

THE LIBERATOR: PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY. W. Williams, General Agent: No. 25 CORNHILL.

VOL. XI.—NO. 53.

REFUGES OF OPPRESSION.

Union was discussed, some years since, we were among the most earnest advocates of that measure.

Without being in any way interested in the fate of Texas, except as in our judgment her destiny and future position are inseparably connected with the welfare of the United States, we are free to confess, that the more we have reflected upon the subject, the more strongly we are convinced, that if Texas should consent to become a part and parcel of the United States, it is our duty to admit her.

In the first place, the best feelings of the philanthropist and the abolitionist should be in favor of the admission of Texas; because, the moment that she is admitted, the laws of the United States in regard to the slave trade, will necessarily extend over every portion of the admitted territory; and the consequent further introduction of slaves, from the West India Islands, will be prevented. We are well aware, that while Texas nominally prohibits the introduction of slaves, except from the United States, her great source of supply is the West India Islands, which are supplied directly from the coast of Africa, through that most infamous of all traffics, the slave trade. Admit Texas, then—throw over and around her the protection of our laws—and not only would we exclude the introduction of slaves from the West India Islands, but in the same measure we should exclude the introduction of slaves from the West India Islands upon the direct trade with Africa.

Then again, admit Texas to the United States, and inasmuch as our laws will prevent the introduction of slaves from the West India Islands, it follows as a matter of course, that the entire supply must be derived from the Slave States of our Union. We need not tell the intelligent reader, that the slave is always nursed with the greatest care, best clothed and fed, and treated with the greatest kindness, where his labor is most productive, and his intrinsic value the greatest. It is a knowledge of these facts, that has induced many humane slaveholders of Maryland and Virginia, to sell their slaves en masse to the south-western planter, at the same time that they refused to sell them to the inhabitants of the same State. These men will tell all who consult them, that owing to the more genial climate and more fertile lands of the south-west, the planter there necessarily finds labor far more profitable; and consequently that he is not only disposed to furnish him with better clothing and food, but that it becomes his interest to do so. It follows of course that every philanthropist and every abolitionist in the land—every individual who really feels, or pretends to feel an interest in the slave, and desires to better his condition—should be the advocates of any and every measure calculated to change his location from Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky and Missouri, to more southern regions and a more favorable climate.

Each Texas to the Union, and within ten years each and all of the States named, including North Carolina, would be compelled to abolish slavery from within her borders, for the simple reason, that they could not afford to keep them, their value would be much greater in the South-west. Necessity—absolute and imperative necessity—would compel the sale of their slaves to the south-western planter, because the entire produce of their labor, brought in competition with the slave labor of Louisiana and Texas, would not equal him in value. The value of their produce, such as cotton, sugar, rice, and other articles, would be less, and their interest upon their cost, such as the case—and that it would be, no man in his senses can question—should not every friend of the slave advocate the annexation of Texas to the Union, in order that the introduction of Texas to the Union, should not be a source of weakness, and at the same time the condition of our slaves be greatly benefited, by being transported to a more genial part of the country, where the increased value of their services would insure them better food and clothing, and greater attention on the part of their masters? And then, too, at the same time that these benefits are to be secured to the slave by a mere change of location, and the introduction of others into the country, we should be morally certain of adding not less than four and probably not less than six States to the list of free States. To this it is answered, that Texas would ultimately constitute as many slave States. Admit it. There are at present fourteen free and twelve slave States; add five to the number of free States, and our number would be nineteen, while the five slave States, ultimately to be formed out of Texas, would only supply the place of the slave States, made free States by the admission of Texas into the Union. Our position will not permit us to dwell upon this argument, and the inevitable consequences of some of the considerations presented, but the intelligent reader, seeking after truth, can very easily perceive the full bearing and tendency of the suggestions here made.

Western Quakerism I.

To the Quarterly and Monthly Meeting of Friends in Indiana Yearly Meeting, and to Friends individually.

Information having reached this meeting that some of our meetings had been opened for the purpose of holding anti-slavery meetings, and delivering lectures, we feel concerned to advise against such a practice, as being contrary to the general usage of society, and of hurtful tendency to our members.

The meeting has also been brought into painful concern on account of the publication and circulation, by members of this early meeting, of a recent address written by a member of our society, on the subject of one of our important testimonies, which had not undergone the examination of a meeting for sufferings, agreeably to the requisitions of our discipline. As such acts may affect the reputation of our religious society, and may disturb its harmony, which has been the case in the instance before us, we feel called upon to express our disapprobation of such proceedings. There are also some characters and style of Friends, whose object seems to be the promotion and advancement of our testimony against slavery; but not being under our supervision, we cannot, consistently, give them our sanction, nor be responsible in any way for their contents.

And as the subject of slavery is producing great excitement in our land, we again tenderly advise our dear friends not to join in association with those who do not profess to wait for divine direction in such important concerns; lest if we overact the part called for on our hands, we injure the righteous cause, and suffer loss ourselves; comparable to what is said of Ephraim of old, 'he hath mixed himself among the people; strangers have devoured his strength, and he knoweth it not.'

Address of Rev. Joseph Sturge to the members of the Society of Friends in America.

Free Labor Advocates, Protectionist and Jubilee, by Arnold Buffum.

Washington Correspondence of N. Y. Herald.

The Abolition Question.

It is singular that the prompt and satisfactory adjustment of the abolition question in the House of Representatives should not have attracted more attention from the press and the country generally.

The expectation was, that a long and violent struggle would precede any settlement of this matter. There is no topic so prolific of discord and bad blood, and the heat engendered by a protracted discussion would hardly have been allayed during the session. It was anticipated on all sides, and the abolitionists in the House and through the country were prepared to fan the embers in every possible way. But Mr. C. Johnson has disappointed these hopes. No man in the House is better skilled in Parliamentary tactics than Mr. J. By a

single adroit movement, he composed the whole difficulty, and put the question at rest for the present Congress, and probably for ever. The abolitionists proper are a contemptible faction in point of numbers, but, by mixing up a good deal of humbug about the right of petition, they have acquired a fictitious importance in Congress, which must not be despised. The motion of Mr. Johnson to lay the report of the committee on rules on the table, prevailed by a majority so decisive as to preclude all idea of bringing the question up again for two years, at least; and meantime, the returning good sense of the people will, it is hoped, round down all efforts to revive in the national legislature a subject so fruitless of agitation, and so unproductive for all useful purposes. If such shall be the result, the country will owe a heavy debt of gratitude to Mr. Johnson, in addition to that due for other eminent services previously rendered—a debt which, at the proper time, they will be ready and anxious to pay.

IRELAND.

Four Letters to the Rev. James Cantray, Methodist Episcopal Minister.

On the participation of the American Methodist Episcopal Church in the Sin of Slavery. By Robert Johnson, Member of the Methodist Society, Dublin. Dublin: Samuel J. Machen, D'Olier-st. 1841.

PREFACE.

This pamphlet is published by the Hibernian Anti-Slavery Society—not for the purpose of attacking or undermining the doctrines of Methodism either in this country or America. Its object has no reference in point of belief, but to the practice of a large and important body of Christian professors in the United States.

As long as Methodists abound among southern slaveholders, so long the church action of such Methodists must favor slavery. Slavery allows of no compromise. Where slavery prevails, the laws of God are set at naught, and murder, and lynch law flourish to a degree unknown in any other part of the habitable globe.

Methodists of Great Britain and Ireland! raise a solemn voice of warning to your American brethren, and suffer no one carrying the gospel message to appear amongst you, till he proves that he has, in his own country, done all in his power to remove from his highly professing church and people their sins of omission as well as of commission in this respect.

DUBLIN, Sept. 16th, 1841.

REVEREND SIR,

As a member of the Methodist Society in this city, allow me to call your attention to some expressions which you made in course of your sermon, in Whitefriar-street Chapel, on Sunday evening, the 5th inst. You stated that man was a being so formed, and so constituted, that he could not equal him in material universe besides; and you asked the question, 'why is it we do not estimate a man's value by his height, or his weight of flesh, and blood, and bones?' and you answered, 'the true value of a man is in his immortal soul, that stamps dignity upon his character, and gives to him an indelible worth; when you used these expressions, you were not aware that the right of its members to carry on a traffic in human flesh, and blood, and bones; and to hold property in, and sell that noble being, MAN, whom you stated to have been created in the image of God, and whom the whole material universe itself cannot equal in value, for the paltry sum of a few pounds or a few dollars, to satisfy the avariciousness of some slaveholder in America, that recognizes the right of its members to sell one another—to sell slaves who are members of the same church with themselves? If those queries be answered in the affirmative, such a state of things but ill agrees with your noble conceptions of the dignity of man, and of the infinite value you place upon him. I have heard that you have told some of your friends in Dublin, how much you and they are doing in America, for the abolition of slavery; how they are abolitionists, and supporting newspapers to advocate the cause of abolition and the rights of the slave. How you could, consistently with truth, make such a statement, I cannot conceive. That some individual members of the Society are doing so, I admit; but, as a body, the Society are decidedly opposed to it. I know there are men in America, who, despite the fulminations of the anti-slavery press, and the unflinching advocacy of the unflinching ranks of Methodism; but Methodism, as well as nearly every other Ism, gives its sanction and support to slavery. And I am sure many of these facts connected with their proceedings on the slavery question cannot have escaped your own observation and knowledge.

In the General Conference which met in May, 1836, in Cincinnati, in the free State of Ohio, it was resolved and adopted by the delegates of the Annual Conference in the General Conference assembled, that they disapprove in the most unqualified sense the conduct of the two members of the General Conference, who are reported to have lectured in this city recently upon and in favor of modern abolitionism;—that they are decidedly opposed to modern abolitionism. This modern abolitionism, sir, means neither more nor less than that declaring slavery to be a sin, and that the slave is a creature of God, and that he is to be treated as such. And in the Ohio Annual Conference, which met a short time before, the following resolution was adopted:—Resolved, That those brethren and citizens of the North, who resist the abolition movement with firmness and moderation, are the true friends of the church, the slaves of the South, and the Constitution of our common country. The New-York Annual Conference, which met in June, 1836, resolved, 'That no one ought to be elected to the office of deacon or elder in our church, unless he give a pledge to the Conference that he will refrain from agitating the church with discussions upon the subject of abolitionism.' With regard to Zion's Watchman, the only newspaper in any way connected with the Society, which they feared would not be silent upon the subject of abolitionism, it was resolved, 'That we disapprove of the members of the Society, who are engaged in giving countenance, patronizing, or in any way giving countenance to a paper called Zion's Watchman.' And in 1838, the same Conference resolved, 'as the sense of this Conference, that any of its members or preachers who shall patronize Zion's Watchman, either by writing in commendation of its character or circulating it, recommending it to any of our people, or by procuring subscribers, or by collecting or remitting monies, shall be deemed guilty of insubordination, and dealt with accordingly.'

These are the resolutions passed in the free States, taken from minutes of the conferences, which show the non-Christian part which ministers of religion have taken upon the slavery question in the Methodist church of America. But I must trouble you still further with an extract taken from the minutes of the Georgia Annual Conference. 'Resolved unanimously, that it is the sense of the Georgia Annual Conference, that slavery, as it exists in the United States, is not a moral evil; I think there is nothing more wanting to fix the guilt of slavery upon your church; to prove that its ministers are very guilty concerning their brother. But you have in this country professed yourself an abolitionist. If so, when the above resolutions were passed, did you ever to be a slaveholder? Was your voice heard through the length and breadth of the land, crying for equal rights for the colored people of the

United States, to which they are entitled to be as men and as Christians, and deprecating such unchristian proceedings in an assembly of men calling themselves the ministers of Jesus Christ? Until you act as a decided slave, it is in vain for you to persecute the people of Dublin that you are an abolitionist. If such a system as slavery were recognized and acted upon by persons professing Paganism and Mahometanism, we might perhaps look on and be silent, without incurring responsibility; but when it exists in the heart of a nation professing christianity, and when it is supported and cherished in the very bosom of the church, it is here that every member should begin to feel his own accountability, and to know that he can no longer be an unconcerned spectator and be guiltless.

I have seen that you stated that Charles L. Remond, a colored American, who lately lectured on American slavery in this city, has given an unfair representation of the case of the General Conference held at Baltimore, in 1840, passing a resolution forbidding any of their preachers receiving the testimony of colored persons in the trial of white persons in the courts of the slave States. I will give you the words of the resolution as it was carried, and you and those who have heard his lectures can judge how far he has been guilty of misrepresentation, and how far the Baltimore General Conference are justified in passing such a resolution. Resolved, That it is inexpedient and unjustifiable for any preacher among us to admit of persons of color to give testimony on the trial of white persons in any State where they are denied the rights of citizenship. The only pretext that can be offered to justify the members of the General Conference in passing such a resolution, would be the interference of the civil law in cases ecclesiastical; nor would even that justify them were it true. Are men as Christians, and are Christian churches, bound to sanction and obey every unjust and iniquitous law which a corrupt legislature may enact? If you only apply the same rule of interpretation to those laws which are denied to the poorers that you which you apply to the eighth commandment, and to those texts which enjoin the obedience of children to their parents in all things, you must come to the conclusion, that in all cases where the law of the land, or the magistrate, commands any thing contrary to the law of God, we are not bound not to concur, but are bound to obey God rather than man. Had the General Conference acted as a convention of Christian men, in the decision of such a resolution, they would have passed one declaring such a law on the part of the legislature to be unjust, unchristian, and tyrannical. Although in America there is no alliance recognized between church and state; no unqualified league by which the state pledges itself to support and uphold whatever church it may chance in its erring wisdom to light upon; and by which the church in its turn pledges itself to support the laws and institutions of the State, no matter how unjust or arbitrary they may be; yet the churches of America virtually perform their part as faithfully as if such a league really existed, in lending their sanction and support to those laws which are for the support and stability of slavery.

Now, sir, I put it to you, that church be the church of God, or that man be a disciple of Jesus Christ, who would teach that slavery is a sin, and that it is a breach of the moral law, that which is doing unto others as we would not that they should do unto us, is not a breach of the moral law? Remember that the scriptures tell us, 'that whosoever shall break the least of these commandments and teach men so shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; and he that shall shall take away his part out of the Lamb's book of life, and out of the holy city.' If slavery be contrary to the precepts of the moral law, and contrary to the spirit and precepts of the new dispensation, the above denunciation must fall heavily upon those who are trying to persuade the people of America that there is nothing in slavery contrary to the true spirit and doctrines of christianity. I am sure, can you, believing slavery to be a sin, maintain, in remaining silent and acquiescing your conduct to the decision and control of a convention that could so far become recalcitrant to the cause of truth and justice, as to pass resolutions such as I have quoted above, and forbid its preachers to disturb the peace and tranquillity of the church with agitating such questions? I ask you, can you be consistent in holding connexion with a church that will receive into its bosom the covetous and the extortioner, the man of the American slaveholder, who the scriptures call a brother be a fornicator, or a scoffer, or an idolator, or a raller, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one, no, not to eat? Where, sir, is the consistency of any man, or body of men—where, sir, is the consistency of that church that would excommunicate for the sin of drunkenness, fornication, or idolatry, and would not equally exclude the slaveholder, who is guilty of the same sins? I am sure, you will not be able to give a satisfactory answer to these queries. Let it not be species of conventionalism and expediency, which you too harsh or unchristian. If any man under heaven deserve the name of villain, it is the American slaveholder. It is the man who will seize with ruffian grasp, as his property, the new-born infant, coming from the hand of its Creator, full of the spotless innocence of heaven, whom nature and nature's God designed for freedom, and converts it into an article of merchandise; or, if any church upon God's earth deserve the name of apostate, it is that church which will support, sanction, and practise such a system of deep-wrought iniquity.

Nor let it be said that any expression here used is designed to militate against Methodism. If called upon, I would be the last to shrink from defending its interests or any of its peculiar doctrines against the assaults of infidelity, or the corruptions of a spurious Christianity; but I shall ever as strenuously bear an honest testimony against the hypocritical spirit which so highly distinguished that venerable man; and who have fallen from that true principle which his first followers so eminently possessed. The first Methodists of America held slavery in the deepest abhorrence; and any member convicted of selling slaves was excluded the society. They declared slavery to be contrary to the laws of God, man, and nature, hurtful to society, and doing unto others what we would not that they should do unto us.

But while I charge the guilt of slavery upon the society in America, I am sorry to have to acknowledge that the society here is not wholly free from the baneful contagion. Instead of our exerting an influence upon the society in America, which is one of the arguments used by those who would still hold religious fellowship with American slaveholders, it is to be feared that the society here has exerted an influence upon us—if indeed, we ever had just acquaintance with the subject, which I am inclined to doubt. Only a few weeks ago, the society here refused the law of one of their meeting houses to Charles L. Remond, a colored American, to hold an anti-slavery meeting free from every thing connected with sectarianism; to give the people of Dublin, of every persuasion, information on the state of the abolition movement; and to enlist their sympathies and interests on behalf of the slaves of the United States;—because, forsooth, some Irish and plaster worshippers in the society, considered the object not to be one of a purely religious character. Now, sir, such an expression, coming from men who tell you they believe in the sin of slavery, and wish for the emancipation of the slave, if it conveys them not to the same feelings, as if they were the enemies of the oppressed, does convey them to the feelings of a hypocrite, does convey them to the feelings of a man who is worshipped in spirit, but not in truth? Hoping for exclusive religious worship to be used only for convenience; they have no

more inherent sanctity than other houses built of the same materials and all peculiar or religious respect or deference paid to them in some sort idolatrous.

One of the leaders of the society here, in a conversation which I had with him on the subject, attempted to prove from the epistle to Philemon, that that individual was a slaveholder, and that Paul finding his runaway slave, sent him back to his master; so that Paul must of course have acknowledged the right of Christians to hold slaves. From anything I can gather from the epistle, if ever Onesimus were a slave to Philemon, (which cannot be proved.) Paul did not exhort him to receive him as such on his return, but to receive him as a brother beloved; not even as a servant, but above a servant; and if he had wronged him in any thing, or owed him anything, he desired it to be placed to his account.

I remain, Sir, your sincere friend, And, I trust, christian brother.

ROBERT JOHNSON.

Erin go Bragh!

A meeting of the opponents of slavery was recently held in the Royal Exchange, Dublin. James Haughton, the well-known philanthropist, presided on the occasion, and in the course of some excellent remarks said—

Slavery such as I have described to you exists, to an immense extent, in America. That highly professing people, who talk so much about liberty, and affect to despise the institutions of every other country which has blazoned upon its standard one of the noblest declarations which has ever been promulgated, but which they have made a mere parchment record, having no place in their affections;—that people have degraded themselves by a foul contact with slavery such as I have described; and it is to this degraded land that thousands of our countrymen are annually emigrating, unconscious that a great blot rests upon the land of their adoption, and that they are to be numbered among the millions of their fellow-men in bondage merely on account of the dark color of their skins, their name will be dishonored on the earth. Let us endeavor to wash our hands clear of this wickedness, by telling every slaveholding American who comes among us, that we can hold no friendly communication with him, until we consider the crime of which he is guilty as degrading as any of the crimes which are considered among men every where as rendering their perpetrators infamous. Mr. Haughton here took a rapid survey of the condition of slaves in the southern States of the Union, and gave some account of the practice of breeding slaves for sale. He drew the attention of his audience to some measures in which we might co-operate with anti-slavery societies in America for the overthrow of this gigantic evil, particularly urging the propriety of a total disuse of useless and expensive luxuries, which could be readily dispensed with, and the giving up of which would evince some disposition, on our parts, to be really alive in the good work.

The meeting was next addressed by our beloved countryman, Richard D. Webb and Richard Allen—the latter of whom said—

My friends, I am anxious that we should really understand all the wrongs—all the guilt of slavery. We do not comprehend it. If we did, we would not be so inactive. What a glaring violation is it not of the divine law! Is not a daring usurpation to hold that being in bondage, of whom it is declared that 'He made him a little lower than the angels, and crowned him with glory and honor?' Man was indeed, set over all the things of the earth; but he who usurps the authority of the Creator, holding property in his fellow-man, how dangerous a position is his! (Hear.) Slavery, I repeat, is the very embodiment of all that is wrong, as regards the improvement or amelioration of the world. What are we aiming at in our exertions to improve our fellow-man both here and abroad? Is it not to increase the comforts of the poor, even if it be at a little expense to the rich? Do we not want that the hard-working producer should have a little more of the wealth which he so manfully contributes to create? And what is the effect of slavery? To rob the millions into the dust, that the few may riot in wealth, and lust, and wickedness; to rob the poor man of his all—emphatically his all. Yes, my friends, I have no hesitation in saying, that of all robbery, the robbery of man by his fellow-man is the worst, and that every slaveholder is essentially and bona fide a man-stealer. And what robbery can compare with man-stealing? A man may steal my hat, my coat, my money—all my earthly property; but he who steals a man, is guilty of that crime which steals all. (Hear, hear.) I am anxious, too, that we should understand the real state of slavery in America. But first I must allude to a remark I sometimes hear. It is this—'we have slaves in Ireland as well as in America—and you ought to work at home. I pity the man who holds such an opinion. I wrote as a motto for the bazaar, contribution going to America—'We have many poor, but we have slaves at home, and place himself in the condition of one of the three millions in America, or of the five millions of slaves in India, our fellow-subjects, and he will blush to make the comparison. (Loud cheers.) I have spoken of America. How would that noble country rise, were it not for slavery! It is from no low motives that I often raise my voice against her special sin—but because I feel that it is that which mars her onward progress. What other sinning might does she not present? The other day—only the other day—last month, what humiliating scenes were enacted in Massachusetts, in dragging colored people out of the railway cars, the 'nigger car' assigned them. But I rejoice to say that the great bulk of the passengers seemed to detest such wickedness. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. James Henry Webb next addressed the meeting. He read some extracts bearing on the subject of slavery, and commented on them, much to the satisfaction of a large audience, many of whom declared their increased abhorrence of slavery; and several voluntarily promised to give up the use of tobacco altogether, for the sake of their poor oppressed brethren. We left the meeting, highly pleased, and fully satisfied that our people need no information on the subject of slavery, to make them detest it in all its hideous forms.

SELECTIONS.

Slavery in British India.

Lord Brougham has recently made a powerful speech in the House of Lords, on this subject.

After stating the law on the subject of slavery, and expressing his fears that British subjects had unwittingly exposed themselves to its penalties, by engaging in the slave trade, his lordship read extracts from the report of the India law commission, which were in relation to India. These extracts of the subject of slavery in India. These extracts of the subject of slavery in India. These extracts of the subject of slavery in India.

Our glorious women see this, and hence it is, among other causes, that Mrs. W. Chapman, Abby Kallay, and others sit in the tea-table field, side by side with the Reformed Drunkards. The enterprise is one—whether the Reformers see it or not, its great ultimatum is to rot the land for the deliverance of the slave, and the downfall of all tyranny. God speed the day.

HARD TIMES. Southern slavery, alias patriotism, is the enemy. If you ask almost any broken merchant in Paris-street, how he came to fail, the answer is, 'Because of my unpaid southern debt.'

From the N. Y. Courier and Enquirer.

Texas.

There is reason to believe that at some period during the present session of Congress, the question of admitting Texas into the Union will be submitted for consideration. This is a question of no ordinary importance; and in our opinion, when considered by the people aside from all prejudices, cannot fail to be regarded with favor.

The question of admitting Texas into the

Union was discussed, some years since, we were among the most earnest advocates of that measure.

Without being in any way interested in the fate of Texas, except as in our judgment her destiny and future position are inseparably connected with the welfare of the United States, we are free to confess, that the more we have reflected upon the subject, the more strongly we are convinced, that if Texas should consent to become a part and parcel of the United States, it is our duty to admit her.

In the first place, the best feelings of the philanthropist and the abolitionist should be in favor of the admission of Texas; because, the moment that she is admitted, the laws of the United States in regard to the slave trade, will necessarily extend over every portion of the admitted territory; and the consequent further introduction of slaves, from the West India Islands, will be prevented. We are well aware, that while Texas nominally prohibits the introduction of slaves, except from the United States, her great source of supply is the West India Islands, which are supplied directly from the coast of Africa, through that most infamous of all traffics, the slave trade. Admit Texas, then—throw over and around her the protection of our laws—and not only would we exclude the introduction of slaves from the West India Islands, but in the same measure we should exclude the introduction of slaves from the West India Islands upon the direct trade with Africa.

Then again, admit Texas to the United States, and inasmuch as our laws will prevent the introduction of slaves from the West India Islands, it follows as a matter of course, that the entire supply must be derived from the Slave States of our Union. We need not tell the intelligent reader, that the slave is always nursed with the greatest care, best clothed and fed, and treated with the greatest kindness, where his labor is most productive, and his intrinsic value the greatest. It is a knowledge of these facts, that has induced many humane slaveholders of Maryland and Virginia, to sell their slaves en masse to the south-western planter, at the same time that they refused to sell them to the inhabitants of the same State. These men will tell all who consult them, that owing to the more genial climate and more fertile lands of the south-west, the planter there necessarily finds labor far more profitable; and consequently that he is not only disposed to furnish him with better clothing and food, but that it becomes his interest to do so. It follows of course that every philanthropist and every abolitionist in the land—every individual who really feels, or pretends to feel an interest in the slave, and desires to better his condition—should be the advocates of any and every measure calculated to change his location from Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky and Missouri, to more southern regions and a more favorable climate.

Each Texas to the Union, and within ten years each and all of the States named, including North Carolina, would be compelled to abolish slavery from within her borders, for the simple reason, that they could not afford to keep them, their value would be much greater in the South-west. Necessity—absolute and imperative necessity—would compel the sale of their slaves to the south-western planter, because the entire produce of their labor, brought in competition with the slave labor of Louisiana and Texas, would not equal him in value. The value of their produce, such as cotton, sugar, rice, and other articles, would be less, and their interest upon their cost, such as the case—and that it would be, no man in his senses can question—should not every friend of the slave advocate the annexation of Texas to the Union, in order that the introduction of Texas to the Union, should not be a source of weakness, and at the same time the condition of our slaves be greatly benefited, by being transported to a more genial part of the country, where the increased value of their services would insure them better food and clothing, and greater attention on the part of their masters? And then, too, at the same time that these benefits are to be secured to the slave by a mere change of location, and the introduction of others into the country, we should be morally certain of adding not less than four and probably not less than six States to the list of free States. To this it is answered, that Texas would ultimately constitute as many slave States. Admit it. There are at present fourteen free and twelve slave States; add five to the number of free States, and our number would be nineteen, while the five slave States, ultimately to be formed out of Texas, would only supply the place of the slave States, made free States by the admission of Texas into the Union. Our position will not permit us to dwell upon this argument, and the inevitable consequences of some of the considerations presented, but the intelligent reader, seeking after truth, can very easily perceive the full bearing and tendency of the suggestions here made.

Western Quakerism I.

To the Quarterly and Monthly Meeting of Friends in Indiana Yearly Meeting, and to Friends individually.

Information having reached this meeting that some of our meetings had been opened for the purpose of holding anti-slavery meetings, and delivering lectures, we feel concerned to advise against such a practice, as being contrary to the general usage of society, and of hurtful tendency to our members.

The meeting has also been brought into painful concern on account of the publication and circulation, by members of this early meeting, of a recent address written by a member of our society, on the subject of one of our important testimonies, which had not undergone the examination of a meeting for sufferings, agreeably to the requisitions of our discipline. As such acts may affect the reputation of our religious society, and may disturb its harmony, which has been the case in the instance before us, we feel called upon to express our disapprobation of such proceedings. There are also some characters and style of Friends, whose object seems to be the promotion and advancement of our testimony against slavery; but not being under our supervision, we cannot, consistently, give them our sanction, nor be responsible in any way for their contents.

And as the subject of slavery is producing great excitement in our land, we again tenderly advise our dear friends not to join in association with those who do not profess to wait for divine direction in such important concerns; lest if we overact the part called for on our hands, we injure the righteous cause, and suffer loss ourselves; comparable to what is said of Ephraim of old, 'he hath mixed himself among the people; strangers have devoured his strength, and he knoweth it not.'

Address of Rev. Joseph Sturge to the members of the Society of Friends in America.

Free Labor Advocates, Protectionist and Jubilee, by Arnold Buffum.

Washington Correspondence of N. Y. Herald.

The Abolition Question.

It is singular that the prompt and satisfactory adjustment of the abolition question in the House of Representatives should not have attracted more attention from the press and the country generally.

The expectation was, that a long and violent struggle would precede any settlement of this matter. There is no topic so prolific of discord and bad blood, and the heat engendered by a protracted discussion would hardly have been allayed during the session. It was anticipated on all sides, and the abolitionists in the House and through the country were prepared to fan the embers in every possible way. But Mr. C. Johnson has disappointed these hopes. No man in the House is better skilled in Parliamentary tactics than Mr. J. By a

single adroit movement, he composed the whole difficulty, and put the question at rest for the present Congress, and probably for ever. The abolitionists proper are a contemptible faction in point of numbers, but, by mixing up a good deal of humbug about the right of petition, they have acquired a fictitious importance in Congress, which must not be despised. The motion of Mr. Johnson to lay the report of the committee on rules on the table, prevailed by a majority so decisive as to preclude all idea of bringing the question up again for two years, at least; and meantime, the returning good sense of the people will, it is hoped, round down all efforts to revive in the national legislature a subject so fruitless of agitation, and so unproductive for all useful purposes. If such shall be the result, the country will owe a heavy debt of gratitude to Mr. Johnson, in addition to that due for other eminent services previously rendered—a debt which, at the proper time, they will be ready and anxious to pay.

IRELAND.

Four Letters to the Rev. James Cantray, Methodist Episcopal Minister.

On the participation of the American Methodist Episcopal Church in the Sin of Slavery. By Robert Johnson, Member of the Methodist Society, Dublin. Dublin: Samuel J. Machen, D'Olier-st. 1841.

PREFACE.

This pamphlet is published by the Hibernian Anti-Slavery Society—not for the purpose of attacking or undermining the doctrines of Methodism either in this country or America. Its object has no reference in point of belief, but to the practice of a large and important body of Christian professors in the United States.

As long as Methodists abound among southern slaveholders, so long the church action of such Methodists must favor slavery. Slavery allows of no compromise. Where slavery prevails, the laws of God are set at naught, and murder, and lynch law flourish to a degree unknown in any other part of the habitable globe.

Methodists of Great Britain and Ireland! raise a solemn voice of warning to your American brethren, and suffer no one carrying the gospel message to appear amongst you, till he proves that he has, in his own country, done all in his power to remove from his highly professing church and people their sins of omission as well as of commission in this respect.

DUBLIN, Sept. 16th, 1841.

REVEREND SIR,

As a member of the Methodist Society in this city, allow me to call your attention to some expressions which you made in course of your sermon, in Whitefriar-street Chapel, on Sunday evening, the 5th inst. You stated that man was a being so formed, and so constituted, that he could not equal him in material universe besides; and you asked the question, 'why is it we do not estimate a man's value by his height, or his weight of flesh, and blood, and bones?' and you answered, 'the true value of a man is in his immortal soul, that stamps dignity upon his character, and gives to him an indelible worth; when you used these expressions, you were not aware that the right of its members to carry on a traffic in human flesh, and blood, and bones; and to hold property in, and sell that noble being, MAN, whom you stated to have been created in the image of God, and whom the whole material universe itself cannot equal in value, for the paltry sum of a few pounds or a few dollars, to satisfy the avariciousness of some slaveholder in America, that recognizes the right of its members to sell one another—to sell slaves who are members of the same church with themselves? If those queries be answered in the affirmative, such a state of things but ill agrees with your noble conceptions of the dignity of man, and of the infinite value you place upon him. I have heard that you have told some of your friends in Dublin, how much you and they are doing in America, for the abolition of slavery; how they are abolitionists, and supporting newspapers to advocate the cause of abolition and the rights of the slave. How you could, consistently with truth, make such a statement, I cannot conceive. That some individual members of the Society are doing so, I admit; but, as a body, the Society are decidedly opposed to it. I know there are men in America, who, despite the fulminations of the anti-slavery press, and the unflinching advocacy of the unflinching ranks of Methodism; but Methodism, as well as nearly every other Ism, gives its sanction and support to slavery. And I am sure many of these facts connected with their proceedings on the slavery question cannot have escaped your own observation and knowledge.

In the General Conference which met in May, 1836, in Cincinnati, in the free State of Ohio, it was resolved and adopted by the delegates of the Annual Conference in the General Conference assembled, that they disapprove in the most unqualified sense the conduct of the two members of the General Conference, who are reported to have lectured in this city recently upon and in favor of modern abolitionism;—that they are decidedly opposed to modern abolitionism. This modern abolitionism, sir, means neither more nor less than that declaring slavery to be a sin, and that the slave is a creature of God, and that he is to be treated as such. And in the Ohio Annual Conference, which met a short time before, the following resolution was adopted:—Resolved, That those brethren and citizens of the North, who resist the abolition movement with firmness and moderation, are the true friends of the church, the slaves of the South, and the Constitution of our common country. The New-York Annual Conference, which met in June, 1836, resolved, 'That no one ought to be elected to the office of deacon or elder in our church, unless he give a pledge to the Conference that he will refrain from agitating the church with discussions upon the subject of abolitionism.' With regard to Zion's Watchman, the only newspaper in any way connected with the Society, which they feared would not be silent upon the subject of abolitionism, it was resolved, 'That we disapprove of the members of the Society, who are engaged in giving countenance, patronizing, or in any way giving countenance to a paper called Zion's Watchman.' And in 1838, the same Conference resolved, 'as the sense of this Conference, that any of its members or preachers who shall patronize Zion's Watchman, either by writing in commendation of its





