THE LIBERATOR.

VOL. VI. OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD—OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND. NO. 41.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.] [SATURDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1836.

THE LIBERATOR

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT

NO. 48, WASHINGTON-STREET, BY

ISAAC KNAPP.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

TERMS.

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

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

SLAVERY.

THE SLAVE CASE—MR. LORING'S ARGUMENT.

(Concluded from our paper of Sept. 24.)

Slavery then is contrary to good morals;—a violation of the law of nature, and of the revealed will of God. It therefore falls within the first exception to the exercise of national comity.

2. But it is also within the second exception. It contravenes our policy. If the slave system of Louisiana is to be introduced here, in the most limited extent, it will be an entire novelty among us. Massachusetts has known nothing like it. The slavery that was abolished here nearly sixty years since, resembled little more than in name, the hard bondage of the South. In the Massachusetts Colony, as early as 1641, 'it is ordered by the Court and the authority thereof, that there shall never be any bond-slavery, villenage, or captivity among us, unless it be [such] lawful captives taken in war, as willingly sell themselves, or are sold to us; and such shall have the *liberties and christian usage*, which the law of God, established in Israel concerning such persons, doth morally require.'(1) This law was not a dead letter. Chief Justice Parsons says, (2) 'If the master was guilty of a cruel or unreasonable castigation of his slave, he was liable to be punished for a breach of the peace, and I believe the slave was allowed to demand sureties of the peace, against a violent and barbarous master. Under these regulations, the treatment of slaves was in general mild and humane, and they suffered hardships not greater than hired servants.'

Throughout New England, it is believed that Slavery 'was very far from being of the absolute, rigid kind. The master was as liable to be sued by the slave, in an action for beating or wounding, or for immoderate chastisement, as he would be, if he had thus treated an apprentice. A slave was capable of holding property, in character of devisee or legatee. If the master should take away such property, his slave would be entitled to an action against him, by his *prochein ami*. Slaves had the same right of life and property, as apprentices; and the difference between them was this: an apprentice is a servant for time, and the slave is a servant for life.'(3)

If the slavery of Massachusetts differed only in its duration from apprenticeship, it follows, that the subject of it could not have been removed without his consent, out of the Commonwealth,(4) as the respondent claims should be done with the subject of the present suit. Negro slavery in this state was far milder than the ancient English villenage (5)—But even the villein could not be carried out of England.(6)

The Declaration of Independence, though not having the force of law, must be considered as the expression of our fundamental policy. It was our initiatory act as a nation, dictated by 'a decent respect to the opinions of mankind;' a manifesto in which we set forth to the world the self-evident principles, which were to form the basis of our rising institutions.

Our own Declaration of Rights, and the judicial decisions founded on it, are indicatory of the same policy. The course taken by Massachusetts on the Missouri question, points in the same direction. To adopt the expressive language of the resolutions on slavery, adopted at a recent meeting of citizens in our Faneuil Hall, 'Our laws do not authorize it—our principles revolt against it—our citizens will not tolerate its existence among them.'

3. Slavery falls within the third exception to the rule of national comity. It violates our public law. The law of this Commonwealth, on slavery, from the adoption of the Constitution of Massachusetts to the ratification of the Federal Constitution, was, to all intents and purposes, the same with the law of England. It had been settled in Sommersett's case,(7) in 1772, that the common law abhors, and will not endure the existence of slavery on English soil. This was an unbending principle. We have seen its application, when enlarged to the British Colonial possessions, in the case of the American slaves forced into Bermuda, and there discharged on *habeas corpus*. This was no unadvised act of the local authorities. It was sett ed law. 'In consequence of this decision [in Sommersett's case] says Mr. Christian, 'of a ship loaden with slaves was *obliged* to put into an English harbor, all the slaves on board might and ought to be set at liberty.'(8) In Forbes vs. Cochrane (9) a similar doctrine was held.

Now I ask the court to look at the language of our Declaration of Rights, and say whether Sommersett's case *could* have settled a broader principle for England, than our State constitution establishes for us. When that instrument declares, that 'all men are born free, and that freedom is 'unalienable,' it covers the whole ground. It was followed by judicial decisions, applying its principles to the case of Massachusetts slavery.

'Slavery was introduced into this country,' says Parsons, C. J., 'soon after its first settlement, and was tolerated *until* the ratification of the present constitution,—,but at the first action which came before the court after the establishment of the Constitution, the judges declared, that by virtue of the Declaration of Rights, slavery in this state was no more.'(1)

Again, all the component parts of slavery are forbidden by our law. If the parts are forbidden, is not that a prohibition of the whole? Slavery is a collection of abuses—of various invasions of personal rights. If our law will not permit a man to beat his neighbor, to kidnap or sell him into exile, to forbid his marriage, to rob him of his children, to deprive him of education, to plunder him of his earnings, shall we be told that it will allow a system which is an aggregate of all these offences? No parts of this system could be tolerated, but by positive law. Are we to introduce the whole through comity?

4.—A fourth exception to the admission of foreign laws by comity has been stated to be, where they would set before our citizens a pernicious and detestable example. It is indeed asserted, on the other side, that slavery will not present a bad or dangerous example here, for the sentiment of our state is so strongly against it, that we have nothing to apprehend from its influence. It is a sufficient answer to this, that whatever is in itself bad and capable of imitation, must be, if tolerated among us, of bad example. It is no satisfactory reply to say, that the constitution forbids the holding of slaves in this state. The constitution is only the expression of public sentiment, and may be altered, if that sentiment could change. Jefferson has particularly noticed the pernicious influence of the example presented by slavery—

'The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on one part and degrading submission on the other. Our children see this, and learn to imitate it. The parent storms, the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives loose to the worst of passions, and thus nursed, educated, and exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities.'(2)

If, then, the influence of slavery is bad, it is not enough to say that that influence will be small here. I know not that it would be small in fact. At the time of Sommersett's case, when, I suppose, there were not one fourth as many slaves in the British West Indies, as there now are in the United States, and when the communication between the different parts of those islands and Great Britain was ten-fold more difficult than it now is between the different parts of this country, Lord Mansfield said there were 15,000 slaves living in England, brought there by their masters, on the strength of an opinion, given a few years before by two eminent lawyers, that they might be still held in England, and carried back as slaves.(3) Here is a somewhat appalling statement. After all, however, this is not a question of degree, but of kind. If as a powerful example, it would be bad, as a weaker example it is bad still. Be it great or small, it is a part of our rights as freemen, to be neither pained nor corrupted by the presence of slavery.

I trust it has been made to appear that independently of the Constitution of the United States, slavery is opposed to the morals and policy of Massachusetts, too diametrically to admit the exercise of the comity claimed. I now hope to show, that nothing contained in that instrument can affect the present question.

What, then, is the operation of the constitution of the U. S. on the subject of slavery in Massachusetts?

It has been argued, that, as the constitution of the United States recognizes slavery—in acceding to the constitution, we are estopped from denying its morality or policy. Estoppels are not favored in law,—and the doctrine set up savors of the most ultra school of liberal construction. How is it that the constitution recognizes slavery? In the first place, simply as a matter of fact; and, in the next place, by conferring certain rights, and prescribing certain duties, growing out of the existence of slavery. We have agreed to recognize slaves as a basis for direct taxation and representation,—and to give them up, when they abscond into the free states,—and here we stop. How am I to deduce from this, the right claimed for the citizens of other states, to force their slaves upon us? The ground on which the recognition of slavery was admitted by Massachusetts into the constitution, was no change of sentiment on the subject of slavery. It was a compromise, for the sake of peace. It was only a recognition *pro tanto*; and so far as we have agreed to recognize it, we do so,—that is, within certain limits, and in a particular way. The position that, having recognized it to a limited extent, we are bound not to object to its being carried to a greater extent, is not a new one. It was a leading argument at the time of the Missouri question, that, having admitted the principle of slavery in the constitution, we could not object to its extension into new states. But this ground was rejected by the north, and no where more decisively than in Massachusetts. More recently, it has been asserted, that the recognition of slavery in the national compact, renders it unlawful for individuals, in the free states, to discuss its evils or their remedy. These loose suggestions argue a very superficial acquaintance with the constitution. I will not urge again, the general considerations by which I have shewn that the terms of the constitution are the measure of the surrender made by the parties to it, of their peculiar principles or rights. It is sufficient to say, that an amendment to the constitution inserted with jealous care, provides that 'The powers not delegated to the U. States by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.'

To apply this rule to the case before us. Independently of the case of fugitive slaves, no power is delegated to the United States, by the constitution, to regulate the relation of master and slave within the several states,—nor is the power to regulate or annul that relation prohibited by the constitution to the states respectively. Each state is sovereign in regard to it, and Massachusetts only owes to Louisiana (it being a case not provided for in the constitution,) the same consideration that would be due to Spain, or any other friendly power.

The second section of the fourth article of the constitution of the United States, which enacts that 'no person held to labor or service, in one state, under the laws thereof, *escaping* into another, shall, in consequence of any law therein, be discharged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered up, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due,' has received a judicial construction in two cases decided in Pennsylvania. In Butler vs. Hopper (1) Judge Washington decided, that this clause did not extend to the case of a slave *voluntarily* carried by his master into another state, and there leaving him, under the protection of some law declaring him free. The same point—namely, that the constitutional provision, respecting persons *escaping* from labor, is to be strictly construed, was again decided by the same Judge, *Ex parte Simmons*.(2)

A third case may be adduced, decided Feb. 20, 1836, by Judge Barnes, more recently President of the District Court for the city and county of Philadelphia, upon the following facts.(3) Marshall Green, a black man, was claimed as a slave, by Peter Buchell of Maryland. About four years previous to the hearing before Judge Barnes, Marshall absconded from his master's residence, and continued there till August, 1835, when he was arrested by Buchell, his master, and carried back to Maryland. At the time when he absconded, he took with him his three children, who were alleged also to be slaves. After Marshall's return to Maryland, Buchell, in order to obtain possession of these children, gave him permission, and for that purpose furnished him with a pass, to come into Pennsylvania, upon his express promise, that he would, within a certain period, if successful in the pursuit of his children, bring them to his master,—if not successful, he would return himself. The time of absence granted by the master, having expired, Marshall was again arrested. Judge Barnes refused the certificate applied for by the master, on the ground that the act of Congress, founded on the constitutional provision, did not embrace a case like that before him—inasmuch as Marshall was not a *fugitive* slave, had not *escaped* from one state into another,—but by his master's consent had left Maryland, and come into Pennsylvania.

If, then, this provision of the constitution cannot be made to cover the present claim, it has necessarily a strong bearing against it. It is a sound maxim of construction, that *Expressum facit cessare tacitum*. In Lunsford v. Coquillon,(4) the Supreme Court of Louisiana say,—

'The right of a state to pass laws, dissolving the relation of master and servant, is recognized in the constitution of the U.S. by a very forcible implication. This instrument declares, that no person held to service or labor in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor. Hence the implication is strong, that such persons who do not *escape*, but whose owners voluntarily bring, may be discharged by the laws or regulations of the state, in which they are so brought. For if this could not be, to what use would be the prohibition?'

A similar remark may be made, respecting the statutory provisions of the states, cited by the opposing counsel. I take as an example, the statute of New York. It pronounces all persons in that state to be free, with certain exceptions, among which is that of slaves attending their masters, on a visit of less than six months. It is obvious that the framers of that law supposed the special exemption was *necessary*, to prevent the local law of freedom from entirely annulling the law of the foreign domicil.

No man is more settled than I am in the conviction, that the court must administer justice according to law. Be the constitution what it may, *here* we are to abide by it. It is indeed my opinion, that the northern states, in their concessions to slavery contained in that instrument, particularly in pledging themselves to *active* measures, for restoring runaway slaves, were guilty of a compromise of long avowed principles,(5) a barter of conscience, a violation of the *express law of God*, which commands, 'Thou shalt not deliver unto his master, the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee; where it liketh him best. Thou shalt not oppress him.'(1) Still, were this like the case of a fugitive slave, where, as I conceive, the laws of God and the laws of man conflict, I should *not* stand here before a legal tribunal, and urge the court to disregard or annul the human law. I only claim, that when, as in the present case, we get beyond the sphere of the human enactment, the court are free there to look to the will of God ('the perfect law of liberty') alone. In this sense, and to this extent, 'christianity is part of the common law.—But my learned brother is not satisfied with having the human law paramount, within its own limits. He claims that whatever be the view which good morals or religion take of slavery, the laws of man having introduced it to a certain extent, there would be great *inconsistency* in stopping there; or in even professing any more conscientious scruples on the subject. He argues that, as one of this court might be called on to give a certificate for the removal of a fugitive slave to-morrow, there would be gross inconsistency in deciding that the voluntary introduction of slavery into Massachusetts would be immoral and impolitic to-day.

I can scarcely believe, that the learned counsel can seriously argue that the State of Massachusetts, having become a party to a compact, under which certain rights are secured to slave masters, she is to be presumed to have abandoned her long cherished views of the character and tendency of slavery; or her policy of excluding it from her soil. Nothing in her history or public acts gives the least countenance to such a theory. We all know, perfectly well, that Massachusetts did not agree to restore fugitive slaves, because she had changed her mind as to slavery, but because she feared anarchy and divisions,—and the constitution, such as it was, was the best bargain she could make. We do not restore these unhappy beings now, because it is right so to do, but because, right or wrong, we have agreed to it. Suppose, then, we admit, for a moment, the gentleman's charge of inconsistency, and what follows?—why, nothing, but be thankful that the merit of inconsistency is still left for us. To be thoroughly consistent in wrong, would be truly a 'bad eminence.'

But, I have no belief that the court will admit, that a decision in favor of the petitioner would involve any inconsistency whatever. I will borrow the language of the learned counsel for the respondent, in speaking of the 'morality' of slavery, and say of 'consistency,' that it is to be measured, in a court of law, by a legal standard alone. And I shall now attempt to show, that the European law of slavery proceeds entirely on the ground, which has been charged as inconsistent;—and moreover, that courts of the highest authority in the free States of our country, and Jurists of the highest eminence, have not felt themselves bound, by the obligations contained in the constitution, from deciding against the comity, which seeks to introduce slavery into those states.

In the case of Sommersett, the leading English case, it was decided that 'slavery is of such a nature that it is incapable of being introduced on any reasons moral or political,—but only by positive law. It is so odious that nothing can be suffered to support it but positive law.'(2) It is thus conceded by Lord Mansfield, that the same institution which was then sustained, and even encouraged, by the British Government in the colonies, where it was supported by the customary law, might be declared by the courts to be too odious and immoral to be allowed a footing on English ground. A necessary position of Mr. Hargrave, in his masterly argument for the slave Sommersett, is that slavery is, in the contemplation of law, a purely local institution; and that, as such, its being tolerated by law, in one part of the British dominions, did not prevent the court from deciding on its immorality and impolicy at home.—And this view was certainly confirmed by the court. I have already said, that this has been long a rule of law of the principal states in Europe. It may be stated as I have done, that slavery is a merely local institution—or, more plainly, that the law of all Europe is, that slaves in the colonies are *property*—in the parent country they are *men*,—and all the legislation and judicial decisions of those countries, on the subject of slaves, proceed on that ground. On this account, Lord Mansfield says,(3) there is no difficulty in giving effect in England, to a contract for the sale of a slave in the W. I.—but, where the person of the slave is in England, and becomes the subject in controversy, that is a widely different case. If this distinction be clearly kept in view, coupled with the principle, that no civilized nation will sanction an aggression upon the legal rights of the citizens of other friendly States, within their own limits, we shall find no great difficulty in reconciling the admiralty and other cases, cited by the respondent's counsel, with the points for which we contend.

The case of Forbes vs. Cochrane, before cited, is very full to this point. Holroyd, J. remarks, 'according to the principles of the English law, such a right cannot be considered as warranted, by the general law of nature. I do not mean to say, that particular circumstances may not introduce a legal relation to that extent; but assuming that there may be such a relation, *it can only have a local existence*, where it is tolerated by the particular law of the place. The law of slavery is a law *in invitum*; and when a party gets out of the territory where it prevails, and out of the power of his master, and gets under the protection of another power, without any wrongful act done by the party giving that protection, the right of the master, which is *founded on the municipal law of the particular place only*, does not continue.'

Best, J. said, 'slavery is a *local law*, and therefore if a man wishes to preserve his slaves, let him attach them to him by affection, or make fast the bars of their prison, or rivet well their chains, for the instant they get beyond the limits, where slavery is recognized by the local law, they have broken their chains, they have escaped from their prison, and are free. The plaintiff does not found his action upon any violation of the *English* laws, but he relies upon the comity of nations. I am of opinion, however, that he cannot maintain any action in this country, by the comity of nations. *Although the English law has recognized slavery, it has done so within certain limits only.*—Whatever service he (the slave) owed by the local law, is got rid of, the moment he got out of the local limits.'

In the case of Knight v. Wedderburn, (1) tried in Scotland, before the Court of Session, Jan. 15, 1778, it was argued for Mr. Wedderburn, in support of his claim to the services of Knight, a Jamaica slave, whom he had brought with him to Scotland, that Knight was still a slave. 'A right of property,' said the counsel, 'will be sustained in every country, where the subject of it may come. The *Status* of persons attend them wherever they go The law of the colonies is not to be considered unjust, in authorizing this condition of slavery. *The statutes which encourage the African trade, show that the Legislature do not look on it in that light.*'

'The *Court* were of opinion, that the dominion assumed over this negro, *under the law of Jamaica, being unjust*, could not be supported *in this country*, to any extent.'

We have seen in the case of Forbes v. Cochrane, that the British courts will not respect the claims of Spanish slave-masters, when their slaves get out of Spanish territory. And yet Great Britain has recognized, in a great number of treaties and other public acts, the right of Spain to hold slaves. In the treaty of Utrecht, in 1735, there is an express stipulation that 4800 slaves should be annually supplied to the Spaniards. But not to rely on this, very recent conventions recognize the right of Spain to prosecute the slave trade, south of the line. Yet Great Britain finds no inconsistency between these acts, and her laws denominating the slave trade a crying enormity. I do not mean to deny, that the policy of foreign governments and of our own, does in my own private judgment, involve inconsistency.

'Earth is sick,
And Heaven is weary of the hollow words
Which kings and statesmen utter, when they talk
Of justice.'

The prohibition of the foreign slave trade by our own government, at the same time that we tolerate the domestic slave trade, is grossly inconsistent. Still in legal contemplation, it is otherwise,—and this is sufficient for our present purpose. The States of Europe have seen the evils of slavery too clearly, to allow it a foothold at home, while mistaken views of colonial policy have caused them to vie with each other, in encouraging it abroad.

I now refer to a few American cases, to show that we have adopted in this country a policy analogous to that of England,—by recognizing slavery as a local or partially acknowledged institution only. Our law is that slaves are *property* within certain limits, namely, (representation excepted) while they remain under the local law of slavery, or when they appear elsewhere in the character of fugitives. They are, on the other hand, *men* where representation in Congress is concerned, or whenever they come rightfully within the limits of the local law of freedom.

I refer the court again to the case *Ex parte Simmons*, decided by Judge Washington, himself a slaveholder. In that case, the claimant of the slave, who had been a resident of South Carolina, and still had a house and plantation there, came to Philadelphia with his slave, hired a house and occupied it for about ten months. The law of Pennsylvania authorizes sojourners, who shall not remain within that State more than six months, to retain control over the slaves whom they bring with them. It was determined by the Judge that, as the claimant did not bring himself within the exception of the statute, the slave was free. I submit to the Court, that in this commonwealth, a slave master can have no greater rights on his first arrival here with his slave, than he has in Pennsylvania after remaining there six months. The call on us for comity, in the case now before the court, is not more imperative than it was in Pennsylvania in the cases cited. In both cases alike, the claim is that the provisions of the positive law of the country should be enlarged, out of comity to a foreigner. The Pennsylvania case goes clearly on the ground that the provisions of the constitution of the U. S. create no obligations on the States, except by their express terms, and according to their plain and direct import.

In Commonwealth vs. Holloway (2), it was held that the law of a slave state that 'a child follows the condition of its mother,' *partus sequitur ventrem*, could not be adopted by comity, in Pennsylvania, in the case of the child of a slave who had absconded from another state, before she became pregnant. I refer also to Butler v. Hopper, before cited.

In the case of Saul vs. His Creditors, (3) the Supreme Court of Louisiana uses the following language:

'Take another case. By the laws of this country, Slavery is permitted, and the rights of the master can be enforced. Suppose the individual subject to it, is carried to England or Massachusetts; would their courts sustain the argument, that his state or condition was fixed by the laws of his domicil of origin? *We know they would not.*'

The case of Francisco (4) came before the present Chief Justice of this Court, on *habeas corpus*. In

(1) General Laws and Liberties of Massachusetts Bay, Chap. 12 § 2.
(2) Winchendon *v.* Hatfield 4 Mass. Rep. 127.
(3) Reeve Dom. Rel. 340—2 Dane Abr. 313.
The master had no control over the religion of the slave.—Ibid.
(4) Reeve, 340.
(5) 2 Dane Abr. 313.
(6) 20 Howell State Trials, 66.
(7) 20 Howell, State Trials, 79.
(8) Bl. Com. 425 in Not. Ed. 1792.
(9) 2 B. & Crew. 448.

(1) 4 Mass. Rep. 127.
(2) Notes on Virginia.
(3) The London newspapers of that day were defiled by the notices of the sale of negroes; advertisements for runaway slaves, &c. See Clarkson's history of the abolition of the slave trade.

(1) 1 Wash. C. C. Rep. 501.
(2) 4 Wash. C. C. R. 396.
(3) Stroud's Slave Laws 167.
(4) Mart. Rep. 465.
(5) 'Many sacrifices of opinion and feeling.'—Story, 3 Comm. on Const. 677

(1) 23 Deut. 15, 16.
(2) 20 Howell State Trials, 82.
(3) 20 Howell St. Tr. 79.

(1) 30 How. St. Tr. 3, note.
(2) 4 Geng. & H. 305.
(3) 17 Mart. Rep. 580.
(4) 9 Amer. Jurist 490.

that case, Mrs. Howard, a resident in the Island of Cuba, and the supposed owner of the boy Francisco, by her return to the writ, expressly disclaimed holding him as a slave. The boy, on being examined by the Judge privately, expressed his desire to go with Mrs. Howard. The Chief Justice decided that the boy might do as he chose,—saying in his opinion, 'If Mrs. Howard, in her return to the writ, had claimed the boy as a slave, I should have ordered him to be discharged from her custody. The boy, *by the law of Massachusetts*, is in fact, free.'

The author of 'The Conflict of Laws' touches on this very point. Referring to Sommersett's case, he says, 'As soon as a slave lands in England, he becomes, *ipso facto*, a freeman, and discharged from the state of servitude. Independent of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, for the protection of the rights of masters in respect to domestic fugitive slaves, there is no doubt that the same principle pervades the common law of the non-slaveholding States in America.' (1)

A case decided in Indiana, by Judge Morris, and reported in the Jurist, has been cited by the counsel for the respondent, as having a bearing adverse to the petitioner's claim. The decisions in the Indiana Courts are rarely referred to here. And I may add, without intentional disrespect, that I have been unable to ascertain who Judge Morris is. The case there was decided, as appears, in favor of the freedom of the slaves. The remarks of the Judge, relied on by my learned brother, were not called for by the circumstances of the case, and may be considered extra-judicial. The opinion appears to involve evident mistakes of law. For example, the Judge declares, that where a citizen of a slave State is travelling upon business or pleasure attended by his slave, 'an escape from the attendance upon the person of his master, while on a journey through a free State, *should be considered as an escape from the State*, where the master had a right of citizenship, and by the laws of which the service of the slave was due.' I need not say how entirely this mode of enlarging by construction the scope of the constitutional provisions respecting fugitives, militates with settled law. Indeed it does not seem very consistent with other portions of the Judge's own reasoning.

This loose way of construing the Constitution has not met much favor in the Northern States. The constitution provides, that 'a person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice, and be found in another State, shall, on demand of the executive authority of *the State from which he fled*, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime.' A grand jury in Alabama, about a year since, indicted R. G. Williams, a citizen of New-York, for having published, in a newspaper called 'the Emancipator,' the following 'insurrectionary' words: 'God commands, and all nature cries out, that man should not be held as property. The system of making men property, has plunged 2,250,000 of our fellow countrymen into the deepest physical and moral degradation, and they are every moment sinking deeper.' The Executive of Alabama demanded the delivery of Williams, to answer to this charge in Alabama;—but it being notorious that he had never been in that State, and could not therefore have 'fled' from it, the Governor of New York, after consulting with his law advisers, very properly refused the application. The Governor's opinion maintains very ably, that the provision of the constitution is to be construed strictly.

The claim set up by the slave master in the Indiana case, is readily distinguished from the present. The master only claimed there the right to pass with his slaves, from one slave State to another, through a free State;—a mere transit, not, as here, a needless residence. It is possible that comity may depend in some degree on locality. The geographical position of Indiana, lying between Kentucky and Missouri, may be thought to present some apparent necessity for relaxing in certain cases, the domestic rule against slavery. No such necessity exists here, and considerations of convenience, as well as of law, urge us to adhere to our ancient policy.

The comity asked in the present case is not toward a mere *transitus*, but is to be extended to a temporary residence. Now these are widely different questions. A transit is a thing well understood and easily determined. What is temporary residence, is a far more difficult enquiry. The doctrine of 'domicil;' questions of the *quo animo*, or intention, these conduct to dubious and intricate ground. How long may the temporary residence continue? Recollect we have no legislative limitation, as in New York and Pennsylvania. Why may not citizens of the slave States remain here with their slaves ten years as well as ten months, if the *animus revertendi* be preserved? What security have we that the fields of Massachusetts may not be tilled by slaves?

It is stated in Sommersett's case, that there were then fifteen thousand slaves in England. Lord Mansfield estimates the apprehended loss to their masters, at 700,000*l*. sterling, and expresses great solicitude as to the consequences of 'setting them loose.' There are not probably twenty persons held as slaves in Massachusetts, to be affected by your decision.

If slavery is introduced at all, in the case of sojourners, why should we not introduce it, as it exists in the Southern States? The learned counsel has indeed most prudently restricted the master's claim. But why should he do so? Has he not said that the personal capacity or incapacity of foreigners as between themselves attends them here,—and sticks like the shadow—'*sicut umbra sequitur*'? Besides, in avowing that he claims to carry this child back into slavery, he admits the intention of doing her a far greater injury than mere beating. If she is to be robbed of her liberty, all other losses are in comparison, but trifling. And such is the view taken by our law. Kidnapping, or imprisoning with intent to kidnap, is one of the highest crimes. The greatest cruelty of all is contemplated here, namely, the removal of the child to a place where slavery, with its usual features, will again attach upon her.

The force of Lord Mansfield's remark cited by the respondent's counsel, is certainly unimpaired by the criticism we have listened to. 'The difficulty of adopting the relation, without adopting it in all its consequences, is indeed extreme.' (2) The learned counsel has limited the slave-master's claim to the utmost, —yet let us see what it still includes. It must include the right absolutely to direct the slave's locomotion,—here is one incident of slavery; to confine his person,—there is another; to exact his labor without wages, (for the case must find that he comes as 'a personal attendant,')—this is a third; to compel submission here, by any degree of personal violence that may be found necessary, and to force him out of Massachusetts, if persuasion should fail, by the cogent aid of the whip or the fetter. Are not these the hateful features of slavery? If the slave should marry while here, he must, of course, be separated from the wife. Here is the old, familiar process of the slave-trader. No,—all the learned counsel's ingenuity could not shew an English or a Massachusetts Court, how to adopt the relation without adopting its most abhorrent consequences. And the reason of this is obvious.— Slavery is an abuse. It is not a thing to be reformed or regulated. Take away its incidents of oppression and baseness, and it is all gone. So far as it exists at all, it exists for evil. We have been told that no practical evil is found to occur in New York or Pennsylvania, from allowing a temporary existence to slavery in the case of sojourners. Having no evidence before us on this point, we can only form an *a priori* judgment. I do not doubt that great, that irreparable evil occurs wherever slavery is tolerated, be it for a century or for a day,—and I conceive this to be the doctrine of Massachusetts. We hear no complaints, it is said, from those States. True; neither do we hear any complaints against slavery, from Georgia or Louisiana. Evil may be their good. Supposed pecuniary advantages may with them outweigh moral ones. I judge them not. It is enough to say that, as a sovereign State, Massachusetts does not borrow her views of slavery from States that may deem it right, or pleasant, or profitable to allow it.

The condition of a Louisiana slave, held as such in Massachusetts, is anomalous. We have no common law to regulate it. My learned brother has laid down the principle, that it will be the province of the judicial tribunals, and not of the Legislature, to do this. What then are to be the rights and duties of this very peculiar member of our society? Can he make a contract? Will you give effect to his marriage? Or shall it be void, and his children illegitimate? Are the children of the slave mother born here to be also slaves? Or will their father, if he should be a free citizen of Massachusetts, be entitled to his own children? If the slave see a crime committed by his master, shall he be admitted as a witness? Alas for the slave, if he testify against his master. The exclusion of slave testimony is an indispensable part of the institution of slavery. If a slave in Massachusetts is slandered, has he a remedy? Is his character his own? If he is assaulted by a stranger, has he his action as a *person*, or is it with the master, as for an injury to *property*? Shall there be any protection for the slave against his master? May the master be bound to keep the peace towards him? Probably not; for in the case of an adult, the utmost violence might be necessary to compel submission. There can be no divorce between such parties, for cruelty;—no cancelation of indentures, for abuse of authority. A slave has no civil rights. Even to maim or murder him, is only an offence against Government: and is punished on the same principle that we forbid cruelty to brutes, —not for their sakes, but for our own. If the slave refuse to leave the State, how shall he be compelled? Will you justify an assault and battery upon him?— Suppose he kill his master in self-defence; is his crime murder? How far will this Court go, in giving validity to contracts for the hiring or sale of slaves here? If one stranger sells to another the slave he has brought with him, and does not deliver him, will you sustain *trover* for a human being? Or, sitting as a Court of Equity, will you enforce specific performance of a contract for the sale of a fellow creature, thus making the Supreme Court an instrument in the domestic slave-trade?

These consequences seem indeed revolting, but they are in character with the system to which they belong.

I have thus endeavored to show that the extension of slavery here is unlawful and inexpedient. It is cause for the sincerest gratification, to reflect that this question, important to our whole country, is to be left in the hands of the judiciary of Massachusetts. The eloquent encomium of Sir William Best, on the Courts of his own country, will not be thought inapplicable here, by the friends of freedom, looking, as they will, with anxious hope, to the decision of this tribunal.

'It is matter of pride,' says that eminent judge, 'for me to recollect, that whilst economists and politicians were recommending to the Legislature the protection of this traffic, and senators were framing laws for its promotion, and declaring it a benefit to the country,—the judges of the land, above the age in which they lived, standing upon the high ground of natural right, and disdaining to bend to the lower doctrine of expediency, declared that Slavery was inconsistent with the genius of the English Constitution, and that human beings could not be the subject matter of property. As a lawyer, I speak of that early determination, when a different doctrine was prevailing in the Senate, with a considerable degree of professional pride.' (1)

The generous boast of the English poet haunts the memory of every lover of liberty:

'Slaves cannot breathe in England:—if their lungs
Receive our air, that moment they are free.
They touch our country, and their shackles fall—
That's noble, and bespeaks a nation proud
And jealous of the blessing.—'

This exalted pride cannot be fully ours. We have sold it for a price. The fugitive from slavery is hunted like a felon, through this favored State. Let us stop there. Let not the accursed system thrive among us. If we are to be restrained from attacking the giant trunk,—if we have even consented to let a single bough shoot over among us, to taint our air,— I trust by the blessing of Heaven, we have yet strength and virtue enough to lop its luxuriance.— God forbid that the deadly branches should bend over and strike root, to become in their turn, a parent-stock, growing up in the soil of Massachusetts.

(1) Confl. Laws 92. Observe that the present tense, *pervades*, is used. I understand the author to assert that, with the single exception of the case of fugitives, the English rule is now actually operating here.

(2) 20 How. St. Tr. 79.

(1) Forbes v. Cochrane. 2 Barn. & Cr. 470.

DECISION OF JUDGE SHAW.

As we understand this case, we see nothing to irritate or alarm the South. Nearly all—perhaps all the free States—have laws, which prohibit a slaveholder from carrying his slave into the State, and there retaining it as property. Such laws are not only admissible, but proper and necessary, in States that do not tolerate slavery. If southerners could remove into Indiana, and carry their negroes with them, and hold them under the laws of the United States, as property, by merely professing to be citizens of South Carolina or Georgia, how could the Legislature of Indiana prevent that State from becoming, in time, a slave State? But the constitution or laws of the United States will not justify a southern man in acting thus—and we are therefore unable to perceive why the Supreme Court of Massachusetts has been so bitterly and harshly condemned. If the institution of slavery in the South is too sacred to be discussed, it seems to us there can be no harm in considering the constitution and local laws of the free States too sacred to be openly violated.—*Louisville (Ky.) Adv.*

COMMUNICATIONS.

TO THE FRIENDS OF THE SLAVE.

The time is near at hand when the citizens of Massachusetts will be called upon to exercise their constitutional privilege in an election of the greatest importance. Electors of President, a Governor, members of Congress, and members of the State Legislature, are to be chosen.

Have abolitionists no stake in the results of this election?

The members of Congress who may be chosen, will be called upon to act upon the subject of Slavery in the District of Columbia. Is it not then, all-important that they should be true and impartial friends of Liberty? Will it not be the extreme of folly for abolitionists to give their votes to men known to be thoroughly opposed to their wishes, sending them to Congress with petitions in their pockets, and only anxious to get rid of them as easily as possible? A mockery like this might be kept up until dooms-day, and not a shackle of the captive be loosened by legislation —and the MAN-MARKET at Washington—the SHAMBLES FOR HUMAN FLESH in the capital city of the United States, continue to be, as it now is, the foulest abomination on the soil of Christendom.

A Governor is to be chosen. And are the opinions and practice of this officer of no consequence to abolitionists?

Demands have already been made upon the Governor of a free State, to deliver up a citizen of that State to the authorities of another, as a criminal, for denying the right of holding property in man.

Is there no danger that demands like this, may find favor in the eyes of a Governor of Massachusetts?

Gov. Everett, in his message of last winter, quoted against the abolitionists the opinion of William Sullivan, L. L. D., that their discussion of the subject of slavery was a misdemeanor liable to be prosecuted at common law. ☞ And the same legal authority, thus endorsed for by Gov. Everett, has gravely argued in favor of the right of the Southern States to demand the abolitionists of Massachusetts, and maintained that it would be the duty of our Governor to deliver them up to 'DEATH WITHOUT BENEFIT OF CLERGY,' for the crime of believing with the Bible and the Declaration of Independence, that '*all men are created equal.*'

Does our present Chief Magistrate endorse this opinion also?

Again—Representatives and Senators of the Commonwealth are to be elected.

Last year, an attempt was made in our Legislature to pass censure upon the friends of Free Discussion. It failed indeed—but there was a strong minority in favor of it. As we value Free Discussion, and a Free Press, we must see to it that we send honest friends of constitutional freedom to represent us. Let the question be put to every candidate,

'ARE YOU FOR GAG-LAWS—YEA, OR NAY?'

Let no abolitionist yield himself, body and soul, to the dirty work of party. Let him shake himself free of every thing which shackles his independence in this matter. Responsible to his conscience and his God only, let him remember at the polls, his own rights in jeopardy, and the claims of the oppressed and plundered slave.

MERRIMACK.

AN ADDRESS

To the Free People of Color in New England and other free States in America.

RESPECTED FRIENDS,—You are not generally uninformed of the christian efforts in operation, for the emancipation of the people of color, both in America and other nations—and for the education and improvement of those who are free, but laboring, more or less, under the disadvantages imposed by a deep-rooted and unwarrantable prejudice, and that based originally on the degradation incident to slavery, and subsequently on color, as slaves are generally of that caste.

I do most heartily desire success to those efforts —and that justice may be meted to you. This desire is abroad in the land, as witness the increasing thousands, whose hearts are deeply engaged, and hands at work on your behalf, especially regarding those in bondage.

As you improve in respectability and condition, you not only secure to yourselves many blessings, and among them 'a good name, which is better than great riches,' but you become through this moral character, a powerful auxiliary in breaking the chains of that inveterate bondage, by which millions of our brethren are held in low degradation and extreme wretchedness.— Therefore, dear friends, exert yourselves to improve your minds—seek the Lord and his kingdom—and earnestly embrace every opportunity to attain a useful education. Be industrious—be prudent—be courteous—and careful of your personal appearance; for,

'From the body's purity, the mind
Receives a secret, sympathetic aid'—

and they are congenial to each other. Be of long forbearance; it is an attribute of the gracious Creator. 'Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently in him. Fret not thyself because of him who bringeth wicked devices to pass. Cease from anger, and forsake wrath—fret not thyself in any wise to do evil.' Thus you will become a self-denying people, and learn to place your hope and dependence on Him who is mighty to redeem, and who never said to the wrestling seed of Jacob, 'Seek ye my face,' in vain; and without whose notice, a sparrow falleth not to the ground.

An auspicious day is opening to you. Your friends and christian advocates have greatly multiplied within a very few years;—the signs of the times are in your favor. Centre then, in godly humility of mind, and in thankfulness to Him, who can rule the hearts of men, and order their steps. Improve the day, and the opportunity.

And permit me, my fellow citizens, to suggest to you the propriety of placing your children, as they arrive at suitable ages, in situations where they may become useful, and guarded against the temptations attendant on a life of idleness—where your sons may become respectable mechanics, merchants, physicians and farmers; and your daughters instructed in good housewifery, and in the arts peculiar to the female character;—and where some of both sexes may be educated as teachers of schools, &c. I am apprised, that the opportunities of procuring such situations have been rare; but the scene, in that respect, is changing; and it is greatly to be desired that you, who are parents of chilkren, may not be reluctant in so disposing of them. They will find, in many instances, good encouragement, and kind benefactors. Placing them at good trades, and where they may improve in education, is doing them a great kindness—and may be the means of preserving them from a loss of character, and from pursuing, too exclusively, a sea-faring life, where morality, and the fear of the Lord which preserves from the snares of death, are lamentably low—and where the probability, under present circumstances, of a colored youth rising into respectability, is small indeed.

I must repeat my affectionate desire to call your attention seriously to the subject of placing your children, where their minds and habits may be guarded and improved, if you have not the means within your own families, and where they may learn some useful employment. It is not easy to conceive of a greater act of kindness to a child—and it is putting the child in a way to reciprocate kindness, when, perhaps, the infirmities of age may render parents incapable of providing for themselves.

There are already some notable instances of the advantages of such a course—one of which I cannot well forbear mentioning for your encouragement. Isaac C. Glasgow, a colored gentleman, was put, when a lad to a scythe-maker and blacksmith, a kind man, in Smithfield, R. I. Here he served a faithful apprenticeship—which, he once observed to me, laying his hand upon his breast, had been a great satisfaction to him to the present time. He became an excellent workman—and at the expiration of his apprenticeship, commanded high wages; and being prudent of his earnings, soon found himself in a situation to marry, and to set up business for himself. He purchased a valuable water-privilege in Griswold, Ct., where he has built several houses, and for many years carried on the axe and scythe-making business, &c. extensively—and, of later time, the making of implements for the whale-fishery—has sustained a good moral character wherever known—and is particularly noted for his punctuality in fulfilling his contracts. He lives in good style; has reared up a respectable family of children, his worthy wife taking a conspicuous part in the management of them, and of the household concerns. Two of his daughters, exemplary young women, were scholars at the noted Canterbury school. He is possessed of a handsome property, and his business is still in successful operation. Besides his forges, he has a valuable grist-mill, with two runs of stones—a saw mill, turning-shop, and wheelwright, &c., and employs a number of men and apprentices through the year. And in these arduous employments, no ardent spirits are used. He is now about sixty years of age, enjoys good health, is comely and engaging in his person and manners, and a believer in the christian religion. I have partaken several times of the bounty of his table—have lodged under his roof, where neatness, kindness and hospitality were agreeably combined. Now go ye, dear people, and do likewise with your children; and may the benedictions of heaven rest on you and on them.

ROWLAND GREENE.

PLAINFIELD, CT.

DECISIVE ACTION.

To the Editor of the Liberator:

DEAR SIR,—The church of Christ, the freed men of the Lord, have too long slumbered over the sin of slavery. The church is comparatively awake to the welfare of the heathen, far away; while the death-groans of the slave are but a reposing lullaby.

Many a minister, many young men, and many churches, are sighing over the distant fields of idolatry and superstition, whose hearts have never been touched by the heaven-piercing cry of the benighted and lacerated bondman. God forbid that I should utter a word to suppress the sympathies and liberalities of any toward the heathen. But I hesitate not a moment to say, that that individual, who longs and pants for some distant Burman or Siam station, forgetful and neglectful of the miseries of home, possesses a false zeal. If there is a seed-plat for gospel enterprise under heaven, it is in *Christian* America. If there is a neglected and abused people on the globe, they are to be found in America—the Indian and the slave. The one, thrust *far away* by law; the other, thrust *under foot* by law; the one, cheated and legally robbed of every civil right; the other, stolen, *legally* chained, sold, whipped, and incarcerated in a moral sepulchre. And every effort which conveys any promise of efficiency in relieving the slave from his bondage, is looked upon even by the church with a most suspicious eye. But that is not the worst. There are not a few, even of the professed teachers in Israel, who claim the sanction of the Bible for the inhuman system of slavery. Bad as slavery is, there is something in such a plea, more grossly outrageous to every feeling of a tender heart, than slavery itself.— What! men and brethren! that religion, which is the very breath of mercy; which is the developement of perfect love; which proclaims peace on earth; which reconciles man to man, as well as man to God; this religion affords the sanction of its approval to the vilest form which oppression has ever assumed, and the direst evils which avarice and cruelty combined have ever inflicted! Were an angel to make such a statement, I should know he was a spirit from hell, and unhesitatingly pronounce it a fabrication of 'the father of lies,' and suspect the utterer of being 'transformed into an angel of light,' the better to betray and deceive our souls.

The churches can no longer be innocent in supine indifference. We are christians in name— we must appear so in truth. How selfish are our principles, how distant from the benevolence of Christianity, if we can be at ease when millions of our neighbors are despoiled of every hope of present and future blessedness! O, must the curse of millions rest longer on the churches of the saints?

Dear sir: I am directed by the church of which I am pastor, to send you the Report of their committee on the subject of slavery, which has been presented, and harmoniously accepted; and request for it an insertion in the Liberator. It runs as follows:

'*Dear Brethren and Sisters:* Your Committee, appointed to prepare and present resolutions on the subject of slavery, REPORT: That in our opinion, the spirit of the gospel, as inculcated by our Saviour Jesus Christ, and his Apostles, in no sense inculcates or justifies the enslaving of our fellow beings; but, contrariwise, marks it as a sin of the most flagrant enormity; classing slaveholders in the catalogue of the vilest criminals, and denouncing them with the severest reprobation. Therefore, your committee recommend to consideration and adoption the following Resolutions:

Resolved, That the buying, selling and holding human beings in bondage for the sake of gain, or the giving or bequeathing of slaves to children or others as property, is a vile infraction of the natural, religious and inalienable rights of man.

Resolved, That the great law of Christian kindness, enjoining upon us not to suffer, in any wise, sin to rest on a brother, but to rebuke and restore him in the spirit of meekness, calls upon us not to seal our lips in silence for fear of offending those on whom this crime is chargeable, but affectionately and plainly to admonish and rebuke them.

Resolved, That all ministers and church members who hold human beings in slavery, are, in our opinion, unworthy of a place in the church of Christ; and that we cannot, in justice to our sense of Christian duty and obligation, extend to them the hand of fellowship as *good ministers* and *worthy members*.

Resolved, That while we will ever endeavor to cherish for our brethren who hold property in human flesh, the spirit of love and the spirit of prayer; still, we cannot lawfully or conscientiously communicate with them at the table of our gracious Lord, who died to redeem souls, '*out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;*' in whom '*all the kindreds of the earth are blessed;*' and in whom '*there is neither Jew nor Greek, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free.*'

Resolved, That for church members to endeavor to exclude colored persons from an *equal seat* in the house of God, or at the communion table, *on account of color*, is *sinful*; and ought to be immediately repented of.

Resolved, That it is our bounden duty to make the cause of the oppressed slave, a subject of special request at the Throne of Grace.

All of which is respectfully and prayerfully submitted.

ISAAC SAWYER, JR. Chairman.

SOUTH READING, Sept. 26, 1836.

Editors friendly to human rights are requested, &c.

HANCOCK BAPTIST ASSOCIATION.

ELLSWORTH, Me., Sept. 28, 1836.

To the Editor of the Liberator:

The Hancock Baptist Association of this State, held its second anniversary in Ellsworth, on Wednesday and Thursday, the 7th and 8th inst. Br. James Gillpatrick, D. Nutter and myself were appointed a Committee on the subject of slavery. We presented the following report, which was unanimously adopted:

The Committee on Slavery, in presenting their report, beg leave to state that it would not be proper for them, on this occasion, to say even a small part of what might be said on this important subject. Expressing themselves in concise terms, they would say that—Of all the systems of iniquity that ever cursed the world, in their opinion, the slave system is the most abominable. It is the enslavement of the workmanship—the noblest workmanship of Deity on earth—the debasement of the bodies—the imbrutement of the intellects —and the blotting out of God's image in the souls, of those who are clothed with the deathless attributes of immortality. It is a daring infringement of human rights, and an unblushing violation of all the precepts in the Decalogue. It is, in a word, the master-piece of Satan, involving all that is oppressive in tyranny—shocking in cruelty—base in robbery—degrading in ignorance, and loathsome in licentiousness. And this foul system, existing as it does in all its horrors, in this our Republic, is our nation's crying sin, and a massy bar to the universal spread of religion in our country. Your Committee would, therefore, submit the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, That the only proper remedy for this appalling evil is IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION.

2. Resolved, That while we deprecate all physical interference in relation to this subject, it is our imperious duty as patriots, philanthropists and christians, to exert a strong moral influence, in order to give a speedy practical developement to the principle, stated in the first resolution.

3. Resolved, That, so long as any of our fellow creatures remain in bondage, we will not cease to pray for them, and sympathize with them in their down-trodden and degraded condition.

4. Resolved, That we, as the professed followers of Jesus Christ, have no fellowship or communion with those who, under the character of christians, continue to hold their fellow men in bondage.

J. GILLPATRICK, Chairman.

The following resolutions were passed by the Washington Association, which held its session last week at Steuben.

1. Resolved, That slavery, especially as it exists in this country, like all other sins, is an evil not to be mitigated, but *immediately abandoned*.

2. Resolved, That while this evil exists, it is the imperious duty of all christians most fervently and perseveringly to pray that God would sustain the oppressed, and speedily work out for them a peaceful and entire deliverance.

3. Resolved, That, as christians, we can have no fellowship with those who, after being duly enlightened on this subject, still advocate and practice its abominations, and thus *defile* the church of God.

E. W. GARRISON, Chairman.

I am, dear cousin,
Yours, &c.
E. W. GARRISON.

NEW-HAMPSHIRE ASSOCIATION.

DERRY, N. H. Sept. 21, 1836.

MR. GARRISON:—I attended the meeting of the N. H. Association, a few weeks since, at Exeter; and, although you have probably heard of the general proceedings, still I will mention a few things which occurred, worthy of observation.

The meetings were generally of an interesting nature, as one subject after another was brought forward, and discussed by men of wisdom and virtue. But most of the speakers were careful to introduce no new or exciting subject, lest they should disturb the slumbers of some who, hearing nothing new, thought it a fit time to doze away the dulness and stupidity occasioned by a long ride. Among the number, however,

'One there was above all others,
Who well deserves the name of friend'—

friend to his country, to his fellow creatures, and to his God, who openly asserted, that, among the numerous societies formed to promote the happiness and eternal welfare of the various classes of men, the Anti-Slavery Society with the rest, shared in his affection, patronage and prayers. It was the devoted Mr. Root. At this expression of his views, the looks of some were kindled into benevolence, while others sat and frowned. The drowsy awoke from their slumbers, and gazing, wondered what had happened, that excited so much attention.

During one of the intermissions, as I was walking in the street, my attention was arrested by noticing a little crowd standing in the shade of a small tree. On walking up, I observed in the midst of the crowd, two individuals engaged in earnest conversation. On inquiry, I found one of them was the energetic advocate of liberty, MR. WELD; the other was a slaveholding minister of South Carolina. The subject of debate was, not whether it was wrong to enslave man, created in the image of God,—but whether it was wrong for the north to speak or act against the system of southern slavery. I listened with attention to hear his views, supposing that, as he was a minister of the gospel, he would try at least to give satisfactory reasons, why such interference (as he called it) should not take place. But the only reason which he advanced was this:—'The north has helped to make laws, justifying slavery, and now the north has no business to interfere.' You may easily conceive, that brother Weld would find no difficulty in rendering such a reason ridiculous to all who heard it; and this he did, to the great mortification of the clerical slaveholder.— He could not endure it, and refused to discuss the subject thus publicly; saying, if he must discuss it at all, he would do it privately with Mr. Weld. Thinks I to myself, why does he wish to be private, about a public matter? Alas, unhappy man! His arguments were so futile, and met such sad disaster, that he probably thought the fewer who heard them the better.

Brother Stanton was present at the same time; but he had no occasion to interfere, as the cause was in good hands. These advocates of liberty were not permitted to lift up their voices in the congregation; but, as pioneers in a holy cause, they were busy among the scattered ranks of the faithful army, exhorting them to go forward to glorious victory. The streets, and lanes, and cooling shades, witnessed their devotion to the cause; although altars and pulpits were denied them; and hundreds there obtained fresh courage to run the dangerous, yet delightful course of dear-bought liberty.

Yours with affection.
GILBERT PILLSBURY.

MAINE CONVENTION OF UNIVERSALISTS.

Met in council Tuesday evening, June 28, 1836. The following Preamble and Resolution were offered by Br. N. Swasey of Bath, and indefinitely postponed:

Whereas, Slavery exists in this boasted land of freedom to an alarming extent, and is forming an awful crisis dangerous to the Union, holding in bondage one sixth part of the nation whom we regard as brethren;—forming a great barrier to the spread of the Gospel to this portion of population, it becomes our imperious duty as christians and freemen, to repent before God of this great wickedness, 'to break every yoke and let the oppressed go free,'—therefore

Resolved, That we will ever maintain the doctrine of free discussion on this subject, it being secured to us by the Constitution of these United States and this State; as Christians and philanthropists, we will not vindicate slavery nor be apologists for the slaveholder; that slavery is a national disgrace, contrary to our Declaration of Rights, a tremendous sin against high heaven, and therefore ought to be immediately abolished.

The following Resolve was offered by Br. Gardiner and adopted.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Convention, it is inexpedient to discuss the subject of Slavery in our religious bodies.

☞ This is a body making superior pretensions to love and good-will. Alas, for their consistency! They are quite as hard-hearted as the 'Orthodox'! Z.

ASHBURNHAM, Sept. 9, 1836.

In view of the fact, that more than two millions of the inhabitants of this country are in bondage the most cruel, and that one half of these are females—we, in the capacity of women, feeling desirous of doing something for their deliverance, have therefore formed an association, to effect this by our contributions, labors and prayers.

June 9th our Society was formed, choosing for its officers,

President—Mrs. Geo. Goodyear.
Vice President—Mrs. Sam'l. Ward.
Secretary—Mrs. Gilman Jones.
Treasurer—Mrs. Henry M. Bancraft.

At the formation we had 19 names. The addition since has been 39. The number now is 58. Our meetings are quarterly. The meeting on the 8th inst. was full of interest, all 'having a mind to work.'

Yours, &c.
SILVA W. JONES, Sec'y.

[From the Herald of Freedom.]

GRAFTON COUNTY CONVENTION.

Agreeably to a Call signed by *four hundred* of the citizens of Grafton county, a convention of liberty and free discussion assembled at Hebron, on Tuesday, Sept. 13, 1836. The meeting was called to order by N. P. Rogers; and Jonathan Cummings of Plymouth was appointed Chairman; Rev. John Le Bosquet of Dorchester, Secretary.

Among the resolutions adopted were the following:

Resolved, That in view of the demoralizing influence American slavery exerts both in church and state, at the north as well as at the south, and the death-blows it aims at our dear-bought liberties, not excepting our own Granite Hills and verdant vallies, that not as abolitionists merely, but as American citizens, as freemen and Christians, we will resist, if necessary, with the constancy of Martyrs, all the encroachments upon our rights,—and we will never cease on all suitable occasions to pour into the ears of guilty oppressors, remonstrances till the last shackle falls from their suffering victim. Adopted unanimously.

Resolved, That slavery and not abolition is that which endangers the integrity and stability of this Union, and that nothing would tend so much to cement the bonds of our political basis as the immediate, voluntary emancipation of the slaves of this country.

Resolved, That no resolutions of ecclesiastical bodies or political caucuses, no acts of State Legislatures, no indifference or opposition from Congress, no threats of dissolution from the South, no mob-law or violence, shall ever deter us from asserting our principles, exercising our rights, or advocating the cause of the slave. Adopted unanimously.

Resolved, That by refusing to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and the domestic traffic in slaves, Congress has fastened the guilt and the infamy of slaveholding on the whole nation.

Resolved, That our delegation in Congress by their votes on the admission of Arkansas, the Pinckney resolutions and other slavery questions of the session, merit the scorn of the high minded slaveholder, and the distrust and discountenance of every northern freeman.

Resolved, That the abolition of slavery is entirely a moral and religious enterprise, having nothing to do with party politics or force, and that it is pursued by the abolitionists in the genuine spirit of the Law and the Constitution.

Resolved, That recent events abundantly prove (if proof were wanting) that southern slavery will destroy northern liberty, unless northern liberty shall abolish southern slavery.

Resolved, That slavery is one of the greatest sins of the American church, dangerous to its purity, peace and union, and loudly calls upon every christian and christian minister, to lift up his voice and exert his influence for its immediate extermination from our land. Adopted unanimously.

Resolved, That this Convention feel deeply impressed with the importance of the equal and free education of our colored brethren, and that we regard with sorrow and deep mortification the demolition of the excellent school established for that purpose at Canaan in this county.

Resolved, That abolition Petitions to Congress ought immediately to be put out, to be presented at the opening of the coming session.

The Committee to draft a Constitution for a County Society, reported one which was adopted, and signed by more than one hundred gentlemen present.

The following gentlemen were unanimously elected officers of the Society:

President—Joshua Woodward, Esq. of Haverhill.
Vice Presidents—Samuel Rogers, John H. Harris, Isaac Crosby, Jacob S. Eaton, James A. Boswell.
Recording Secretary—Timothy K. Blaisdell.
Corresponding Secretary—Daniel I. Robinson.
Treasurer—Wm. W. Russell.
Directors—Jonathan Cummings, Oscar F. Fowler, Davis Baker, and John Le Bosquet.

Stolen Money Found. It will be recollected that some two weeks since, the steamboat Rhode Island, on her passage from New York to Providence, was robbed of $39,000 in foreign gold, belonging to the Fulton Bank of Boston. No trace of it could be discovered until last night, when the Engineer of the steamboat, in drawing some oil from a large can in which it was held, found the facit stopped, and on opening the can to discover the cause, found in it the bag containing the whole of the gold, sewed up securely in another bag. The gold had no doubt been deposited in the oil can until the thief could find an opportunity for its removal.

BOSTON:

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1836.

MR. CALHOUN.

This *distinguished* Nullifier and Slaveholder was recently invited to a public dinner at Athens, Georgia. From his letter declining the invitation, we make the following extract:

'Of all questions which have been agitated under our government, abolition is that in which we of the South have the deepest concern. It strikes directly and fatally, not only at our prosperity, but our existence, as a people. (1) Should it succeed, our fate would be worse than the aborigines whom we have driven out, or the slaves whom we command. (2) It is a question that admits of neither concession nor compromise. The door must be closed against all interference on the part of the General Government in any form, whether in the *District of Columbia*, or in the States or *Territories*. (3) The highest grounds are the safest.

There is one point, in connexion with this important subject, on which the South ought to be fully informed. From all that I saw and heard during the session, I am perfectly satisfied that we must look to ourselves, and ourselves only, for safety. It is perfectly idle to look to the non-slaveholding States to arrest the attacks of the fanatics. (4) I readily admit that the *great body* of the enlightened citizens of *all* parties in these States are opposed to their wicked and dangerous schemes, but so intent are the two parties which divide and distract all the non-slaveholding States on getting or retaining power, that neither will directly oppose the abolitionists on our account, (5) from the fear that by incurring their displeasure, they might lose the ascendancy in their respective States, or defeat their prospects of rising to power. (6) As strong as may be their sympathy for us, their regard for their party at home is stronger. (7) Of this we may be perfectly assured. Nor would it be less vain to look to Congress. The same cause that prevents the non-slaveholding States from interference in our favor at home, (8) will equally prevent Congress. We must not forget that a majority of Congress in both Houses (9) are the Representatives of those States, and of course actuated by all the feelings and calculations which govern their respective States. (10) But if true to ourselves, *we need neither their sympathy nor aid.* The constitution has placed in our power ample means, short of secession or disunion, to protect ourselves. (11) All we want are harmony and concert among ourselves to call them into effectual action when the necessity comes.' (12)

(1) How glaring the falsehood! how insensate the prediction! Yea, how foolish the wisdom, and how small the greatness, of this infatuated oppressor! For he reasons thus insanely—that to do justly, love mercy, break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free, is to 'strike at the existence' of a people; but to rob, and lacerate, and crush to the earth, millions of our fellow creatures, must surely add to the 'prosperity,' and prolong the lives, of those who resort to conduct so atrocious! Does the sterile soil of Maryland and Virginia enforce this Bedlamitish theory? Or, did this theory obtain in the Ancient Dominion at the time of Nat Turner's insurrection? To say nothing of the already grand results of emancipation in the West Indies, we commend the 58th chapter of Isaiah to the careful perusal of Mr. Calhoun, as containing the testimony of God to the safety, utility, and vast advantage of immediate, entire, unconditional emancipation. For darkness, light is promised, morning light; for disease, health; for insecurity, righteousness and the glory of the Lord as a protection; for alienation, fellowship and communion; for dismal perplexity, divine guidance; for drought, a never failing supply of water; for old waste places, renovated fields and villages; for depopulation, a numerous progeny. But we fear that the voice of God, as well as that of man, will be contemptuously disregarded by Mr. Calhoun and his southern associates.

'They hear not, see not, know not—for their eyes
Are covered with thick mists—they *will not* see.'

(2) 'The SLAVES whom we COMMAND'!—How happy and delightful must be their condition, since even Mr. Calhoun refers to it in order to convey an idea of unutterable wretchedness! Out of thine own mouth art thou condemned, thou wicked *master!*

(3) It may be well to remind Mr. C. that southern slaveholders do not constitute *all* the people of the United States; that the people of the non-slaveholding States, being largely a majority, have a potent voice in this matter; that the District of Columbia and the Territories of the Union are under the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, and not of South Carolina; and that it is idle declamation, on the part of a slaveholding junto, to talk of closing a constitutional door which THE PEOPLE alone have the power to shut. Thanks for the valuable hint, that 'the highest grounds are the safest'—we shall profit by it, by admitting of no compromise of principle on the subject of slavery.

(4) What! are you despairing of succor already?—What! have the little, contemptible body of fanatics so soon become masters of the field in one half of the Union? What! do you retreat from the conflict, across Mason and Dixon's line, into South Carolina? What! was the famous Faneuil Hall meeting held in vain? and were the speeches of Otis, Sprague and Fletcher as worthless as the ravings of Bedlam? What! must five thousand 'gentlemen of property and standing' yet succumb to a few anti-slavery females? What! when these patriotic friends of the South, Governors Marcy and Everett, officially intimate that the abolition incendiaries may be punished at Common Law, do you mockingly ask, '*Cui bono?*'—What! have the mobs in New-York, Philadelphia, Boston, Utica, Troy, and a hundred other places at the North—have all the pro-slavery meetings held, from time to time, in all the free States—effected nothing, except to build up the cause they have attempted to prostrate?—Even so, Mr. Calhoun—you are right. Cheers, then, for liberty! Verily, 'Truth is mighty, and it will prevail.'

(5) What a *defamatory* compliment is this to 'the great body of the enlightened citizens of all parties' at the North—that, (for so the compliment runs,) knowing as they do that it is the intention of the abolition madmen to violate the Constitution, divide the Union, ruin the prosperity of the South, amalgamate the white and black races, cut the throats of Messrs. McDuffie, Calhoun & Co., and bring chaos back again; yet, so intent are they upon their political bickerings, and so indifferent to the fate of their dear southern brethren, that they will do nothing to oppose these blood-thirsty incendiaries!—Ye mobocrats at the North, whether high or low—ye cringing, servile dough-faces—ye greedy and dumb dogs among a time-serving priesthood—ye getters up of anti-abolition meetings—behold the gratitude, and receive the thanks of the South, for all that you have done to fasten the chains upon its immense slave population, to destroy the liberty of speech and of the press, and to disgrace the character of your country in the eyes of the world! You are now taunted with having done nothing—with being too cowardly, or too corrupt, to make any direct opposition to a band of infatuated and lawless men—notwithstanding all the mighty efforts you have made, all the money you have expended, all the lies you have told, and all the acts of violence you have committed, to uphold southern slavery! Yet you have this consolation—that you constitute 'the great body of the *enlightened* citizens of all parties'!—What intelligent knaves, what patriotic traitors, Mr. Calhoun makes you to be! Verily, you have your reward.

(6) What, sir! do you confess that the abolitionists are a formidable party—so formidable, as to keep in awe all political parties, and to be courted by all? 'Twenty-two men and two women' have multiplied surprisingly within the last three years!

(7) Another flattering compliment to the bounty, patriotism and sympathy of 'the great body of the enlightened citizens of all parties'! Truly, the South has reason to exclaim—'Save me from my friends!'

(8) Mark this—all the pro-slavery meetings, riots, denunciations, threats and messages, on the part of the North, in opposition to the abolitionists, are considered of no avail by Mr. Calhoun. 'Interference in our favor' means the enactment of GAG LAWS by northern legislatures, forbidding under severe penalties the discussion of the 'sublime merits' of slavery. This is in accordance with the language of the Richmond Whig of last year:—'What good will it do to rebuke the incendiaries? They have been rebuked a hundred times, but it has neither cooled their fiery zeal, nor diminished their growth.—There must be some *sanction*, some PENALTY, some LAW of the States where they live, prohibiting their injuries to the southern people, and PUNISHING them for their infliction. Nothing short of this will cure the evil, *or satisfy the South.* The South wants no sympathy, no condolement, no *deploration*, no expression of abstract theories on this matter. It wants the Northern States to PUNISH their incendiary citizens, who are disturbing her peace, and to prevent a repetition of the wrong. The people of the North must go to HANGING these fanatical wretches.' So Gov. McDuffie says—'The LAWS of every community should punish this species of interference by DEATH, without benefit of clergy, regarding the authors of it as enemies of the human race.' Such murderous expectations and demands show by what tenure the citizens of the North would hold their freedom, if subjected to the control of southern slaveholders. According to Mr. Calhoun, nothing has prevented Congress from making it a penal offence to discuss the subject of slavery, but a *political* fear of the abolitionists—the *insignificant* abolitionists!

(9) No—in the Senate, both parties are equally balanced—26 to 26—and must remain so, according to the present mode of representation, or until one of the slave States shall cease to deal in slaves and the souls of men. *True*, at the present time, the Vice President of the United States, as President of the Senate, has the power, by a casting vote in case of a tie on the question of abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia and in the territory of Florida, to carry the Senate in favor of emancipation; but there is little hope, under present circumstances, that such an event will take place.

(10) Yet 'the great body of the enlightened citizens of all parties in the non-slaveholding States are opposed to the wicked and dangerous schemes of the abolitionists.' Put this and that together. Will Messrs. Harrison Gray Otis, Peleg Sprague, Richard Fletcher, and 'gentlemen of property and standing,' with the rabble at their heels, please to remember that the South 'needs neither their sympathy nor aid'? So they are admonished by John C. Calhoun.

(11) This is another thrust of ingratitude at those northern intermeddlers, who have been so busy in hurling brickbats and rotten eggs at the heads of abolitionists—all for the 'protection' of the South! 'We are able to protect ourselves,' says Mr. Calhoun. In what manner? 'By those ample means which the constitution has placed in our power.' Indeed! Protection against what? The arguments of the abolitionists? Chivalrous South! The only means allowed you are the freedom of speech and of the press: the same means are extended to us at the North: now, then, to the conflict—and remember that

'Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just;
And he but naked, though locked up in steel,
Whose conscience with injustice is corrupted.'

(12) Is the South divided? 'All we want are harmony and concert among ourselves'—this is language which seems to imply that discord reigns in the ranks of the slaveholders. Some of them, perchance, are beginning to see the iniquity of slaveholding, and to feel the leaven of abolition working in their consciences. No doubt 'when the necessity comes,' the 'ample means,' provided for the protection of the South by the constitution, will be called into 'effectual action'—and then——but we will not anticipate what will be the consequence.

ELOQUENT BLASPHEMY.

Some of our northern newspapers are publishing, with evident satisfaction, the following passage, extracted from a Eulogium upon the life and character of JAMES MADISON, by the *Honorable* James Barbour, of Orange Court House, Virginia:

The Funeral of Madison—Many of you were at his funeral; you must have seen his *slaves* decently attired in attendance, and their orderly deportment; the profound silence was now and then broken by their sobs—they attended the procession to the grave. There are none of us, I fear, who have not drunk of the cup of affliction, heavily drugged by the untimely bereavement of a dear child or affectionate companion; such will but too well remember, that so long as the remains continued on earth, the tie that connected us seemed not entirely dissolved; but while standing at the verge of the grave, and seeing the corpse deposited, and hearing the pious man give utterance to the fearful sentence, 'dust to dust,' whose fulfilment by some friendly hand flung back the hollow and mournful sound, how it pierced our souls; how we felt that the separation was now final—that all was gone.

At this part of the service it was not only the body servant, who was standing directly by me, that, by his sobs and sighs, showed how severely he felt his bereavement in the loss of the kind and indulgent master, but the HUNDRED SLAVES gave vent to their lamentations in one violent burst that rent the air; *methought it ascended to Heaven, and was heard with joy by the heavenly host, as a redeeming item* in that great account which he, in common with all the sons of Adam, had to meet. And I derived consolation at the moment from the belief that *if*, in that great account, *slight blemishes* here and there, *from the inexorable law of nature*, were to be found, *this alone* would, in the eye of mercy, be sufficient to blot out the unfriendly character that bore record of his infirmity, to be remembered no more.

The design of the foregoing absurd and impious panegyric is, evidently, not only to extol Mr. Madison, but also to gloss over the abominations of slavery. But, instead of redounding to the credit of the deceased, it makes his memory infamous; and instead of mitigating displeasure in view of southern oppression, it serves to increase disgust and indignation. The very first sentence is one of awful condemnation:—'Many of you were at his funeral; you must have seen his SLAVES.' How many? 'The HUNDRED SLAVES.' A revolutionary patriot—and a slaveholder! A democratic republican—and a slaveholder! One of the framers and vindicators of the American Constitution—and a slaveholder! An ex-President of the United States—and a slaveholder! The President of the American Colonization Society—and, living and *dying*, A SLAVEHOLDER! As to the decent attire and convulsive grief of his slaves, all this may or may not be true—the picture is obviously made for effect, and derives its coloring from the imagination. But, to what purpose is it exhibited? Does it prove that slavery is a good, and freedom an evil? Can it shield Mr. Madison from reproach, for invading the inalienable rights of his vassals, robbing them of the fruits of their toil, and placing them on a level with his cattle and swine; or for habitually violating all those great principles, which, in order to procure liberty for himself and his *white* associates, he so ably vindicated as self-evident, eternal, and essential to the well-being of the human race? Will it be inscribed upon his cenotaph, that a hundred slaves attended his funeral?—James Madison was a daring usurper of the prerogatives of the Almighty, and a traitor to the cause of universal liberty. And what must add to the infamy that belongs to his conduct, he not only held a multitude of his fellow-equals in servile bondage during his life-time, but, being mercifully spared to an advanced age for repentance, not even death itself could make him unlock a single fetter, or set a single slave free. He has left them to be divided among his heirs—to be separated and trafficked as convenience or necessity may choose. Yet he is eulogized as 'the glorious dead'—'the Chief, the Patriot, and the Sage'—and Eloquence, History, Poetry and Art are invoked to proclaim his deeds,

'From sea-beat strand to mountain goal!'

Nay, it is impiously imagined by his Virginia panegyrist, that the violent burst of grief among his slaves, at 'the loss of a kind and indulgent master,' 'ascended to heaven, and was heard with joy by the heavenly host'! Yes, it is equal, in efficacy, to the death of the Son of God, and renders his atonement of little worth—for, '*if slight blemishes* here and there, from the *inexorable law of nature*,' (!) were to be found in his character, this exhibition of sorrow, on the part of his *property*, would prove 'a redeeming item,' and 'in the eye of mercy be sufficient to blot out the unfriendly character that bore record of his *infirmity*, to be remembered no more'!

Of the fruits of his robbery, Mr. Madison has bequeathed three thousand dollars to that grand conspiracy against the rights and liberties of our colored population, and that most detestable association, the American Colonization Society. This is another condemnatory trait in his character. Thus far, that Society has had three Presidents. The first was Bushrod Washington, a slave-trader as well as slaveholder, who left all his slaves in bondage at his death. The second was Charles Carroll, who, although immensely rich, and holding as property more than a thousand slaves, died without liberating one of his victims. The last was James Madison, who left a hundred slaves to weep at his funeral, but not one to rejoice in freedom!—What distinguished man-stealer will be chosen to fill the vacancy, remains to be decided. Judge Marshall was one of the Vice Presidents of the Society, and he also left his slaves to obtain their emancipation in the grave, by the great liberator Death.

Facts like these serve to illustrate the character of that Society in a manner as decisive as it is afflicting.

While we have spoken thus plainly of the guilt of Mr. Madison, in being a slaveholder, and refusing at his death to let his slaves go free, we willingly concede that, in other respects, he deserves commendation—not, however, as a warrior, joining with others to obtain liberty by the shedding of blood; but for his able and successful vindication of the great principles of civil and religious liberty, and of the rights of man, with his voice and pen, which, while it condemned his own practice, effected much for the cause of human liberty.

☞ From the accomplished sister of J. G. WHITTIER.
[For the Liberator.]

TO GEORGE THOMPSON,

Written after reading his speeches at Glasgow, in the debate with R. J. Breckenridge.

Coming to us across the sea,
Thy tones, as deep and dear as ever,
Still bid us turn in trust to thee,
As one whose zeal shall slumber never.

We know that for our cause of Right,
Heaven-strengthened, thou art ever pleading;
We feel that to the Truth's pure light
Such words as thine a world is leading.

We know that with untiring care,
Thou'rt nurturing in thy nation's bosom
The holy plant of Love, which prayer
And constant zeal shall cause to blossom!

Oh—tell the Pilgrim's father-land
That with us Freedom has not perished,
That still amidst a faithful band,
The love of human rights is cherished.

Oh—bid the christian hearts which love
Our erring land, to give their warning;
With zeal to speak, entreat, reprove,
Till Freedom's perfect day is dawning.

Tell Freedom's friends their onward cheer
Is heard across the waters sounding,
And many a heart, forgetting fear,
With added strength and hope is bounding.

Plead for our slaves!—plead nobly, where
The bondman's fetters have been riven,
And righteous aid, in love and prayer,
From the strong-hearted shall be given.

Faint not, thou faithful steward!—cast
As dust beneath thee man's reviling,
So shall thy recompense, at last,
Be ransomed millions round thee smiling!

20th 9th Month, 1836. E. H. W.

The admission of the New England Anti-Slavery Society [Convention] into the Salem-street Church, Boston, contrary to the known wishes of the Pastor, [Rev. Mr. Blagden,] was the occasion, we understand, of his retiring to another field of labor.—*Zion's Advocate.*

☞ A fact like this is worth placing on record.—How will it appear in the eyes of posterity? This reverend personage, it is almost superfluous to add, is a Gradualist, a Colonizationist, a Unionist, and a believer in an eternal enmity between the white and colored races, while they remain together, although he is dark enough in complexion (if we must have such a test) to be colonized, not only to 'another field of labor,' but to Liberia. He was last week installed as pastor over the Old South Church in this city. [N. B. It is proper to add, that this church is larger, and much more wealthy, than his former church.] He probably did not leave his people merely because the meeting-house was too polluted to be occupied by him, after the sittings of the Anti-Slavery Convention in it, but also because a majority in his church, and many in his congregation, are zealous abolitionists. Perhaps he will find similar difficulty, ere long, among his new parishioners; for the abolition contagion is infecting all classes of people, and no physical or spiritual *cordon sanitaire* can check its progress.

POLITICAL. We call the attention of our readers to the communication of 'MERRIMACK,' in another column. The suggestions made by our correspondent are seasonable and important. There may be some men, calling themselves abolitionists, (but we believe there are few if any,) who deem the support of their sectarian or party views paramount to the cause of their colored countrymen in bondage—but they are not worthy of the name. ☞ No consistent abolitionist, in our opinion, can give his vote either for EDWARD EVERETT as Governor of Massachusetts, or for MARTIN VAN BUREN as President of the United States.

DOING THE WORK EFFICIENTLY. By referring to the preceding page, it will be seen that the Hancock and Washington Baptist Associations in Maine, and the Baptist Church at South Reading in this State, have resolved to have no fellowship or communion with slaveholding preachers or church-members. Let this example be imitated by all other churches in the free States, and the death-blow will be instantly given to the monster slavery. The fifth resolution adopted by the South Reading church, is worthy of special notice and commendation, and furnishes fresh evidence that prejudice is visible.

PROGRESS OF THE CAUSE. The 'Watch-Tower,' published at Adrian, Lenawee County, Michigan Territory, contains a CALL, signed by 260 citizens of Michigan, for a Convention to be held on the 12th inst. at Ann Arbor, for the purpose of organizing a *State Anti-Slavery Society!* This is a noble response of the West to the call of the East. We have been invited, by a Committee, to attend said Convention, and should rejoice to do so if such a journey were practicable at the present time.

PORTLAND. The Journal of Reform, at Portland, correcting a statement in our last number, says—'We are acquainted with two congregational ministers in this city, who have no part nor lot in the 'American Union for the Relief and Improvement of the Colored Race.' They are devoted, warm-hearted Abolitionists, and were not ashamed to be found among them, when Stanton delivered his eloquent addresses. Unfortunately they have no churches to open for the purpose of pleading for suffering humanity. God grant that the like spirit may soon pervade the minds of all the clergy in this city.'

ROWLAND GREENE. A short but excellent address to our free colored brethren, from this worthy and beloved minister of the Society of Friends, will be found in a preceding page. It deserves their attentive perusal and grateful consideration. The example of well-doing, cited in the case of Mr. Glasgow, is full of interest and encouragement. Let all our colored friends be emulous to imitate it. True, it is not a solitary instance; true, there are very many among them, of both sexes, who deserve the esteem and commendation of the wise and good; but there is yet abundant room for their improvement as a class. As our venerable friend, Dr. Greene, travels extensively, we trust he will find opportunities to address his colored brethren face to face, in public assembly. We are certain they will listen to him with profit and delight—for he is one of their best friends, and exerting a salutary influence in their favor.

☞ The Augusta (Georgia) Sentinel is furious at the late decision of Judge Shaw in this State. The Vermont State Journal pleasantly remarks—'We shall not be surprised to find in the next number of the Georgia Sentinel, a proffered reward of some twenty thousand dollars for the head of that notorious northern incendiary, Mr. Justice Shaw!'

☞ A County Anti-Slavery Society has just been formed in Caledonia County, Vermont, of which our early coadjutor and esteemed friend, Rev. JAMES MILLIGAN of Ryegate, is President. It has an excellent Constitution.

☞ A Female Anti-Slavery Society has also been formed in Waitsfield, auxiliary to the Washington County Society, in the same State. The Montpelier Journal says—

'We trust their praiseworthy example will be followed in every town. The importance of associated female influence in this great enterprise, is not duly appreciated, we fear. Let those who have thought little on this subject, read Mrs. Child's or Miss Grimke's Appeal.'

☞ The annual meeting of the Middlesex County Anti-Slavery Society was held at Lowell on Wednesday last. The weather was exceedingly unpropitious, and probably prevented a full attendance. We have received no particulars of the meeting.

☞ The length of the cogent and eloquent Argument of Mr. Loring ought not to deter our readers from a careful perusal of it.

DIED—In Reading, Sept. 29th, of dysentery, Caroline Augustus, only child of Calvin and Mary S. P. Temple, aged 8 months.

George Thompson in London.—We conversed with a gentleman on Monday last, directly from England, who heard Mr. Thompson lecture to a crowded auditory, on the subject of slavery, in Exeter Hall, London. He says he never witnessed such enthusiasm in favor of any speaker, as was there exhibited towards Mr. T. A great number of Americans, he thinks several hundred, were present on the occasion; those from the South in favor of slavery, looked sorrowful, two of whom, in the early part of the proceedings, had determined to take their stand upon the platform, and address the assemblage in answer and in opposition to Thompson; but after hearing him awhile, their hearts failed them, and they seemed glad to get away unnoticed.

Mr. Thompson lived in good style—was received and heard with enthusiasm wherever he went—was deeply engaged and much employed in lecturing on slavery, and wanted nothing but opposition. How wretchedly must those vile slanderers feel, who busied themselves in representing Mr. Thompson, while in this country, as a renegado—an outcast—a fugitive from justice; who hesitated not to disseminate the grossest and most malignant falsehoods against him, in order to excite the multitude to commit outrage upon his person.

Robert B. Hall, a young gentleman of fine talents from Boston, was in company with Mr. Thompson, and lectured with great applause on the subject of temperance, while our informant was there. Mr. Hall is well known in this neighborhood as one of the most able, active and influential young men in favor of moral reform.—*Lynn Record.*

COLLEGE IN LIBERIA.

An effort is now making for the establishment of a college in Liberia. A large meeting has been held recently in the city of New York in aid of it. Many young men are zealously engaged in the noble enterprise, in which every benevolent heart must rejoice. And they ask, 'Shall the amount of a few thousand dollars prevent the commencement of a work so imperiously demanded for the benefit of the African race?'—*Chr. Index.*

If these benevolent young men are so zealous in a good thing, (and it *is* a good thing,) why not establish a college in the slave States for the benefit of the African race? If the benefit of the African race imperiously demands a college in Liberia, does not the '*Race*' as imperiously demand one for their benefit in these States? Not one of the millions of them can obtain a place or an education in any of our Christian colleges. Why not, then, establish one expressly for their benefit? We fear that a Christian town meeting would be called, and the select men be ordered to put the building on runners, and haul it into a swamp. Such a thing *was done* even in Canaan, N. H.

O consistency! how art thou outraged by benevolence toward the 'African race!'—*Christian Secretary.*

A Slave Case.—A mulatto was arrested a few days ago, at Reading, Pa., charged with being a runaway slave, belonging to an estate in Maryland. There was some informality in the papers under which the claimant acted, and no evidence was gone into to prove whether the mulatto was a slave or not. He was discharged, but immediately arrested on a charge of larceny. He was shortly after brought before a judge, on a habeas corpus, but again dismissed on the ground that the evidence against him was not sufficient to sustain the charge.

LITERARY.

THE FOSSIL ELEPHANT.

BY MARY HOWITT.

The earth is old! six thousand years
Are gone since I had birth
In the forests of the olden time,
And the solitudes of earth.

We were a race of mighty things;
The world was all our own:
I dwelt with the Mammoth large and strong,
And the giant Mastedon.

No ship went over the waters then,
No ship with oar and sail;
But the wastes of the sea were habited
By the Dragon and the Whale.

And the Hydra, down in the ocean caves,
Abode a creature grim;
And the scaled Serpents, huge and strong,
Coiled up in the waters dim.

The wastes of the world were all our own,
A proud, imperial lot!
Man had not then dominion given,
Or else we knew it not.

There was no city on the plain;
No fortress on the hill;
No mighty men of strength, who came,
With armies, up to kill.

There was no iron then—no brass—
No silver and no gold;
The wealth of the world was in its woods,
And its granite mountains old.

And we were the kings of all the world,
We knew its breadth and length;
We dwelt in the glory of solitude,
And the majesty of strength.

But suddenly came an awful change!
Wherefore ask not of me;
That it was, my desolate being shows—
Let that suffice for thee.

The Mammoth huge, and the Mastedon,
Were buried beneath the earth;
And the Hydra and the Serpents strong,
In the caves where they had birth!

There is now no place of silence deep,
Whether on land or sea;
And the Dragons lie in the mountains' rock,
As if for eternity!

And far in the realms of nameless ice,
Beyond each island shore,
My brethren lie in the darkness stern,
To awake to life no more!

And not till the last conflicting crash,
When the world consumes in fire,
Will their frozen sepulchres be loosed,
And their dreadful doom expire!

[From the Fall River Monitor.]

Lines suggested on attending a meeting of the F. R. Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society on Tuesday evening last.

Ye fair ones, press on—to a holy cause
Ye are lending your powerful aid,
Your hands to the plough, I entreat you to pause
Never, oh never! tho' the tyrant's applause
Be withheld, never falter, dismay'd.

The glorious cause ye so fearlessly plead,
Is the cause of the poor and oppress'd,
And sanction'd by heaven, ye shall surely succeed;
Yes! yes! we shall triumph whilst onward ye lead,
And the prey from the spoiler we'll wrest.

In the might of your womanhood gird you—arise,
Through the length and the breadth of the land;
Let the loathing of cruelty flash from your eyes,
And where is the tyrant will dare to despise
Your efforts, or hope to withstand?

'Tis to you that we look through the blessing of heaven,
Our blood-besmear'd country to save:
O cease not your labors till freedom be given
To your sisters in chains, till the manacles riven,
Shall drop from the arms of the slave.

Is it true that your loveliness never appears,
So sweet, so endearing, as when
Ye wipe from the eyes of the weeping the tears,
By soothing their sorrows and calming their fears,
And removing the cause of their pain?

Let your watchword be onward till slavery flies,
Far, far from this land of the brave,
Till the songs and the shouts of the freed shall arise,
Like balmy incense afloat in the skies,
Where the star spangled banner shall wave. * * *.

[From the Massachusetts Spy.]

O! SAY NOT, THAT THE GOD OF HEAVEN.

Suggested by reading the Message of Gov. George McDuffie to the Legislature of South Carolina, in 1835, in which his Excellency asserts that Slavery is the ordination of God, and deprecates the idea of future emancipation.

O! say not, that the God of Heaven,
Of pure and holy will,
A race hath made, and spirits given,
With sense of good and ill,
Yet doomed them, by his fiat law,
To bondage, worse than Egypt saw.

O! say not, that a sable skin
Alone is worthy crime,
For which the whiter, free of sin,
May smother, through all time,
The living fire, in every heart,
Which fain the servile chain would part.

O! say not, that, in future years,
There shall not come a day,
When mercy, Afric's slighted tears,
Shall, kneeling, wipe away;
And lord and slave, o'er land and sea,
Shall chant the chorus of the free.

[From Zion's Watchman.]

THE SLAVITE.

Who disregards fraternal ties,
The mother's grief, and children's cries,
And 'mid their tears the whip applies?
The Slavite.

Who shuts the word of truth and light,
And seals the mind in endless night,
And yet declares his course is right?
The Slavite.

Who trades in sinews, blood and bones,
Indifferent hears the sufferer's groans,
And sweetest ties of life disowns?
The Slavite.

Who keeps the mind in ignorance,
And chains the soul to time and sense,
And deems instruction an offence?
The Slavite.

Who steals the wages of the poor,
And drives them far from pity's door,
When they can labor hard no more?
The Slavite.

On whom does God in anger frown,
And when the saint receives his crown,
Who'll sink to endless misery down?
The Slavite.

Whose portion shall with demons be,
Where light and hope he'll never see,
Throughout a dread eternity?
The Slavite.

MISCELLANEOUS.

APPEAL TO CHRISTIAN WOMEN AT THE SOUTH.

We give below an extract from Miss A. E. Grimke's noble and truly eloquent appeal to the Christian women of the South, recently published in pamphlet form, by the American A. S. Society. In answering the question, 'why appeal to *women* on this subject?' she mentions four things which women can do in regard to it. 'You can read on this subject. You can pray over this subject. You can speak on this subject. You can *act* on this subject.' She then dwells at some length on each of these points, particularly on the last, urging those who have slaves to emancipate them, teach them to read, encourage them to believe it their *duty* to learn, if it were only that they might read the Bible. She exhorts to the performance of duty in this matter, even though it should be necessary in doing it, to say to the framers and executors of wicked and unjust laws, 'whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye.' Disdaining the purpose of recommending *resistance* to the law, she says, 'if a law commands me to *sin, I will break it*; if it calls me to *suffer*, I will let it take its course *unresistingly*.' Then follows the extract we copy below.

'But you will perhaps say, such a course of conduct would inevitably expose us to great suffering. Yes! my christian friends, I believe it would, but this will *not* excuse you or any one else for the neglect of *duty*. If Prophets and Apostles, Martyrs and Reformers, had not been willing to suffer for the truth's sake, where would the world have been now? If they had said, we cannot speak the truth, we cannot do what we believe is right, because the *laws of our country or public opinion are against us*, where would our holy religion have been now? The Prophets were stoned, imprisoned and killed by the Jews. And why? Because they exposed and openly rebuked public sins; they opposed public opinions; had they held their peace, they might have lived in ease, and died in favor with a wicked generation. Why were the Apostles persecuted from city to city, stoned, incarcerated, beaten, and crucified? Because they dared to *speak the truth*; to tell the Jews, boldly and fearlessly, that *they* were the *murderers* of the Lord of Glory, and that, however great a stumbling-block the Cross might be to them, there was no other name given under heaven by which men could be saved, but the name of Jesus. Because they declared, even at Athens, the seat of learning and refinement, the self-evident truth, that 'they be no gods that are made with men's hands,' and exposed to the Grecians the foolishness of worldly wisdom, and the impossibility of salvation but through Christ, whom they despised on account of the ignominious death he died. Because at Rome, the proud mistress of the world, they thundered out the terrors of the law upon that idolatrous, warmaking, and slaveholding community. Why were the martyrs stretched upon the rack, gibbeted and burnt, the scorn and diversion of a Nero, whilst their tarred and burning bodies sent up a light which illuminated the Roman capital? Why were the Waldenses hunted like wild beasts upon the mountains of Piedmont, and slain with the sword of the Duke of Savoy and the proud monarch of France? Why were the Presbyterians chased like the partridge over the highlands of Scotland—the Methodists pumped, and stoned, and pelted with rotten eggs—the Quakers incarcerated in filthy prisons, beaten, whipped at the cart's tail, banished and hung? Because they dared to *speak* the *truth*, to *break* the unrighteous *laws* of their country, and chose rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, 'not accepting deliverance,' even under the gallows. Why were Luther and Calvin persecuted and excommunicated, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer burnt? Because they fearlessly proclaimed the truth, though that truth was contrary to public opinion, and the authority of ecclesiastical councils and conventions. Now all this vast amount of human suffering might have been saved. All these Prophets and Apostles, Martyrs and Reformers, might have lived and died in peace with all men; but following the example of their great pattern, 'they despised the shame, endured the cross, and are now set down on the right hand of the throne of God,' having received the glorious welcome of 'well *done*, good and faithful servants, enter ye into the joy of your Lord.'

But you may say we are *women*: how can *our* hearts endure persecution? And why not? Have not *women* stood up in all the dignity and strength of moral courage to be the leaders of the people, and to bear a faithful testimony for the truth whenever the providence of God has called them to do so? Are there *no women* in that noble army of martyrs who are now singing the song of Moses and the Lamb? Who led out the women of Israel from the house of Bondage, striking the timbrel, and singing the song of deliverance on the banks of that sea whose waters stood up like walls of crystal to open a passage for their escape? It was a *woman*; Miriam, the prophetess, the sister of Moses and Aaron. Who went up with Barak to Kadesh to fight against Jabin, King of Canaan, into whose hand Israel had been sold because of their iniquities? It was a *woman*! Deborah the wife of Lapidoth, the judge, as well as the prophetess of that backsliding people; Judges iv, 9. Into whose hands was Sisera, the captain of Jabin's host delivered? Into the hands of a *woman*. Jael the wife of Heber; Judges vi, 21. Who dared to *speak the truth* concerning those judgments which were coming upon Judea, when Josiah, alarmed at finding that his people 'had not kept the word of the Lord to do all after all that was written in the book of the Law' sent to enquire of the Lord concerning these things? It was a *woman*. Huldah the prophetess, the wife of Shallum; 2. Chron. xxxiv, 22. Who was chosen to deliver the whole Jewish nation from that murderous decree of Persia's King, which wicked Haman had obtained by calumny and fraud? It was a *woman*; Esther the Queen; yes, weak and trembling *woman* was the instrument appointed by God, to reverse the bloody mandate of the eastern monarch, and save the *whole visible church* from destruction. What human voice first proclaimed to Mary that she should be the mother of the Lord? It was a *woman*! Elizabeth, the wife of Zacharias; Luke i, 42, 43. Who united with the good old Simeon in giving thanks publicly in the temple, when the child, Jesus, was presented there by his parents, 'and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem?' It was a *woman*! Anna, the prophetess. Who first proclaimed Christ as the true Messiah in the streets of Samaria, once the capital of the ten tribes? It was a *woman*! Who ministered to the Son of God whilst on earth, a despised and persecuted Reformer, in the humble garb of a carpenter? They were *women*! Who followed the rejected King of Israel, as his fainting footsteps trod the road to Calvary? 'A great company of people and of *women*;' and it is remarkable that to *them alone*, he turned and addressed the pathetic language, 'Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and your children.' Ah! who sent unto the Roman Governor, when he was set down on the judgment seat, saying unto him, 'Have thou nothing to do with that just man, for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him?' It was a *woman*! the wife of Pilate. Although '*he knew* that for envy the Jews had delivered Christ,' yet *he* consented to surrender the Son of God into the hands of a brutal soldiery, after having himself scourged his naked body. Had the *wife* of Pilate sat upon that judgment seat, what would have been the result of the trial of this 'just person?'

And who last hung round the cross of Jesus on the mountain of Golgotha? Who first visited the sepulchre early in the morning on the first day of the week, carrying sweet spices to embalm his precious body, not knowing that it was incorruptible and could not be holden by the bands of death. These were *women*! To whom did he *first* appear after his resurrection? It was to a *woman*! Mary Magdelene; Mark xvi, 9. Who gathered with the apostles to wait at Jerusalem, in prayer and supplication, for 'the promise of the Father;' the spiritual blessing of the Great High Priest of his Church, who had entered, *not* into the splendid temple of Solomon, there to offer the blood of bulls, and of goats, and the smoking censer upon the golden altar, but into Heaven itself, there to present his intercessions, after having 'given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savor?' *Women* were among that holy company; Acts i, 14. And did *women* wait in vain? Did those who had administered to his necessities, followed in his train, and wept at his crucifixion, wait in vain? No! No! Did the cloven tongues of fire descend upon the heads of *women* as well as men? Yes, my friends, 'it sat upon *each one of them*;' Acts ii, 3. *Women* as well as men were to be living stones in the temple of grace, and therefore *their* heads were consecrated by the descent of the Holy Ghost as well as those of men. Were *women* recognized as fellow laborers in the gospel field? They were! Paul says in his epistle to the Philippians, 'help those *women* who labored with me, in the gospel;' Phil. iv, 3.

[From the Friend of Man.]

ECCLESIASTICAL ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

This project is treated very severely in some of the papers. The writer of the original article is, we believe, a thorough anti-slavery man. We are inclined to favor such a convention as is proposed; one in which the true anti-slavery doctrines shall be acknowledged. It is an important inquiry, what is it the duty of the churches to do, particularly as our General Associations are passing resolutions to exclude anti-slavery lecturers from our pulpits?—*N. E. Spectator.*

It was not the *project of having a convention*, that *we* treated 'severely.' [We know not whether the Spectator alludes to us.] We said *some* of the reasons given for a convention were good. But some of them we thought were *not* good. We had no desire to conciliate the class alluded to, by giving the proposed convention such a cast as we understand to be recommended. Others, it seems, understood the writer as we did. We expressed and entertained no doubt that the writer was an honest anti-slavery man. But we did doubt the propriety and wisdom of his views, and of the policy he seemed to recommend.—And we gave our reasons—reasons that remain unanswered, so far as we have seen. There may have been more importance in the subject of our strictures than we were aware of, when we penned them. An Orthodox Congregational minister in Massachusetts writes us as follows:

'I thank you for what you have said on the subject of an Ecclesiastical convention, on slavery. I strongly suspect the hand of Joab [Dr. ———] at the bottom of the plan. The 'American Union' seems to have been a kind of failure, but our go-between-ites are not to be discouraged by one defeat.' Another correspondent writes thus:

'If the "*Union*" had been organized instead of the *Colonization Society*, or the Ecclesiastical Anti-Slavery *Convention* proposed at the time the "Union" was formed, they might have kept up with the times. But it is a stern chase now.'

The editor of the Spectator will probably find that 'the *papers*' have not been half as 'severe' on the subject as the *people* will be, if the *ministers* undertake to 'take the anti-slavery movement into their own hands.'

It is doubtless 'an important inquiry what it is the duty of the *churches* to do, particularly as our General Associations are passing resolutions to exclude anti-slavery lecturers from our pulpits.' A CONVENTION OF CHRISTIANS WHO ARE ABOLITIONISTS, would therefore be a very appropriate measure. But a convention of the *ministers* to decide upon the duty of the *churches* would not be exactly the same thing—particularly if the *same* ministers who formed the 'General Association' are to form the convention!

Our readers probably know that the 'Zion's Watchman' is a Methodist paper in New York, which pleads the cause of emancipation. This fact accounts for the opposition it encounters.

ZION'S WATCHMAN.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the New York Wesleyan Society, held August 26th, the following preamble and resolution were unanimously adopted, and ordered to be published:—

Whereas, It has come to the knowledge of this committee, that repeated attempts have been made to retard the circulation of Zion's Watchman among the ministers and members of the Methodist E. Church; and

Whereas, The proprietors of this paper are members of the Methodist E. Church, and firmly attached to its discipline and doctrines; and

Whereas, Zion's Watchman is edited by a regular member of one of the Annual Conferences, and devoted to the interests of the Church aforesaid; and it differs from no other methodist paper in this country, except so far as it is open to the discussion of questions which are not discussed in our regular official paper—and so far also, as a liberality of sentiment, and other circumstances, may serve to render it paramount in its claims to public patronage; Therefore,

Resolved, 1. That we view with *alarm*, the repeated attempts which have been made by certain members of the New York Annual Conference, to prevent the circulation of Zion's Watchman among the ministers and members of the Methodist E. Church.

Resolved, 2. That we cannot but consider these attempts as aimed at the freedom of speech and of the press, and against one of the dearest principles of Protestant Christianity.

Resolved, 3. That these attempts are peculiarly wanting in magnanimity and fairness, inasmuch as the Christian Advocate and Journal, (the medium through which they have been made) has from the beginning, repeatedly refused to publish any thing, and all that those whom it has censured, have felt it their duty to say in explanation or self-defence. Nay, more; it has, for two years past, published numerous articles on one side of a controverted subject, in which the whole Christian community are deeply interested, and at the same time, it has refused to publish any thing on the other side, even when it had censured many of our ministers, not excepting, even, two Annual Conferences of the Methodist E. Church.

Resolved, 4. That we have the fullest confidence in the piety, talents, and moral worth of the Rev. La Roy Sunderland, the editor of said Watchman, who, by his zealous labors in the ministry for many years, and by his services already rendered in editing this paper, has established a claim to the confidence of the religious public, not to be destroyed by the persecutions directed against him.

Resolved, 5. That we are more than ever convinced of the necessity of such a paper as Zion's Watchman—as, in our opinion, on its success depends, in a great degree, the purity, honor, and prosperity of the Methodist E. Church; and we do, therefore, hereby pledge ourselves anew to the labors and sacrifices necessary for its support.

Resolved, 6. That, struggling as we are for the maintenance of great moral principles, which concern the rights and peace of all Christian people, in every church, we look with confidence for countenance and support from a liberal christian public.

Resolved, 7. That the editors of papers which exchange with the Watchman, be, and they are hereby respectfully requested to give the foregoing preamble and resolutions a place in their papers, respectively.

JAMES W. BARKER, Secretary.

N. B. Zion's Watchman is published weekly at 96, Nassau-street, New York, by the Executive Committee of the New York Wesleyan Society. Terms, $2 per year, in advance.

From the Hampshire Republican.

A FEW FACTS.

Mr. Editor:—In the 'Southern Times and State Gazette,' published at Columbia, S. C. May 20th, is an article on the present high prices of Cotton, Rice, Negroes, &c. which is taken from the Charleston Mercury, and is thus noticed by the Editor of the Southern Times:—

'We invite the attention to the article in another column from the Charleston Mercury, under the signature of "Agricola." In these days emphatically, of political discussion, a well written article on the actual pursuits, and the practical economy of life, is doubtless greeted by our readers, something like the green and smiling oasis in the desert to [by] a weary traveller.'

Coming to us through these two very respectable southern papers, and the writer not seeming to be excited either by abolition, or any political notions to express himself too strongly, it may be considered a fair expression of Southern motives and feeling on the subject of Slavery. It is time for us at the North to dismiss the idea that slaveholders generally, consider slavery an evil, and are anxious to get rid of it.

The object of the writer is to demonstrate that the present high price of Cotton, Rice, and Negroes will be sustained. He says the demand for Cotton fabrics is constantly increasing—that other countries, owing to their despotic governments, as in Egypt, to the unsettled state of things as in Brazil, and the well known aversion of all natives of tropical climates to labor, will not meet the demand. He then goes on to say —'The South and Southwestern States to all the world, alone possess a climate fitted to the cultivation of cotton, and field laborers able to endure the climate, and *yet kept steadily at work* under the care of an intelligent white population. This is the true source of all our national prosperity. It is the slave institution of the South that alone gives motion to every wheel that moves from Maine to the Mississippi. So far from its being a curse, it is the greatest blessing a kind Providence ever bestowed both upon the masters and their slaves. It combines skill and economy with agricultural industry in a climate which would render the whole country a wilderness, if either masters or slaves were removed. This *combination* makes the South the garden of America; without the negroes, there would be no cultivation—without the master, there would be no skill, no industry, no order. A climate that will grow Cotton is fatal to a white man, if he attempts field labor in the summer. On this great truth rests the whole matter. This solves the question as to the price of Cotton. I have shown that the demand is increasing every day; and that a steady agriculture which a settled government, and the happy combination of negro labor, and the intelligence of an educated white owner, afford the only supply to be depended upon.'

Respecting the price of Negroes, the writer says:

'They are now *the cheapest capital in the world*. An hundred negroes will give fifty workers, each worker can earn $300 a year; that is $15,000 for the whole—if they cost $1,000 round, the investment would pay 15 per cent. besides the increase, and then [$1,000] will be their value as soon as capitalists consider the matter in its true light.'

It thus appears that an average lot of negroes including young and old, male and female, will pay the owner fifteen per cent, besides the increase on the high price of $1,000 each, all round. This is in South Carolina, but the further you go South and West, the more will negroes earn.

In Mississippi, they can raise twice as much Cotton with the same number of hands, as in South Carolina.

Perhaps these enormous profits may account for the pious gratitude that fills the breast of 'Agricola,' when he considers slavery the greatest blessing ever bestowed by a kind Providence.

Probably the *stupid* negro is not so *quick* in ascribing that system to a kind Providence, which shuts him up in hopeless ignorance, works him by fear of the whip like a dumb beast, and without wages, sells off, and separates his wife and children as though they were the cattle in a barn-yard; may be he has still so much of African heathenism remaining that he ignorantly ascribes it to the devil.

No doubt more work is done by these negroes who are '*kept steadily at work*' day after day, and year after year; no time being lost in school—nothing in visiting parents, children, or friends, no remission of toil suffered as they begin to descend the down hill of their weary pilgrimage—more work is done than if there was no 'intelligent' 'white master' to keep them at work and pocket their earnings, because *he can't* [wont] work.

We at the North will hardly believe that *every* wheel from Maine to the Mississippi, is kept in motion by the same system of Slavery—but that our merchants and manufacturers feel deeply interested in the profit of slave-labor, is proved by the great opposition amongst us, whenever an attempt is made to show the horrible injustice of it.

In the United States are 2,250,000 slaves. If they earn on an average what they do in South Carolina, it will be $150 each, or $337,500,000 per year. *Such* a system of *legalized* oppression and extortion, is found in 'the land of the free,' 'the home of the oppressed.'

Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the dominions of the autocrat of Russia!

Oh that my head were waters, and my eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the sins of my country. J. P. W.

The Texian army, it is now understood, are 3000 strong. Their encampment has been removed to the Garcite, near Matagorda Bay. The greatest harmony now prevails between the civil and military department of Texas.

From the New York Evening Post.

A STORY AND THE APPLICATION.

Some time since, a watchman going his rounds between ten and eleven o'clock in the evening, saw a robust fellow, 'tall of his hands,' cudgeling another, considerably his inferior in size and strength. The affair took place at the intersection of Broadway and Chatam streets; the poor man who suffered the beating was bleeding profusely at the nose and mouth; the Charley interposed, and as the watchhouse was not far distant, instead of leting the assailant go, he lodged him in it for the night.

In the morning he was brought before the police magistrate; the assault and battery was substantiated, and, the cudgel with which it was inflicted was produced. It was a stout oak stick, numerously and frightfully garnished with

Horns whelked and waved like the enraged sea.

The magistrate asked the offender what he had to say for himself.

'Sir,' answer he, with an air of great confidence, 'the man that was with me, Tom as I call him, is the most wicked, the most obstinate, and the most disorderly fellow in the world. He is a fanatic, and an agitator, a perfect incendiary.'

The magistrate desired him to explain.

'Why, sir, you see the case is here. I wanted to go by the way of Chatam-street, and Tom wanted to go by the way of Broadway. I told Tom that Catham-street was the nearest way home, but he wouldn't mind me, and he actually started to go up Broadway; so I had to cudgel him a little to bring him to his senses.

'Well, after beating him rather smartly, I let go his collar, and asked him again whether he would not be reasonable and go along with me, like a civil man and a peaceable citizen, instead of making disturbance and a noise in the street, by foolishly and stubbornly taking his own way. Would you believe it, sir, he not only refused to go with me, but set out on a trot up Broadway, and ran several rods before I could overtake him. Now, as I knew there was no law to compel him to go my way instead of his own, I even followed the example of our forefathers when they threw the tea overboard—I took the law into my own hands. I knocked his hat into the gutter with my cudgel, broke the bridge of his nose, and was engaged in striking out his eye teeth when the watchman came up. I told Tom plainly, while I was doing this, that it was all the effect of his own wickedness and folly.'

The magistrate interrupted the man at this part of his story, telling him that, according to his own account, he was wholly to blame, and must therefore be committed.

To blame,' rejoined he, 'who, I? Do not you see, sir, that Tom was to blame, and not I? It was all the effect of his wicked and perverse conduct. If he had taken my way, as I requested him, no disturbance whatever would have happened; we should have gone home together like a couple of brothers. I had no way to stop him, but by catching him and cudgeling him. So you see plainly, that his mad and diabolical determination to do as he pleased was the cause of this disturbance and disgrace; so it was no fault of mine.'

The magistrate was not convinced by this lucid reasoning, but sent the offender to prison, muttering at the injustice of the laws which condemned him for what was so obviously the fault of another.

The Cincinnati papers which attempted to lay the sin and disgrace of the late mob in that city at the door of the persons who suffered by them, argue in the very manner and almost in the very words used by the hero of the story we have related.

THE MARYLAND COLONIZATION SCHEME CARRIED OUT.

Our readers will remember the exterminating laws of Maryland, passed in 1831-2. They were counterparts of the Maryland Colonization Society, the leading friends of which were instrumental in procuring their enactment. The mission of the Messrs. R. J. and John Breckinridge into Connecticut and Massachusetts, was for the purpose of enlisting the patronage of Christian people in New England for the support of this scheme. They were met by Messrs. Phelps, May, and others, and the iniquity of the scheme fully exposed. Yet R. J. Breckinridge, in his late debate with George Thompson in Glasgow, attempted a defence of the scheme, and showed plainly that he was in favor of removing the free colored people by compulsion. Bearing these facts in mind, the following piece of news is highly important. It furnishes not the only recent instance in which clerical management has produced the oppressive legislative action of the enemies of freedom, and emboldened blood-thirsty mobs to set law, liberty and religion at defiance.—*Friend of Man.*

[From the Cambridge (Md.) Chronicle, Aug. 27.]

JUDGE LYNCH.

The reader may recollect a meeting was held in Brinkley's District, Somerset county, on the second of June, with the ultimate view to remove the free blacks from said district. It was resolved 'that all free negroes who should not leave the district before the first of September, would be considered as insurgents; and also that after that time, the laws of this State (which are now neglected) would be enforced against them.' We noticed the meeting at the time; but supposing it owed its origin to an excitement resulting from an exaggerated view of things, thought to hear no more of it. We were mistaken, however. It is the subject of an advertisement in Tuesday's Village Herald, setting forth that the resolutions adopted at the meeting will be carried into effect—that the free negroes remaining in the district will be expelled. Both the tone and the style of the advertisement seem somewhat calculated to excite surprise. We certainly did not expect such an emanation from any part of Somerset, knowing the deferential regard she has uniformly paid to the laws; and we would be slow to believe that the publication in question, which concludes in the following exceptionable manner, could receive the sanction of any considerable number of citizens.

'Judge Lynch will be in the district on the last day of this month, in order to commence his judicial services.—We trust his associates will not be far behind him, as we presume his judgeship will be crowded with business. We sincerely wish, however, that the free negroes (poor human creatures!) will not trust their cause to the venerable Judge, but make their escape before he arrives; for he will be compelled to do his duty, notwithstanding any law, custom, or usage, heretofore practised in any of the courts of this State to the contrary.'

An every day scene.—'Whoa—haw—gee—go along'—accompanied by divers applications of the whip—occasional shouts—hallooing—beating, &c. The poor oxen have a hard time of it. Is there not too much cruelty practised towards these useful and docile creatures? Abbot says, in his letters from Cuba, that he never saw an ox struck in the island—and that their strength, rapidity of motion and docility were very much superior to any thing he ever saw in America.—*Taunton Reporter.*

A late London paper notices as remarkable, that on a preceding day of the week, the nisi prius court at *York*, presented the spectacle of a *Jew* as foreman of the Jury.