

From one side we hear a warning 'Sign the Pledge, and from the other an invitation the 'gin-gins'...

But there are other tracts on other subjects in the Tract Society's window. For instance, there is one 'A Strange Thing; and there is another 'Will it Ever be Known?'

MR. GARRISON REVIEWED.

We were somewhat surprised to hear that Rev. J. R. Johnson, pastor of the Universalist Society in Milford, had preached a discourse...

So, for liberty to the land and all the inhabitants thereof, will the church pray and labor. For this I am hopeful, and for this consumption so devoutly to be wished...

Two processes for the abolition of slavery are described in this extract: one the process of 'our radical friends,' Mr. Garrison and his condisciples...

But what is Mr. Johnson's approved process for the abolition of slavery? 'Simply this: the slaveholder will be converted to free labor, because he will see more money will be made by it.'

But what is Mr. Johnson's approved process for the abolition of slavery? 'Simply this: the slaveholder will be converted to free labor, because he will see more money will be made by it.'

But we proceed to remark, that Mr. Johnson, in other parts of the same discourse, professes and claims credit for a kind of anti-slavery quite inconsistent with the mere anti-protest just considered.

I know, said the speaker, that the Old School Presbyterians and the Episcopal church, to a great extent, are open to the charge of being pro-slavery.

We should like to know what the Old School Presbyterians, Episcopalians, or anybody else, have ever said or done contrary to Mr. Johnson's process for abolishing slavery.

Again, Mr. Johnson refers to the protest of the three thousand clergymen against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, as a great anti-slavery testimony pre-eminently commendable in itself, and powerful in its effect.

But it is idle to play scenes. Slaveholding is a crime per se, or no crime. If a crime at all, it is one of the greatest that can be committed by man.

Garrison has taken his position, and he has a straight line through whatever opposes, without respect of institutions, persons, places or times.

DISGRACEFUL. The Republican wing of the Constitutional Convention of Minnesota, now in session, has, by a majority vote, disfranchised the colored people of the Territory.

What do we see? A majority of the Republican delegates to a Convention called on purpose to frame an organic law for the establishment of justice, and for securing the blessings of liberty, lose sight of their noble mission and their oft-repeated principles.

But the Buchananians! It is said, 'have raised this cry of Nigger! Nigger! Nigger!' and we must take the wind out of their sails!

It is true the party to be invited to vote on this question, are at liberty to strike out the odious provision, but we cannot see that the Convention thereby dodges the responsibility of its insertion.

The Liberator.

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS. BOSTON, SEPTEMBER 11, 1857.

Whereas, it must be obvious to all, that the American Union is constantly becoming more and more divided, by Slavery, into two distinct and antagonistic nations, between whom harmony is impossible, and even ordinary intercourse is becoming dangerous.

And, whereas, Slavery has now gained entire control over the three branches of our National Government, Executive, Judiciary, and Legislature, has so interpreted the Constitution as to deny the right of Congress to establish freedom even in the territories, and by the same process has removed all legal protection from a large portion of the people of the free States, and has inflicted, at many times and places, outrages far greater than those which our fathers rose in arms to repel.

And, whereas, there seems no probability that the future will, in these respects, be different from the past, under existing State relations.

The undersigned respectfully invite their fellow-citizens of the Free States to meet in Convention, at CLEVELAND, (Ohio), on WEDNESDAY and THURSDAY, October 28th and 29th, 1857, to consider the practicability, probability, and expediency of a separation of the Free and Slave States, and to take such other measures as the condition of the times may require.

The Committee, to whom the duty of making all necessary arrangements for this Convention was entrusted, has decided upon CLEVELAND, (Ohio), as the place, and WEDNESDAY and THURSDAY, October 28th and 29th, as the time for holding it.

Several thousand names have been received, although no systematic measures whatsoever have been taken to procure signatures. Unquestionably, by a very little effort, many thousands more might easily be obtained.

New England, as yet, is behind the West in the interest manifested in the Convention, judging from the number of those who have signed the Call; yet, in preparation of mind to give it a strong support, we doubt not she takes the lead.

See how the chains of Southern mastery and over-seerism, usurpation and tyranny, are strengthening, day by day! First, read the pregnant Letter of Pres. Buchanan to Prof. Silliman and other eminent citizens of Connecticut, with regard to Kansas!

Simultaneous with the appearance of this ominous Letter comes the intelligence from Kansas, that, at a recent convention of the Free State party, it was resolved to waive all their scruples, and to participate in the October election, along with the border ruffians, relying upon Gov. Walker's promise of fair play at the polls!

Further—it is announced that Judge BENJAMIN R. CURTIS has resigned his seat on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States. His plea is, a wish to attend to his private and pecuniary matters; but there is no doubt that such a pressure has been brought to bear upon him, in consequence of his able and upright decision in the Dred Scott case; that he cannot stand under it, and he ignobly beats a retreat.

A venerable statesman of this Commonwealth was heard to denounce, in the strongest language, Judge Curtis's resignation, as an act of most culpable desertion of his post and duty, to which he had allowed himself to be driven by the sneers and frowns of his Southern associates and former intimates at Washington; saying, also, that, if the compensation of the office were inadequate, that fact was unworthy of notice or thought for a moment, and that he (Curtis) should have stood, and starved there, if necessary.

DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION. ROCK ISLAND Co., Ill., Aug. 30, 1857.

DEAR SIR,—I enclose you the 'Call for a Convention' to discuss the propriety of dissolving this Confederation, with my signature thereto.

In signing this Call, let me say that I am opposed to dissolving the Union, because I do not deem it necessary to abolish slavery. Why, then, some of my old friends may ask, put your name to a 'treasonable' document emanating from 'fanatics'? I reply, because a large majority of the people of all parties in politics, and all sects in religion, are such fanatical and idolatrous worshippers at the shrine of the Union, or 'nation,' as they call this Confederacy, that they either forget the reserved rights of the States, or the sacred rights of humanity. In my humble opinion, the Federal Constitution, strictly construed, gives no sanction or support to slavery, in any one conceivable form. This may be an error, but if so, it is on the side of humanity, and is fully sustained, as genuine Democracy, by the following extract from the Virginia resolutions of 1798:—

'That this Assembly doth explicitly and peremptorily declare, that it views the powers of the Federal Government as resulting from the compact to which the States are parties, as limited by the plain sense and intention of the instrument constituting that compact.'

If it is treason for any portion of the States to secede from the Union, then we live under a despotism as cruel as ever cursed the civilized world; and the sublime and cheering doctrine of the Declaration of Independence is sheer nonsense. The absurd theory that these States form 'one nation' acquired its present popularity from Gen. Jackson's 'Proclamation'—a Proclamation which he had no more right to issue than had the Czar of Russia, a Proclamation which falsifies historical facts, and converts this Confederacy of free, sovereign and independent States into a consolidated despotism, leaving not even the shadow of the original States. What is a State? Let our own learned lexicographer answer: 'A State—a kingdom or republic.' If this definition be correct, and it is also true that these thirty-one States, as they are yet termed, are consolidated into 'one nation,' it follows, as an irresistible conclusion from the premises, that every vestige of the original States is annihilated. What mockery, then, to talk of 'States,'—not to mention 'free, sovereign and independent States'! The most talented advocate of this false theory cannot escape the result to which it leads. I say false theory, because the Federal Constitution itself asserts its falsity, by asserting the existence of the States; and if they are States, then they are 'kingdoms or republics'; and while they remain such, it is sheer nonsense to say that they constitute another State, and thus form thirty-one instead of thirty-one States. But it is said that 'a State is not a nation.' Then a State is not a State. But the fact is incontrovertible, that State or Commonwealth is but another name for a nation.

Now, what is a nation? The same distinguished lexicographer defines the word 'nation' to mean, 'a body of people under one government.' The people of these confederated States, as a whole, are not 'under one government.' This point cannot be controverted. The people of Massachusetts are under one government; and thus, according to Mr. Webster, are a 'nation.'

Now for the facts in the case. The State Government, in connection with the Federal Government, constitutes a whole Government, under which the people of Massachusetts live, and so of every State in the Union. That it takes the two systems to constitute a whole government for each State, Mr. Jefferson has so clearly shown that no sane man will gainsay his impregnable position. To sustain this false theory, the 'Proclamation' and its devotees assert, without a particle of proof, that the allegiance of their [the States] citizens was transferred, in the first instance, to the government of the United States. Who ever heard of 'allegiance' being due, under our republican system, to government? Allegiance is due to the sovereign power, let that reside where it may. If sovereignty resides in the people of each State, as a separate community, then allegiance is due to this sovereign power. If, on the other hand, sovereignty resides with the people of the United States, as one community, then allegiance is due to that sovereign authority; but it can in no case be due to government, which is the mere agent of the sovereign people.

Now, where does Massachusetts assert that sovereignty resides, and to whom the allegiance of her citizens is due? Her Constitution requires the following test oath: 'I truly and sincerely acknowledge, testify and declare, that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is, and of right ought to be, a free, sovereign and independent State; and I will bear true faith and allegiance to said Commonwealth.'

Again: the 'Proclamation,' to bolster up this false theory, insinuates that sovereignty is divided between the States, as States, and the Federal Government, and its devotees shout 'Amen' even to this absurdity. Now, as allegiance cannot be due, by the same people, to two sovereigns, so neither can sovereignty be divided. The word 'sovereign,' Webster defines to be 'supreme in power; a supreme ruler.' Sovereignty, then, is of necessity indivisible, and will not bear comparison, as—Massachusetts is a sovereign State, the United States is a more sovereign 'nation,' and the Federal Government is most sovereign. Of course, for, in defiance of the Federal Constitution, construed in accordance with the good old Democratic doctrine laid down in the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, the sovereignty and reserved rights of Massachusetts, and the sacred rights of humanity, it enacts and enforces that accursed usurpation, the Fugitive Slave Law.

Now, which is right, and obligatory on the people of Massachusetts, Gen. Jackson's 'Proclamation,' or the Constitution of Massachusetts, as to where sovereignty resides, and to whom the allegiance of her citizens is due? Every man who loves liberty and detests slavery, and every Democrat who venerates the political principle of the immortal Jefferson, must enthusiastically respond, 'Massachusetts.' If Massachusetts is a sovereign State, and the allegiance of her citizens is due to the sovereign power of the State, she cannot possibly commit 'treason' against the United States by peaceably seceding from the Union; the hanging propensity of the New York Observer to the contrary notwithstanding.

Secession is not only a natural, but a reserved right, inherent in that State sovereignty to which Massachusetts, by her Constitution, requires an oath of allegiance. It has been said that the State and Federal Governments, as a whole, constitute the government of Massachusetts. This, had it not been the sanction of Mr. Jefferson, is proved by two undeniable facts. First, that the Federal Government cannot pass laws to punish murder and other crimes committed by the citizens of Massachusetts within her limits; and, second, that her State government cannot pass laws to regulate her foreign policy. These two governments combined being, then, the government of Massachusetts, and of no other State, nation or people under heaven, what vengeates the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence dare deny, 'That whenever her government becomes destructive of these ends, [the ends for which she instituted it], it is the right of her people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.' As the 'Proclamation' and its devotees are forced to admit that a State has a natural right to secede from the Union, I will grant that the preceding propositions are false, and then see how the case stands on the question of natural rights. The Federal Government has no natural rights, and I deny that it has a constitutional right to usurp and enforce power, and then coerce Massachusetts into subordination and vassalage, should her people, planting themselves on their natural rights, secede from the Union, rather than implicate themselves, as they now do, in the crime of slavery, by permitting to be enforced within their limits that vile usurpation, the Fugitive Slave Law,—an usurpation of power (cautiously reserved by the States from Federal interference) which throws into the shade every charge brought against the British Government in the Declaration of Independence.

The question of natural rights. The Federal Government has no natural rights, and I deny that it has a constitutional right to usurp and enforce power, and then coerce Massachusetts into subordination and vassalage, should her people, planting themselves on their natural rights, secede from the Union, rather than implicate themselves, as they now do, in the crime of slavery, by permitting to be enforced within their limits that vile usurpation, the Fugitive Slave Law,—an usurpation of power (cautiously reserved by the States from Federal interference) which throws into the shade every charge brought against the British Government in the Declaration of Independence.

In conclusion, let me say, God speed this discussion! as it is, perhaps, the only movement that can open the eyes of the people to the true nature of our complex, yet simple, system of government.

Yours, in the cause of State Rights and Humanity, B. G. WRIGHT.

The following reply to Sigma has been denied a place in the Transcript, though that old villain has been permitted to use its columns without stint, number after number, with his malignant attacks upon Mr. Pillsbury and ourselves. Such editorial favoritism, whose character is assailed, is meaner than picking pockets or robbing hen-roosts; but Sigma requires it, and his royal despotism must not be insured. Shame on such truckling!

SIGMA AND THE DOGS MUEZZED.

To the Editor of the Transcript:

Sir,—In the Transcript of the 13th ult., I declared, both as an eye and ear witness, that the charge brought by Sigma against Parker Pillsbury, of having publicly baptized three dogs, in mockery of religion and its ordinances, was base, malicious, and utterly destitute of truth. In reply to his declaration, that he had 'letters from gentlemen of Danvers, of the first respectability, confirming the statement, in all its minute particulars, upon the testimony of eye and ear witnesses,' I challenged him to produce either witness or letter in a tangible shape. How has he met the challenge? By renewing his atrociously wicked accusation, without presenting a particle of evidence; and by making the columns of the Transcript, week after week, a sewer through which to discharge upon my head a torrent of malignant invective and personal defamation.

Tribadry like this—cursing like a very drab—is beneath serious refutation. Remember, Sigma plumes himself upon being both a Christian and a gentleman! Never was self-delusion ever greater. To reach his abysmal position, in order to stand on his own level and to meet him with his own weapons, one must make a lower descent than did the rebellious angels.—Headlong themselves they threw Down from the verge of heaven: nine days they fell!

Convicted of slander, Sigma seeks to change the issue, and to escape the scorn and indignation of all upright men, by acting the part of the cuttle-fish, and riling the waters, so as not to be transfixed. It is an old and scaly trick, but it will not answer his purpose. No matter what shape he assumes—whether he 'O'er bog or steep, through strait, rough, dense or rare, With head, hand, wings, or feet, pursues his way, And swims, or sinks, or wades, or creeps, or flies'—his exposure is inevitable—his capture certain.

The point in dispute is not whether I am an 'infidel,' or a 'bully,' or 'a pernicious citizen,' or 'foolish and frantic,' or 'a notorious blasphemer,' or 'the devil's printer,'—nor does it relate to my biblical or sabbatical views,—but it is solely as to the truth of the following accusation made by Sigma against one of the latches of whose shoes he is 'not worthy to unloose':—

Parker Pillsbury, some years ago, performed, in public, the ceremony of baptizing three dogs, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

This was Sigma's original, naked, unqualified charge—leading every unsuspecting reader of the Transcript naturally to suppose that, to outrage the religious feelings of the community, Mr. Pillsbury actually and literally did the absurd and monstrous deed attributed to him! Subsequently, Sigma adds that Mr. P. did it 'in consonance with his opposition to the Sabbath, to bring the ordinance of baptism also into contempt'!

His first witness is the anonymous author of the story in the Salem Register, who dares not to avow himself under his own proper signature, and upon whose lying statement all the changes that have since been rung upon Mr. Pillsbury's 'blasphemy,' by the enemies of the Anti-Slavery cause, have been based! His next witness is a 'Mr. —' (all in the dark again!) who said, 'he was positive that Pillsbury offered the dogs bread and wine, after he had baptized them, and taken them into the church.' What next? Pushed to the wall, Sigma coolly says,—'Of course, neither dogs, nor bread, nor wine, were actually present. What! all gone into this air! Since the days of veracious Jack Falstaff, has there ever been story-telling equal to this? No dogs, no bread, no wine! A hundred upon poor four of us. — I am a rogue, if I were not at half-sword with a dozen of them two hours together. — Sixteen, at least, my lord. — If I fought not with fifty of them, I am a bunch of radish; if there were not two or three and fifty upon poor old Jack, then I am no two-legged creature. . . . Four rogues in buckram let drive at me; I made no more ado, but took all their seven points in my target thus. — These nine men in buckram, that I told thee of—with a thought, seven of the eleven I paid.' Well, to the fabrications of Sigma and his anonymous backer may be justly applied the language of Prince Henry to Falstaff's assertions:—'These lies are like the father that begets them; gross as a mountain, open, palpable.'

But Sigma has another dodge.—It is well understood that this was a mock ceremony throughout! Nothing left of the story but a mockery! But this representation is equally false. Mr. Pillsbury has denied it, in the most explicit manner, in the Transcript, in addition to my own positive contradiction. (Of the hundreds who were present, not one comes forward to contradict our statements, or in support of Sigma. No 'mock ceremony,' with or without dogs, was performed on the occasion. All that Mr. Pillsbury did—after showing how slavery degrades man to the level of a beast, and in order to give a new and thrilling view of its enormity—was, to put the question to the audience, with true solemnity of feeling and manner, 'What would be said of the clergyman, [say] let Sigma answer [I] who should bring certain dogs into the church, and proceed to baptize them, one by one, as Bosc, Tiger, or Lion, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?' And he promptly added, 'Would not a thrill of horror run through the community, in view of such a blasphemous procedure?'—And yet, which is the more blasphemous act—to turn men into brutes, or ceremonially to treat brutes as though they were men?—a question which Sigma will please to answer, if he dare! This was the sum and substance of all that Mr. Pillsbury said and did; and if Sigma can see no pertinency, nay, nothing but 'blasphemy' in the illustration, then, if he were 'baptized in a mortar seven times, yet would not his foolishness depart from him.' Mark how plain a tale tells him down, and subjects him to infinite ridicule! And now, Sigma, 'what trick, what device, what starting-hole, canst thou now find out, to hide thee from this open and apparent shame?'

Before dismissing him and his canine pets, let me again ask, upon what evidence does Sigma charge Mr. Pillsbury with the grave offence of casting ridicule upon one of the sacraments of the Christian religion, which he urges upon him in terms so offensive? A statement made in an anonymous communication in the Salem Register, and written by an enemy, which has been contradicted and disproved as often as it has come to the knowledge of Mr. Pillsbury or his friends! Does Sigma mean to be understood that the asser-

tions—even the uncontradicted assertions,—of newspapers are to be received as evidence of the truth of the charges conveyed in them? It must be the case of the —day of May, 18—, made charges, with specifications, against himself, of the gravest offences against morality and the law. Does Sigma mean to say, because made in a newspaper, that the article was not anonymous, like that against Mr. Pillsbury, but written by a responsible editor, who, in his wish to be proceeded against, either for libel, or by way of indictment, and I have never doubted affirm that those charges were true, on this account, far more reasonably, on his own rule of evidence, than by any proof he has yet brought forward.

Sigma aspires, in company with Capt. Isaiah Ripley and his band of ruffians, to be the champion of the Union, the Bible, the Christian Sabbath, and the ordinances of religion! They are all terribly shocked by your knocking down and dragging out—persecuting, the other for an indictment on the part of the Grand Jury, and assignment to the penitentiary! This is a rare exhibition of godliness and piety! commingled, and an interesting juxtaposition! With your leave Mr. Editor, I shall have something to say on this subject in another number; and, as Sigma has been allowed to fill many of your columns and expect to see fair play in this controversy, I take it for granted that you will be just and equal to all the parties,—promising that I will occupy far less space than you have already conceded to Sigma.

Yours, still for the truth, WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

14 Dix Place, Sept. 8, 1857.

SIGMA AND PARKER PILLSBURY.

To the Editor of the Transcript:

Sir.—In your paper of the 16th ult. is a communication from 'Sigma,' reiterating the libelous charge against Mr. PARKER PILLSBURY, respecting the baptism of certain dogs at Danvers, and quoting in support of it the following extract of a letter from the malicious fabricator of the story, who continues to skulk, like an assassin, in the dark:—

'The most significant fact is, that it has never been denied. Mr. E. F. Burnham, who runs the Danvers and Boston Express, told me that he had heard Mr. Pillsbury through the same performance, on three different occasions, previously. Mr. Chapman, senior editor of the Register, met Mr. James N. Buffum, in Lynn, a few days since, and conversed with him on the subject. Mr. B. did not deny any of the facts, but objected to the inference, that would be drawn from them, by some, that they, the Abolitionists, were infidels.'

'Sigma' says of the author of this extract, that he is 'a gentleman of sterling integrity, careful and conscientious, (!!) of liberal education, &c.' Whosever he may be, we pronounce him to be guilty of the vile misrepresentation; and the use he has made of our names, as endorsing his statement in the Register, we declare to be audacious, false and scandalous in the highest degree. We endorse, as thoroughly truthful and accurate, the statements made in the Transcript by Mr. GARRISON and Mr. PILLSBURY, relative to this matter; and so will every honest and intelligent person who was present on the occasion.

It is only to-day that we have seen the Transcript, containing 'Sigma's' reference to us as witnesses in his favor; and we hasten to make this emphatic denial, in justice to ourselves, to Mr. PILLSBURY, and to that great and good cause, of which he has been so long the self-sacrificing, able and unwavering advocate.

ELI F. BURNHAM, DANVERS. JAMES N. BUFFUM, LYNN.

Danvers, Sept. 8, 1857.

THE WESTERN CONVENTIONS.

DEAR MR. GARRISON:

The first of the series of Conventions arranged to be held in Western New York, closed its sessions last evening in this place, (Binghamton).

The meetings continued two days, and though the audiences were not large, still there was much interest manifested by those who attended. Miss Susan B. Anthony, A. M. Powell, Rev. S. J. May and Miss Anthony made a capital speech the first evening, showing the injurious effects of slavery upon all classes of society, in an eloquent and forcible speech against the existing Union between the North and the South. Mr. Brown made the closing remarks. Mr. May, who did not arrive until the second day, spoke on Thursday afternoon and evening. I need not say that his addresses were interesting; for you know that they could scarcely be otherwise. As an indication of the interest which the hearers took in the Convention, I need only remark, that on the last evening, when the last speaker finished at nearly 10 o'clock, they still remained in their seats, apparently desirous of hearing more upon the great subject that had called them together.

You are, no doubt, aware that this place is the residence of the Hon. D. S. Dickinson, formerly a Senator in Congress, and who, on one occasion, expressed the regret that he had not been born in the Old Dominion. Some say his neighbors would not have been any worse off, if he had.

Upon the whole, I think the Convention has done a good work—the seed has been sown which will bear day a bountiful crop. But one person besides the advertised speakers ventured any remarks, and he had but little to say in favor of the Union. Like the Marseilleise which the Girondins dug at the foot of the scaffold, in ghastly gradation, dying away in an throat, so must the cant about the sacredness of the American Union die away before the light of truth and impartial investigation.

The agents separated here; Mr. Brown goes to Windsor, a rural town some fifteen miles from the railroad; Miss Anthony and Mr. Powell go on to Spencer. The next Convention is to be held on Tuesday and Wednesday next, at Oswego, where they expect good meetings.

Yours, for the slave, W. W. R.

A PITHY LETTER AND GOOD EXAMPLE.

Sir.—The enclosed five dollars is for the support of Mrs. Foster's army, whose weapons are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of that strong hold of oppression, which, if God prevent, will ruin this country, and prove a curse to every laboring man. I hope the ten thousand dollars will be raised before this reaches you.

Yours, respectfully, A. BIGWOOD.

Ottawa, (Wisconsin), Aug. 24, 1857.

CORRECTION AND ADDENDA.—Mr. Garrison: In my article of your issue of August 29th, the types misrepresented me by saying that Minnesota officials forbid them (colored citizens) the right of pre-emption. It should have stated that the General Land Office at Washington had decided against a colored man's claim to land in Wisconsin.

While on the subject of this Tanyan hunt against colored Americans, let me submit an additional fact. Mr. and Mrs. Webb, dramatic readers, who have been receiving marked and flattering attentions in England, being desirous of visiting the continent, have just been refused a passport by the American Minister (Hon. Geo. M. Dallas,) on the pretext that in Europe they were not American citizens. Comment is unnecessary.

