadvertently jumped off into the middle of the track, and was struck by the heavy locomotive, and so severely injured that he died about six o'clock the next morning. Mr. Haven was a highly respectable and very worthy man, and had been in the employ of the Worcester Corporation for about 12 years. He has left a wife and family to lament his loss.—*Boston Mail.*

Fatal Accident. As the Lexington and West Cambridge train was coming into Charlestown, on Saturday afternoon, the engine came in contact with a horse and wagon, driven by Mr. Asa Spaulding of Lincoln, at the crossing from East Cambridge to Milk Row. Mr. Spaulding was thrown from his wagon and instantly killed, the locomotive and cars passing over him.

ANOTHER RAILROAD ACCIDENT.—Yesterday afternoon, about one o'clock, as one of the freight trains on the Norwich and Worcester Railroad was passing through Greenville, the snow-plow was thrown off the track, by which the train was suddenly checked, and the two locomotives attached were thrown together with great violence. One of the engineers, Mr. John Driscoll, was thrown off, and the tender fell over on to him, crushing him to death instantly. One of the fireman had his foot badly injured.

Melancholy Occurrence.—A melancholy and somewhat singular occurrence took place a few days ago, near Lake Constance, in the township of March. Two men having observed some wolves engaged in eating a deer, one of them, named Black, went to dispute the prize with these ravenous animals, when he unfortunately fell a victim to his rashness, the wolves having devoured him, leaving, as has been reported, only a small portion of his bones.—*Bytown (Canada) Gazette.*

We learn from the Picayune that the whole city of New Orleans was thrown into consternaion and alarm on the occation of the embarkation of the Mississippi Regiment. One of the Volunteers having been arrested as a murderer, the rest refused to embark till he was released, and behaved so outrageously that the alarm was given to the city, the governer called out the Legion to defend the city, and all was terror till the news came that the Regiment was under way. The Picayune expresses itself heartily glad that they have gone.

JOHN Q. ADAMS.—A friend from Boston says that the venerable Mr. Adams is exceedingly anxious to reach Washington, and so much so, that his physician finds it difficult to keep his patient quieted. It is supposed in that city, that Mr. A intends making a farewell speech in the House of Representatives, before he retires from public life, and this he had designed to do, had not his present sickness detained him from Washington. Like Lord Chatham, perhaps he is anxious to finish his earthly career, when in the actual discharge of his public functions —*New-Haven Palladium.*

☞ Mr. Adams is now in his place in Congress.

The 'Lone Star.'—Mr. Winthrop of Boston, in a recent speech upon Texas annexation and its results, said, the 'lone star' reminded him of the star described in the vision of the Apostle on the Isle of Patmos:

'And the third angel sounded, and there fell a great star from heaven, burning as it were a lamp, and it fell upon the third part of the rivers, and upon the fountains of waters;

And the name of the star is called Wormwood; and the third part of the waters became wormwood; and many men died of the waters, because they were made bitter.'

☞ A grand wedding came off in Baltimore, a few nights ago, among the upper ten thousand. The bride was the daughter of one of our most wealthy merchants, and the bridegroom himself quite wealthy. It is reported that the fortunate young man, on sitting down to breakfast the next morning, was surprised to find under his plate, a check from the bride's father for $100,000! Quite a snug little sum to spend during the honey-moon. —*N. Y. True Sun.*

A Streak of Lightning.—Last evening, at ten o'clock, Toronto was attached to the Buffalo and New York line of telegraph, and communications passed along the line from New York to Toronto for the first time. Subsequently, Boston was brought into the circuit, and a connected line of NINE HUNDRED miles placed in operation. Messages passed from the various offices, and the substance of the recent foreign news transmitted to Toronto from the station here.—*Albany Argus.*

At the late annual meeting of the American Colonization Society in Washington, the speakers were all strong pro-slavery men. Mr. Gurley's name does not appear. Among them was Stephen A. Douglass, of Illinois, who in the House of Representatives recently voted against the Wilmot proviso! Mr. Pettit, of that State, who was in favor of restricting slavery, it would seem was not sufficiently attached to slavery, to qualify him for the occasion.

Shocking. A mulatto man in Cincinnati on the 17th inst. put his head into a huckster's wagon, when quick as lightning, without even a warning growl, the dog sprang at the man, and seized him by the mouth and nose, and despite every effort of his to get the dog loose, he clung on and gnawed until he had taken part of the man's nose and all the upper lip entirely off! The man fainted.

Accident in the Mines. On Friday afternoon, as some of the miners who were employed in Spencer's mine at Pottsville, Pa., were proving the air with their lamps, the foul air ignited, when a most terrific explosion took place, killing six men, and dangerously injuring the seventh, who it is not expected will survive.

The Cambria brought out, according to the Boston papers, $2,500,000 in specie. The freight bill for the cargo of the Cambria will amount to about 60,000 dollars.

The amount of duties paid at the Boston custom house in December and January last, was 707,199 dollars, against 545,853 in those months of preceding years. January gave an increase of nearly 50,000 dollars.

Amos Lawrence of Boston has offered to give *Twenty Thousand Dollars* to found a Literary Institution in Wisconsin Territory, provided a like amount be raised in that territory.

A bill lately passed the Missouri Senate, granting permission to John Edmunds to keep a tavern without license, provided he does not sell spirituous liquors. The ground for this piece of extra legislation, it appears, was that Edmunds has *nineteen children*, all living.—*Phil. U. S. Gaz.*

The New York Evening Post states that the new packet ship Constitution, now lying at one of the wharves of that city, is the largest merchantman in the world, carrying eighteen hundred tons.

Rev. A. A. Miner, pastor of one of the Universalist societies in Lowell, last week received an anonymous letter, dated 'Nashua,' containing a present of six $100 bills.

The committee to whom was referred the matter at issue between Rev. C. W. Dennison and Rev. Nathaniel Colver, in Boston, have reported against the latter.

A drop or two of honey well rubbed on the hands while wet, after washing with soap, prevents chapping, and removes the roughness of the skin—it is particularly pleasant for children's hands and faces in cold weather.

More Volunteers. A married woman in Fall River, *fifteen years old*, had a pair of twin boys last week. The father is *seventeen years old.* They are all doing well.—*Newport Daily News.*

THE LARGEST PAINTING IN THE WORLD
Will be exhibited every evening except Sunday, at
AMORY HALL,
BANVARD'S MAMMOTH PANORAMA OF
THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER,
PAINTED ON THREE MILES OF CANVAS,

EXHIBITING a view of country 1200 miles in length—extending from the mouth of the Missouri river to the city of New Orleans. [illegible]
Admission 50 cents; children half price. To commence at 7 o'clock, precisely.
Exhibited every Saturday and Wednesday afternoon, at 3 o'clock. Jan. [illegible]

NEW BOOKS.

THE Water Cure Manual, embracing an account of Vincent Priessnitz and his Discoveries; Description of the Modes of using Water in the Cure and Prevention of Disease, and the Remedial and Hygienic influences of Air, Occupation, Clothing, Diet, &c. Illustrated with Cases of Cure. By Joel Shew, M. D., Practitioner of Water Cure.
The above Work contains a more full account of the water treatment than has been given in any other book.
Also, Christian Non-Resistance, in all its important bearings, Illustrated and Defended. By Adin Ballou. Sermons of Rev. Theodore Parker; Parker's late Works, &c.
February 26.

DENTAL SURGERY.

THE subscriber would inform Ladies and Gentlemen who need Dental Operations, that they may have teeth filled in the best manner with pure Gold Foil, (manufactured by Ball of Philadelphia,) for the moderate charge of five shillings for each cavity in most cases, and Gold Plate with Mineral or Porcelain Teeth for prices within the reach of all [illegible] good stock and faithful work; and after sufficient time has elapsed to test the work, should the same prove unsatisfactory, all the money paid will be returned. [illegible] permission to refer to ladies and gentlemen of this city, for whom all kinds of dental operations have been performed [illegible] several years' experience in the business, having been employed in the Dental Establishment of Dr. N. C. Keep, and in that of Dr. Kimball, and having made all the Dental Plate Work in that of Dr. H. [illegible] two and a half years; and also the entire direction and making of two specimens of Dental Plate Work exhibited by Dr. Hitchcock at the Mechanic's Exchange, and subsequently sent by him to the Emperor of Russia and the Sultan of Turkey, and one exhibited by Dr. H. at the late exhibition of the Massachusetts Charitable Mechanic Association at Quincy Hall, which received a premium.
J. GUNN, Surgeon Dentist,
115 Court st., corner of Sudbury st., Boston.

The reader will perceive, by turning to J. Gunn's advertisement, that he is the first Dentist in the country who has advertised to return, unconditionally, the payment for Dental Plate Work, where entire satisfaction is not given. This we consider to be of eminent advantage to the public, and the best evidence that he is in possession of real improvements in that complicated branch of the art. [illegible] having quite a large number of persons in this city who have paid no small sums for Artificial Plates of Teeth which, after a few weeks, were found to be unserviceable.—*Transcript.*

HITCHCOCK & HOLT,
DENTISTS,
Corner of Court and Stoddard-streets, Boston.

DR HITCHCOCK has resumed his profession at his Old Establishment, where he may always be found, and is now associated with Dr. Holt, who is so favorably known as an excellent operator [illegible] During the absence of Dr. H. [illegible] In addition to his tour to Europe, and the extensive practice [illegible] in stating that, with the aid of his associate, his dental establishment is not to be surpassed by any in Europe or America [illegible] Feb. [illegible]

ROBERT MORRIS, JR.
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
BRAZER'S BUILDING, STATE ST.,
BOSTON.

Abdominal Supporters.
NEW-ENGLAND
TRUSS MANUFACTORY.
JAMES FREDERICK FOSTER

CONTINUES to manufacture all the various approved TRUSSES at his old stand, No. 304 Washington street, opposite No. 264, entrance to Temple Avenue, Boston, where he has been for the last ten years—and his residence and business being both in the same building, he can be seen at home nearly the whole of the time, day or evening. He has more room and better conveniences for the business than any other person engaged in it in this city.

ALSO—Abdominal Supporters, for Prolapsus Uteri; Trusses for Prolapsus Uni; Suspensory Bags, Knee Caps, Back Boards, Steeled Shoes for deformed feet; Trusses repaired at one hour's notice, and often times made to answer as well as new. The subscriber having worn a Truss himself for the last twenty five years, and fitted so many for the last ten years, feels confident in being able to suit all cases that may come to him.

[illegible] Trusses, Dr. Chase's Trusses, [illegible] Read's Spiral Truss; Rundell's do; Salmon's Ball and Socket; Sherman's [illegible] patent French do; Bateman's do, [illegible] Stone's Trusses; Also, Trusses for Children, of all sizes. Marsh's Truss; [illegible] and the Shaker's Rocking Trusses, may be had at this establishment. Whispering Tubes and Ear Trumpets, [illegible]
All Ladies in want of Abdominal Supporters or Trusses, waited on by his wife, Mrs. CAROLINE D. FOSTER, who has had ten years' experience in the business.

CERTIFICATES.

From Dr. John C. Warren, of Boston.
Having had occasion to observe that some persons afflicted with Hernia, have suffered much from the want of skilful workmen in accommodating Trusses to the peculiarities of their cases, I have taken pains to inform myself of the competency of Mr. J. F. Foster to supply the deficiency occasioned by the death of Mr. Beath. After some months of observation of his work, I am satisfied that Mr. Foster is well acquainted with the manufacture of these instruments, and ingenious in accommodating them to the different cases which occur. I feel myself called upon to recommend him to my professional brethren, and to the public, as a person well fitted to [illegible] these important articles.
JOHN C. WARREN, M. D.

From Dr. Robbins, Roxbury.
Since the death of Mr. John Beath, I have used, in preference to all other Trusses, those made by Mr. J. F. Foster of Boston.
P. G. ROBBINS, M. D.

From Dr. Green, of Boston.
I have sent many persons to be fitted [illegible] and Abdominal Supporters, by James F. Foster, and he has uniformly given full satisfaction in their application.
The benefit of such instruments is often lost in consequence of their imperfect construction [illegible]
H. B. C. GREENE, M. D.
Boston, April [illegible]

The undersigned is familiar with the ability of J. F. Foster, to manufacture Trusses [illegible] invalids, and fully believes that [illegible] work will favorably compare with that of [illegible]
J. V. C. SMITH,
Editor of the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal.

AGENTS FOR THE LIBERATOR.
NEW-HAMPSHIRE.—Leonard Chase, Milford.
VERMONT.—Rowland T. Robinson, North Ferrisburg.
MASSACHUSETTS.—[illegible] Elias Richards, Weymouth;—[illegible] Northampton;—John Levy, [illegible] Adams, Fall River;—[illegible]
RHODE-ISLAND.—William Adams, Pawtucket;—[illegible]
NEW-YORK.—S. H. Gay, New-York City;—[illegible] C. Fuller, Skaneateles;—[illegible] terloo;—John H. Parker, Peru;—[illegible]
PENNSYLVANIA.—M. M. Williamson, [illegible] James Fulton, Jr. McWilliamstown;—[illegible] John Cox, Homorton;—JOSEPH FULTON, [illegible] phia;—[illegible]
OHIO.—Lot Holmes, Columbiana.