



REFUGE OF OPPRESSION. From the Boston Courier. PHILLIPS AND LIBERTY.

afford him the indulgence of still further opportunity—

SELECTIONS. SPEECH OF HON. CHARLES SUMNER, DELIVERED IN U. S. SENATE, MARCH 12, 1860, IN DEFENCE OF THADDEUS HYATT.

inquisition or the Star Chamber, or if you please, the grand jury; with power to investigate facts, involving the guilt of absent persons, and to denounce fellow-citizens as felons and traitors.

tended to be a short visit to my friends in the United States, whom I had not seen for fifteen years.

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS. The United States Constitution is 'a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell.'

Central of the New York papers publish in full a characteristic speech of Wendell Phillips, delivered at Brooklyn on Tuesday evening last. We wish to present the best side of the case for the citizens of Brooklyn, and so record the fact, that not a little trouble was experienced in procuring a platform for Phillips, and so record the fact, that not a little trouble was experienced in procuring a platform for Phillips, and so record the fact, that not a little trouble was experienced in procuring a platform for Phillips.

Mr. Phillips is perfectly infuriated, because he cannot speak in Charleston or Savannah, as he does in Brooklyn or elsewhere at the North. But if he and his fellow-laborers are the least indignities which he might reasonably expect in the South, we honestly believe that, after the Union were dissolved, he would not fare much better at home.

It is related in English parliamentary history, that, on a certain occasion, when the House of Commons was about to order the commitment of a somewhat too famous witness to the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, the Speaker interfered by volunteering to say, as he put the question, 'That the House ought to pause before they came to a decision upon a point in which the liberty of the subject was so materially concerned.'

But assuming that the resolution is defective, so far as it constitutes an inquest into crime, it may be said that the inquest is compelled by the answer to the other parts. Surely the Senate will not resort to any such refinement in order to impair a citizen.

Oh, what a spectacle was this for a foreigner to behold! what an exemplification of the universality of slavery on the American soil! The Jews had their city of refuge, to which the homicides could fly and be safe from the avenger of blood; but America, the land of the Pilgrims, the land of Washington, and Franklin, and Patrick Henry, and Jonathan Edwards, has no City of Refuge, into which one of her own immortal children can crawl, and be safe from the two-legged leopards whose prey it is the offspring of God!

On the motion of the Provost, a cordial vote of thanks was awarded to Mr. Thompson, shortly after which the meeting separated.

It is, of course, useless to attempt reply by way of argument to the 'remarkable plea' of Mr. Phillips, or to any of the pleas put forth from time to time by him or his associates. They are, one and all, of the spirit so maliciously attributed as the universal characteristic of certain of our fellow-beings.

Indeed, Mr. Phillips reasons always just as an insane person does—that is, with a certain degree of correctness from his premises, if only those premises were themselves correct. A crazy man is not devoid of the reasoning faculty, but his conclusions are false, because his premises are false.

There are certain cases in which the power is clear. First, and most conspicuously, in the trial of impeachments; secondly, in determining the eligibility, returns, and qualifications of its members, and thirdly, in punishing its members for disorderly conduct. All these proceedings are judicial in character and purpose, and carry with them, as a natural incident, the power to compel witnesses to testify.

At all events, if this power is to be exercised, let it not be under a simple resolution of the Senate; but by virtue of a general law, passed by both Houses, and affirmed by the President, so that the citizen shall be surrounded with certain safeguards.

They touch our country, and their shackles fall! Oh, what a spectacle was this for a foreigner to behold! what an exemplification of the universality of slavery on the American soil!

Resolved, 2. That on the subject of slavery, the Presbyterian Church have been, and are, and ought ever to be, controlled by the example of Christ and his Apostles; and that there is no authority in the Scriptures for such a principle of administration as regards a slaveholder an outcast from the kingdom of Christ; that no church ought to be regarded as unchristianized because some of its members are slaveholders, and that such a principle is subversive of the very spirit of missions; and that of all methods of ameliorating the evil of slavery, the most efficacious and the most consistent is to deny to such a community that gospel which is the wisdom and power of God unto salvation.

Mr. Phillips, like all abolitionists, is a thorough radical—at least in theory. He fairly glants over the idea of such a hatred of wealth and aristocracy in the heart of the original Saxon democrat, that there is nothing that he likes better than strangling both.

Another distinguishing characteristic of a disordered intellect is displayed by Mr. Phillips in his malignant and savage pursuit of certain men with whose opinions he disagrees. For this privilege of disagreement, allowed to everybody in a free country, and for no other reason, they are like Mordcaid sitting in the king's gate.

Such are the five cases in which this extraordinary power has been heretofore exercised; the first three standing on the text of the Constitution, and the other two on the text of self-defence necessarily inherent in the Senate; all five sanctioned by precedents of this body; all five judicial, also, in purpose and intent; and all five agreeing in this final particular, that they have no legislative purpose or intent. Beyond these cases there is no precedent for the exercise, by the Senate, of the power in question.

George Thompson in America. Extract from a very able and eloquent speech recently delivered in Glasgow, Scotland, upon American Slavery, by GEORGE THOMPSON, Esq., late M. P. for the Tower Hamlets, London.

Well may the colored American curse the soil of his birth, and shake its dust from his feet. To all, save one being, the place of his birth is dear. It is the lodge-stone of the heart—the point to which the soul continually gravitates.

Dr. Murray thought that the true policy was not to agitate the subject of slavery. The passage of this resolution would bring about this result. We should look at the subject in view of the pecuniary help needed, and the passage of this resolution would greatly lessen our prospects in New England and elsewhere.

That's plain talk. This patent Republican takes an oath to support the Constitution, and by doing

the higher law illustrated. Mr. Sedgwick, Republican, has made in the House an out and out Garrisonian harangue, of course full of historical perversion and higher-lawism, and thoroughly unconstitutional.

Encamped by Indian rivers wild, The soldier, resting on his arms, In the scenes that blessed him when a child, And glows and bladders at the charms Of Scotia's woods and waterfalls.

Dr. Murray thought that the true policy was not to agitate the subject of slavery. The passage of this resolution would bring about this result. We should look at the subject in view of the pecuniary help needed, and the passage of this resolution would greatly lessen our prospects in New England and elsewhere.

Dr. McElroy remarked that the passage of the resolution was simply a question of expediency. There was not a principle that all did not know the Presbyterian Church to hold to. There was nothing new. The question was whether the church should be thrown out at this juncture. He had power and sold slaves, and under similar circumstances would do so again. He preached the same views from his pulpit.

Dr. Plomer moved an amendment, substituting the word 'condition' for 'evils,' as referring to

slavery. He hoped the Convention would take no pro-slavery or abolition ground. He supposed they were merely to say to those in New England and other sections of the country, who have heretofore contributed to the American Board, but are now dissatisfied, that we are in a way to receive your aid, without annoying you with further agitation. He trusted they were not about to commence agitation on the subject of slavery.

Finally, a Committee was appointed to report upon the subject, consisting of Drs. Spring, McElroy and Halliday, E. Lord, Esq. and Daniel Lord, Esq., who subsequently reported the following among other resolutions, which were adopted:—

Resolved, 1st. That this convention recognizes no standard of procedure in the great enterprise of Christian Missions but the instructions and conduct of Jesus Christ and his apostles.

2d. That the church in this great work is onward; but in her progress she requires the conservative power and direction of heavenly truth and heavenly love. On this rock, and on no factitious principle of human policy, the cause stands, and will prosper.

3d. That the Missions of the Presbyterian church have been, and ought ever to be, conducted on this principle; and that the existence of slavery in the community, and of slaveholders in the church, affords no ground for the withdrawal from them of the gospel, which is the wisdom of God and the power of God.

4d. That in their conduct of the Choctaw Mission, the beloved and honored missionaries so long and faithfully employed in the service of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, have never departed from these great principles; and that in so modestly and firmly adhering to them at every sacrifice, they deserve our implicit confidence, and shall receive our hearty support and patronage.

THE HARPER'S FERRY AFFAIR.

Speech of George Bennett, Esq. before the Virginia Legislature.

The following is the substance of the argument made before the Virginia Legislature, by George Bennett, Esq., in favor of relieving Stevens and Hazlett, Esq., who were subsequently hung for having participated in the Harper's Ferry affair:

Mr. Chairman of the Senate Committee, Mr. Chairman of the Committee of the House, Gentlemen of both Committees:—

As to the case: There are two prisoners. There were seven capital indictments all in finality against them at one time—four against Stevens, the others against Hazlett. On the first indictment Capt. John Brown was tried, and it to Stevens was forced to plead. Of that indictment, if the most strenuous study of the criminal law in its principles—if the greatest pains to understand how every species of indictment, complaint or information should be framed—and if the most careful and laborious reading of a great number of indictments, with a view to trial—if all these things give me an opportunity to judge, or a right to speak on the subject, I say that indictment was very bad. But your Court of Appeals thought there was enough of it good to hang Capt. Brown and his companions. Stevens, however, was supposed to be dying. He had five bullets in his body; he fell from fainting fit into fainting fit, and the Judge determined not to try him, when a message from the then Governor Wise proposed to transfer him to the Courts of the United States. Stevens had been brought in on a bed, and the people, who showed very little sympathy for the others, appeared deeply moved when the young man was hung on the Court-House floor. The case was transferred, but only continued, and you know, gentlemen, better than I, what efforts were made here to have a special session in February, when the regular session of the Circuit Court was to be as early as May. The law passed, and I was notified by the newspapers: Gentlemen, I left my distant home at a very great disadvantage and loss; and when I arrived in Charleston, I found the bad indictment not pressed, as we call it, and three others, newly made, with all the errors cancelled, which eleven lawyers had pointed out. I defended Stevens on the indictment for conspiracy. Two Virginia lawyers, Thomas C. Green and Lawson Bots, defended Hazlett, and it gives me great pleasure to say, of my own knowledge, that a more eager, thorough, careful defence I never witnessed. It gives me the greater satisfaction to say so, because they were unkindly, and, I am sure, unjustly accused of collusion with the government in the case of Brown. I was disgusted to hear that. I did not believe it then. I feel now it was without foundation, since I saw what they did for Hazlett. Hazlett, however, was not to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

But we do not propose to ask your good offices for too much, since the law gives you no power to pardon any crime but treason, and leaves all other pardoning exclusively to the Governor. The difficulty was raised the moment I arrived here; but a little reflection enables me to see that it is more apparent than real. I suggested that, even under the code, the Legislature might recommend the pardon of criminals whom they could not pardon themselves. This was agreed to, and the result is that you are listening to me, for which I thank you.

they lead in action or in speculation. Remember the case of Coppie—how he was hung for a letter, which turned out to be written by Cook—and how sorry everybody was when sorrow was unavailing!

If necessity alone can excuse it, how are we necessitated? What overpowering force is upon us, that we do nothing but kill and kill? What obliges you to look with sickening heart upon hands smoking with the blood of a misguided man?—I do not mean the case of Coppie. He was misguided—he was deluded—he did not delude yourselves into the fatal belief that he was a common murderer, or a low criminal. No, nor any of his associates. It was no common murderer or low criminal that convulsed the State of Virginia. It is only belittling the Commonwealth to say it, if true, and trifling with our own dignity if we do not believe it when we say it. No! empty your Penitentiary into the street, and nobody but the prison guards will so much as chase the criminals. These men are fanatics. As the word, tremendous host sweeping down their deers upon terrified Christendom, like fire upon grass! It is the awful eyes of Mohammed—the waving arm of Ali! I see the dreadful face of Khaled, black as night, casting the frown of death over kneeling Damascus. I see his bloody scimitar uplifted—I hear his inexorable voice, 'O, Christian dogs! say God is God, and Mohammed is the Prophet of God, or instantly sink into the flames of hell. And this man, who could swim his horse in the blood of his own kind, and who had murdered a man? Or was it a murderer who was all but worshipped for ages, from the Pillars of Hercules to the Sea of Japan? Yet the very least of the slaves of his successors often slew more human beings in one assault than Stevens ever saw assembled together.

I look again, and behold the innumerable, invincible steel-clad swarms of the Crusade! I behold Godfred, and Tancred, and Bohemond, and Hugh the Great. I see them toil under the flaming sky of Syria. I hear their thundering shouts, 'God with us! God with us!' I see them pour into the Holy City a river of blood. I see their sad possession, and, strangest sight of all, I see their immense assembly, uncovered, unarmed, barefooted, kneeling, groaning with real anguish before the sepulchre that once held the human body of the son of God! I see them rise. I see them put on the weighty armor. I see them draw the broad-bladed dagger and away the two-handed sword, and trample with bloody, remorseless cruelty, under their iron shoes, the hearts of distracted multitudes in the great mosque of Omar!

But what school-boy does not know that the Knight who had cleft the skulls of a hundred Saracens would have had his golden spurs chopped from his heels with a cleaver, and would have been hung on the nearest tree by the hands of his own neighbors, for fatally felling the poorest Christian calf-follower, in a moment of passion, with the stock of his lance?

The darkest as well as the most enlightened ages have always made this distinction, and History runs over with examples of it, which, it seems, I am obliged to call attention to this day. Allow me nothing more striking illustration of this distinction between a common criminal and a fanatic.

A young Frenchman once read a small book, Las Casas's account of the cruelties of the Spaniards to the Indians of America. It is a very remarkable book, gentlemen, in subject, style, and illustration, for it was full of pictures by the greatest masters of the then new art of engraving, and it had a circulation greater than the Waverley Novels, or the works of Mr. Dickens, or of Thackeray, or of Dumas—enormously greater, if we consider the difference between the age of the book and the age of the publication. Not all the soldiers of France, nor all the ships of England, struck such a blow at the power of Spain as that little book; for, wherever it went—and it went everywhere—no tongue was too tender to frame a curse, and no heart too feeble to troth with hatred for the Spaniards. That book filled the young Frenchman's heart with madness. A race, he thought, capable of cruelties so monstrous, must be accursed of God. They ought to be exterminated—and he, he must be the agent of God's justice! How he acted on that conviction, may be seen in the blood of the Spaniards, but blood alone could satisfy the deadly hatred of L'Olonnois. Now, according to the plainest common sense, according to the dictates of the most ordinary honest dealing, according to the dictionary and the Bible, and the shop, and the stable, and the street—what was this man? A murderer! And yet Stevens, who, as it happens, never killed a human being—for it is notorious that he actually hurt nobody—and who is yet regarded by this Commonwealth almost as a hero, did nothing more than to murder him, when he acted in act of intent, from a common murderer or criminal. A man takes Harper's Ferry with twenty-one men, and actually remains there when he can leave, and captures and locks up men, just as if he was a constable with a warrant, or a sheriff with a writ, whom you obey, of course, unless you are crazy. A man does this, and much more, and I am asked, Don't you think him a common criminal? I do not; I think him an extraordinary fanatic, and I think it is a wrong to hang him, as if he were a common criminal.

I am told with much simplicity, when I say so, that he cannot be a fanatic—he is so cool and shows so little passion! Why, gentlemen, I hardly know what remark to make; but I must answer, I suppose, so I will try. Passion, Mr. Chairman, is a matter of temperament. Many men who have much passion exhibit very little, because they have control or lack expression. Many who have not much, express all they have, and appear to have more than actually belongs to them. But fanaticism is deeper than mere passion of any sort. It is a disorder of the entire mind, which makes him see things as they are not. It affects every kind of man, without regard to his passion any more than to his nature. The late Mr. Calhoun, for example, was a perfect fanatic. And yet, who ever heard him say—who ever saw him do—any unpleasant, unbecoming, one passionate thing? No one. I have not the slightest doubt that, for the later years of his life, his powerful but disordered mind imagined itself to be thinking! Read his books, and you will find a most extraordinary state of things—a confusion of the forms of demonstration not to be found outside of a book of geometry, and an application of them not to be imagined outside of bedlam! Gen. Jackson, on the contrary, was not fanatical at all. If any man ever lived who saw things as they are, it was Gen. Jackson. But he was a passionate man. Mr. Calhoun, who wanted South Carolina to take the United States, never saw, probably, in the whole course of his dignified existence. Gen. Andrew Jackson, on the contrary, saw a great deal during the early part of his not very long life, but exceedingly useful life.

Am I told that Brown slaughtered his own countrymen? If he did, Stevens did not. You say Stevens was prepared to help him. Perhaps; but the reply is as obvious as it is common-place. If the man fanatically attacks his own family, it is not that fact which makes the crime more heinous. It is the fanaticism which takes away the moral responsibility!

As to slaughtering his own countrymen, Washington did that by the hundred, and expected to be hung as Brown was, if taken. No moral blame whatever can attach to a fanatical outrage, and it is an outrageous abuse of language to argue that it does. It is then, say the advocates of death, must you do it, or else you are responsible with beast, lose into the streets, and be killed? Stevens, I answer, is not a beast, but a man. Kill your beast, and then, perhaps you lose; but it is certain that the most profitable use to be made of a man is to hang him.

But one charge which I have very, very often heard since I arrived here must be answered, for I am told it affects many. It is that the North sympathizes with these men, and that, therefore, they ought to be hung! Leaving the exceedingly odd regular for a while, look the first charge in the face. If we do, can we help it? And is it wrong? We are very apt to sympathize with almost anybody who is going to be hung. It is human to feel that way, and you feel so yourselves just as often as you do. But if the sympathy goes any further, yourselves are partly to blame for it. I have an excellent chance to know the feeling on both sides; for though my own party always is so conveniently small, yet you can have them all for acquaintances, yet, owing to some singular accident, the greater number of my personal friends are Abolitionists or Republicans. The surprise, then, was complete. The Democrats were furious; and as for the other side, I happen to know that Dr. Howe—upon whom you are very severe, without in the least proving him to be deserving of the epithet of a young countryman wholly in their power, the mercy which she risked her life to show to a stranger, an alien, and an enemy!

Charleston. Up to that time we—that is, the public—thought Brown was a madman, or, at the very utmost, that he was a cool and courageous fanatic; and for that we have the high authority of Gov. Wise.

At Charleston, we found an excitement and a suspicion that looked like insanity. People from the North were following about the streets—stared at—and stared, not only by the authorities, but by super-servicable men, very likely unknown to them. And I have often remarked that people who are not interested in slavery, to the amount of the thousandth part of a drop of the sweat of a negro, are its most absurd and offensive advocates. Ladies coming to see the prisoners, as ladies always will, were stared at through windows, publicly threatened, and advised to leave, in the country papers. A sculptor, who came in the interest of fine arts, had to accomplish his object by stealth. But all this might never have been heard of but for the inconceivable simplicity which extended the same treatment to the Reporters, particularly after the first reports came in. Now, if a newspaper in my own city chooses to say I was a murderer, or even a thief, I doubt if I should venture beyond the mildest form of denial. For how can you contend with a gentleman who can talk about you one hundred thousand times every morning? It is of no use, as I should think had been ascertained by any Virginia gentleman—who would know that artists, authors and reporters, of *id genus omne*, are the most irritable of men, and accordingly, being exasperated at this, to them, novel treatment, they revenged themselves in their own fashion. In a few days every town in the North, from Portland in Maine to Portland in Oregon, was full of unfavorable notices of the people of Charleston. I desire it to be expressly understood that I am not now finding fault with the precautions of the authorities, though they irritated me greatly at the time. I am merely telling you the impression made upon me and others by what happened, and showing you how to account for much newspaper 'sympathy' for John Brown.

Mr. Sennott here adverted to the fact that any one charged with enormous crimes commonly enlisted much sympathy, whether guilty or not. He referred to numerous cases, such as the Juniper case, the Lemoine case, and spoke of the sympathy shown by ladies of Richmond for Prof. Webster.

A stolid old wretch who cut up his friend's body like a sheep, and went to tea with his family almost the next day, and then his hand blooded another who only regretted at leaving life open to be that he could have no more dinners from Parker's;—and were your lovely and sympathetic ladies murdered because they unknowingly pitied him? You sympathized with O'Connell—did you desire a bloody revolution in the British Empire on that account? But the case of Lopez, gentlemen, I particularly recommended to your reflections. He went to Cuba exactly as Brown came here. He influenced young men to enlist with him. They went and were shot, and did you not sympathize with them? I do not think so. I do not think you would have the Spanish Government liberate the remnant of his force, as we hope you will the poor remains of Capt. Brown's. And it is clear that if pitying Brown makes us Abolitionists, pitying Lopez makes us filibusters, negro thieves and land pirates. I can count all the active Abolitionists, even in Boston, on my fingers. I know they make much noise, but so does a parrot at my hotel. He is an excessively noisy bird, and shrieks, and scolds the entire neighborhood from morning till night. But he is hardly a fair representative of the population of the city. I do not think he is more than a nuisance, than all of them put together. Neither do our Abolition or Republican politicians represent to you the feeling of our people—and yet you arm yourselves against us.

And you refuse to pardon Stevens because we wish you would! Gentlemen, this may be a reason, but it requires great practice in arguing about the Resolutions of 1798 and 1799 to enable one to comprehend it.

Does public safety require these executions? Safe from what? A slave insurrection? I do not think you feared any. People at the North say you do, and go so far as to state that you dare not pardon any one connected with Brown on that account. Now, I know—first, from actually living in a slave State, what the reciprocal sentiments of the slaves and their masters are. Secondly, I know from general principles, that if I had been brought up among slave children—if I had joined their childish sports as a child always will—if I had played hide-and-seek with a little black boy around a haystack, or in the woods, and he had come with his marble, or fought and made up with him over a hundred childish disputes—I might think that a meddling scamp would make him leave me some day; but I should as soon think of cutting his throat as of his cutting mine. No! the days of barbarism are over, unless you choose to reinstate them. Treat the negro as you do, and the kindness, submissiveness and improvidence of his nature will keep him what he is—your faithful, humble, lazy, and most burdensome slave. And if he were the fiercest savage of Africa, we are white men, and we are to govern him, and we are to be the masters of the United States. For whatever you may think, or whatever politicians may say, we are all of one mind on that kindred point; and though I detest war, I think a small defensive war with some foreign power might be useful just now, if it did not last too long. A union of the Massachusetts Regiment and the Palmetto, under the orders of Col. Memming, to defend this Capitol against a British incursion—or a union of the Green Mountain Boys and the Seventh Regiment on board a fleet of Massachusetts transports loaded with weapons of the newest Yankee pattern, to attack the people of Savannah and Charleston against the enemy, would be a Union meeting we could believe in!

Even the muscle which must exist somewhere in the anatomy of our most distinguished Union-saver to originate his circulation, might be fairly supposed capable of expanding with something more than muscular irritability in a Union-meeting like that.

Allow us to say what we please at home about slavery. Do not especially try to suppress any discussion, or to punish, directly or indirectly, those who discuss, as long as they do not meddle with your property. If they do that, punish them, and you can object. We hate slavery, of course. We do not mean to talk, nor do we propose to talk, in abolition to your negroes. The same thing, times for all things. The science of physiology, for example, in all its branches, is eminently useful and proper to talk of—but not in general society. The abolition of slavery in like manner is a very important subject of discussion even here—but not so to a crowd of ignorant slaves. So long as we observe on our side that safe and proper rule of action, do you on your side take no liberties with our discussions. Let us alone—hands off, if you please. Mind your own business. It is your turn now to cry out; and, however much we detest slavery, don't undertake to keep us from saying so or thinking so, as long as we never meddle practically with you and yours. That meddling, foolish men, on both sides, have undertaken to interfere in practice with what did not concern them at all, is the cause of all our difficulties. Letting each other's peculiar business alone will probably bring about the cure for them—and now help us by a good beginning on your side. Your broken laws have been dreadfully avenged. The active invaders are nearly all destroyed. The rocks, the river and the hungry galleys have devoured the blood of our men, and the poor remnant is waiting in a dungeon the result of your deliberations. Let it result in mercy, we capture you. Mercy is a word that should drop easily from your Virginia lips. Your Commonwealth owes its existence to an act of mercy.

Your founder, like my client, was the invader of a people who had never harmed him; like him, he was taken in an act of invasion; like him, he was tried with all the solemnities of savage law, as Stevens was under the forms of a civilized code; like him, he was sentenced to death, according to the profoundest maxims of those poor barbarians, who knew no better or safer way than always to kill all their enemies. But he was saved by mercy, incarnate in that sweet Indian maid, whose image glows through the twilight of history with all the loveliest hues of young romance! May the parallel not fail us here in its noblest part! May those whose hearts proudly beat around me with more than regal—the richer than imperial blood of Pochontas—remember their illustrious ancestor this day! May they emulate her merciful spirit! May they prove their own descent by their magnanimous action! May they not refuse to extend their reluctant aid, to a young countryman wholly in their power, the mercy which she risked her life to show to a stranger, an alien, and an enemy!

The Liberator.

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.

BOSTON, APRIL 6, 1860.

ANNUAL MEETING.

The Annual Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society will be held in the city of New York, in the Cooper Institute, on Tuesday and Wednesday, May 8th and 9th. The state of the country demands a full and spirited attendance of its members and friends. The Woman's Rights Convention will be held in the same place on Thursday and Friday, May 10th and 11th.

THE FRENCH EMPEROR.

NAPOLEON III. IN ITALY: AND OTHER POEMS. By Elizabeth Barrett Browning. New York: C. S. Francis & Co., 654 Broadway. 1860.

The following are the contents of this volume of 72 pages:—Napoleon III. in Italy; The Dance; A Tale of Villafranca; A Court Lady; An August Voice; Christmas Gifts; Italy and the World; A Curse for the Nation. These effusions are crowded with those pictorial delineations, mystical yet pregnant expressions, lofty aspirations, strong imaginings, and deep throbings of humanity, which characterize Mrs. Browning as the most remarkable poet of the age. 'What I have written,' she says in her preface, 'has simply been written because I love truth and justice *quod mens*, more than Plato and Plato's country, more than Dante and Dante's country, more even than Shakespeare and Shakespeare's country.' Is it not a strange moral paradox, that such a 'lover of truth and justice' should regard the perfidious usurper of the liberties of France—whose hands are dripping with the best blood of the empire—as the true friend of Italian freedom and independence, bent on nothing but the highest and noblest objects for Europe and mankind? Thus does she extol him:—

'Nay, but he, this wonder, He cannot falter nor prate, (1) Though many around him and under, With intellects trained to the curve, Distrust him in spirit and nerve Because his meaning is straight. (2) Measure his meanness by his deed; With those who have governed and led; Larger so much by the heart, Larger so much by the head. Emperor. Evermore.'

Again, referring to the happy French usurper:— 'Courage, courage! same is he, Of whom (himself among the dead And silent) this word shall be said: That he might have had with him his work, that is near and degrading! Such is the notion that prevails in the classic writers of Greece and Rome, and with the 'gentlemen' and 'ladies' of New England to-day—I mean, with the ornamental males and females. Slavery is only supported by the profound contempt for productive industry which marks the South; and it has its support at the North chiefly in the same contempt. Miss Diddle-diddle-diddle descended from a blacksmith at Beverly or Marblehead; he was grandfather to this foolish thing; she is ashamed of her origin, and never sees an *ancill* without a blush of mortified vanity. Now, if I had a son, I should rather he would be a great engineer, a great mason, carpenter, or railroad builder, than a great painter, sculptor, or fiddler; and certainly I should rather my son were an ordinary third-rate tailor, shoemaker, brazier, than an ordinary third-rate sculptor to spoil marble and waste the time of men he strove to make statues of. How much better to be a common house-painter than a stupid dabbler of canvases! In America—I mean, in the free States, the mass of the people, in their collective action, work right in respect to this—though uncounted individuals make the greatest mistakes; but here it is the community as a whole that falls into the error. Alas for them! the miserable rags which are the clothing of the people, and the wretched food they eat, are consequences of the fatal blunder, and the haggard, melancholy faces of the common people, ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-fed, are the protest of Nature against the worship of Beauty and the scorn of Use. Think of a city exporting one million dollars' worth of trinkets, while she has not a saw-mill nor a powerloom! We manage this matter better in New England. There were seven paper mills in Massachusetts, a foundry at Saugus, and saw-mills more than I can recollect, before a picture had ever been painted in all New England, or a statue made. Jonathan had many a useful notion before he made him a fiddle.

In Europe, you see many things which seem strange to an American. Take the use of wine. If I am right, the Europeans consume about 6,500,000,000 gallons of wine. In France, leave out of account the pasture land which is not ploughed, and the forests, of the actual arable land, one-third is devoted to the culture of the grape! Yet there are immense districts where no can be raised at all. I see it stated that the government returns make it appear that the people of France drink 850,000,000 gallons of wine, and the calculation is that the amount is not much less than 1,000,000,000! Yet I don't believe, in the year 1859, there was so much drunkenness among the 39,000,000 people of France as among the 3,000,000 Yankees of New England! I have been four months at Rome; there are wine shops every where; I am out of doors from three to six hours a day; and I have never yet seen a man drunk; now and then one is merry, never intoxicated. The Romans, Italians, French, &c., are quite temperate; they drink their weak wine with water, and when they take liquors, it is only a little glassful at a time, (which does not make a spoon-full.) I don't believe there is a bar in all Italy where men step up and drink rum and water, gin and water, &c. Excessive drinking is not to the taste of the people. In the North of Europe, and even in Switzerland, it is not so. The English, without help from the Irish and Scotch, drink about 600 or 700,000,000 gallons of beer every year, not to speak of the wine, spirits, &c., they take to wash it down withal. There is drunkenness. So you find it in Scandinavia, in Holland, and North Germany. How do you think the Americans will settle the drink question? Certainly not by taking merely to water, tea, coffee, &c. We shall have more beer, perhaps return to the making of cider, and certainly plant vines where they will grow. Drunkenness is such a monstrous and ghastly evil, I would do almost any thing to get rid of it. But I sometimes think we have taken the wrong track. I am glad to see the license law introduced to the New York Legislature, and think it will do more good than our New England scheme of prohibition by force.

So we have got a Republican Speaker of the House of Representatives at last! It is a great gain: all the weight of the Union must now incline from the Democratic party. I suppose Kansas may come into the Union this session, and that shameful quarrel be ended. But what violence on the part of slaveholders, what declarations that they will dissolve the Union if Seward is elected! I wonder the Union-savers at Boston and New York do not see what fools they make of themselves by professing zeal for the Union, while they so strike hands with the only men who attempt to destroy it. Just now, I see the South is rich, with her cotton crop worth \$200,000,000; while the North is poor—the *grass crop* short by 33 per cent. in 1859, and the *grain crop* poor for the last three years. I take it the West is greatly in debt to the East for goods sent forward, not to speak of money put into (wild-cat) railroads, into lands which will not soon be settled, and into city debt. Prospects to me do not look well for the West for some years to come; the people are very improvident and wasteful. Such live lands and such slovenly

Yet these eight millions were manifestly acting only as electoral puppets, under the pressure of violent constraint, and not as free and independent voters; else how happens it that the freedom of the press is struck down among them—that liberty of speech can be indulged only at the peril of imprisonment, ostracism or death—that no public meetings for free discussion can be held in any part of the empire—and that the power of the 'Emperor evermore' is absolute over all the thoughts and movements of the people? This is her reply—referring to the day of election:—

'That day I did not hate, Nor doubt, nor quail, nor curse. I reverencing the people, did not bate My reverence of their deed and oracle, Nor vainly prate Of better and of worse Against the great conclusion of their will. Alas! it was a foregone conclusion, and not a free choice on their part! It was the liberty granted at the last Presidential election, in the slaveholding States of this country: whoever voted for John C. Fremont did so at the peril of his life! Such an election is a mockery.

Under what enchantment is this gifted woman laboring? Hear her once more:—

'But now, Napoleon, now, That, leaving far behind the purple throng Of vulgar monarchs, thou Art tread' higher in thy deed Than stair of throne can lead To help in the hour of wrong The broken hearts of nations to be strong.— Now, lifted as thou art To the level of pure song, We stand to meet thee on these Alpine snows! And what we need, we talk, nor do we seek to feast From somnambular repose With answers to the presence and the shout, We poets of the people, who take part With elemental justice, natural right, Join in our echoes also, nor refrain. We meet thee, O Napoleon, at this height At last, and find thee great enough to praise.'

THE LIBERATOR.

THE NON-RESISTANCE PRINCIPLE: WITH PARTICULAR APPLICATION TO THE HELP OF SLAVES BY ABOLITIONISTS.

Among other good results of the noble enterprise of John Brown in Virginia, I am happy to see that some minds are stimulated to inquire into the definition, scope and obligation of the principle briefly entitled 'Non-Resistance.'

Perhaps his aspect gives good reason for the position that he has taken. What am I to do? This man appears to be an enemy! He certainly acts like one! Under the circumstances, I must consider and treat him as an enemy.

What is the treatment in question, according to my rule, heretofore given? LOVE YOUR ENEMIES!

Again: he has done me a wrong. He has no right to kill, or to wound, or even to strike me. This is not brotherly treatment. Besides, who knows how far his enmity, or passion, may carry him? This is clearly a case for self-defence!

Shall I kill him—wound him—strike him? What! to him the very thing which I censure in his conduct to me? Perpetrate a second wrong by way of redressing the first? Show that I am as ready to commit violence as he, when my supposed advantage requires it?

Am I not, then, to defend myself at all? Yes! self-defence is right, but let us not deceive ourselves by a wrong use of language. To kill, to wound and to strike, are acts of offence even more than of defence.

I will save myself from harm, if I can do so by any right means, but to strike the striker would be like stealing from the thief, a repetition of the wrong act, a casting out Satan by Satan.

Let us look again at the rule! OVERTCOME EVIL WITH GOOD!

I remember, too, that one of the venerated teachers who have written on this subject, as if in reply to the question whether the general rule admitted of any exception, gave his precept in this emphatic negative form, namely:

'See that nono vender evil for evil to any man!' My rule, then, the rule which I recognize as the best I can possibly conceive of, requires me to use none but good means, right means, to overcome evil.

If a calm and friendly aspect, an inquiry why such an assault is committed, and an appeal to reason and justice, without either passion or retaliation, will avail to calm the passion of my antagonist, and make him explain, apologize, and offer satisfaction, this is the best possible termination of the affair.

If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. I will by all means try this method first. It may be that I shall, by this simple and easy method, transform an enemy into a friend; or work which the whole police of the city, backed by the army and navy of the United States, could not accomplish.

This, manifestly, is the first thing to be tried. Moreover, this would certainly be successful in a large number of cases which are now prolonged and made more bitter by violence and retaliation. Is it not true that 'A soft answer turneth away wrath'; and also that 'Grievous words stir up anger'?

In cases where this does not succeed, but where the violence of my assailant is continued or increased, I have to decide on the spot whether it will be better for me and my brother (I must try not to lose sight of his welfare, however regardless he may be of mine), to bear with perfect quietness whatever his passion may inflict—in the hope that, when passion has subsided, he will see, repent of, and acknowledge his injustice—or to use my strength to restrain him without injuring him. If I adopt the former of these two methods, if I bear his insults and assaults with a patience manifestly proceeding not from fear or meanness of spirit, but from good-will to him and conscientious self-control, and if this course produces the desired effect, and he comes to me on the morrow to acknowledge his fault and offer reparation, this is the second best possible termination of the affair.

Again, I shall have gained my brother! And that man will be, ever after, more likely to befriend me, and more likely to control himself, than if I had returned his injurious treatment. Moreover, as in the case before supposed, I am sure that this method would succeed in a certain proportion of cases. God's arrangement for mankind is, that wrong-doing should breed self-reproach, and that this should tend to confession and amendment. I will trust to God's arrangement!

On the other hand, if my bodily strength is sufficient, and I judge it best to use that in self-defence—grasping my opponent, and, without injuring him, holding him so that he cannot injure me—this method also is at my option. The right of self-defence is unquestionable, and circumstances may show this to be the best way of using it. And if, while I thus prove to my opponent my physical superiority, my language and demeanor, manly and yet friendly, can show him his fault, and make him sincerely regret it, this is the third best possible termination of the affair. Again, I have gained my brother!

Suppose, finally, that all these methods fail to preserve me, as they all sometimes will fail; for Non-Resistance must often receive the cross before the crown, and triumph only through suffering, and the followers of Jesus and Paul, in this heavenly path, will still sometimes meet with foes as powerful and unrelenting as theirs; if all these resources fail, and I am killed on the spot, what then? Have I erred, have I acted foolishly, have I thrown my life away by refraining from the return of injurious violence upon my adversary? I do not think so; but let us deliberate!

LOVE YOUR NEIGHBOR AS YOURSELF! LOVE EVEN YOUR ENEMIES! OVERTCOME EVIL WITH GOOD!

Let us make the application of these rules to a particular case. Stealing is an evil and a crime, unhappily too common in all communities. It is an injury to individuals, and an offence against society. Theft is one of the recognized evils which it is the duty and interest of us all to overcome. But it is to be overcome with good, not with evil.

A man who has lost property by theft sometimes knows the thief, and knows where he possesses property of equal value. Shall he steal that, and thus restore the disturbed equilibrium of property? This might compensate for the loss, but would it remove the evil? Is it a right method of proceeding?

Nobody will say so. Instead of removing the evil, it has doubled the evil. If one thief is an offence against good morals and the welfare of society, two thefts must be yet more so. This is not the proper mode of proceeding. Nobody uses it, nobody would justify it. On the contrary, it is the interest of the person robbed, and of the whole community, to pay a sacred regard to the laws of property, and to show, by their whole conduct, that they respect and scrupulously observe those rights which the thief has violated. Only thus can they justify themselves in complaining of him, and applying remedial measures to him, as a thief. If they show themselves dishonest in the very case in question, with what face can they accuse him of dishonesty?

(1) See Letter of Dr. DANIEL MANN in the Liberator of March 16th, 1850. In the course of it, Dr. M. says—Moral measures, so long as they serve effectually, are doubtless most proper. If we can persuade the robber to desist from his trade, and leave us unharmed, or if we can run away from them, and thus prevent mischief, it is well to do so. But if our own safety, or that of others, requires other means of protection, involving danger or destruction to the aggressor, I know of no just restriction of our right to use them, according to the apparent necessities of the occasion. The same power which gave me a tongue to persuade, and legs to run away from them, and thus to be able to fight, and so far as I can see, gave me the right to use either of these three remedies against wrong, according to the exigencies of each occasion.

What I wish to have noted here is the fact, that, in proceeding against the thief—(unhappily and unjustifiably the custom of the community is to proceed against him, instead of applying to him the law of love!)—we ourselves set the example of a faithful adherence to the laws of property, and do not at all pretend that his prior commission of the offence in question justifies us in committing it.

Suppose, instead of a thief, that the offence committed is an assault. A man strikes me, wounds me! Perhaps his aspect gives good reason for the position that he has taken. What am I to do? This man appears to be an enemy! He certainly acts like one! Under the circumstances, I must consider and treat him as an enemy.

What is the treatment in question, according to my rule, heretofore given? LOVE YOUR ENEMIES!

Again: he has done me a wrong. He has no right to kill, or to wound, or even to strike me. This is not brotherly treatment. Besides, who knows how far his enmity, or passion, may carry him? This is clearly a case for self-defence!

Shall I kill him—wound him—strike him? What! to him the very thing which I censure in his conduct to me? Perpetrate a second wrong by way of redressing the first? Show that I am as ready to commit violence as he, when my supposed advantage requires it?

Am I not, then, to defend myself at all? Yes! self-defence is right, but let us not deceive ourselves by a wrong use of language. To kill, to wound and to strike, are acts of offence even more than of defence.

I will save myself from harm, if I can do so by any right means, but to strike the striker would be like stealing from the thief, a repetition of the wrong act, a casting out Satan by Satan.

Let us look again at the rule! OVERTCOME EVIL WITH GOOD!

I remember, too, that one of the venerated teachers who have written on this subject, as if in reply to the question whether the general rule admitted of any exception, gave his precept in this emphatic negative form, namely:

'See that nono vender evil for evil to any man!' My rule, then, the rule which I recognize as the best I can possibly conceive of, requires me to use none but good means, right means, to overcome evil.

If a calm and friendly aspect, an inquiry why such an assault is committed, and an appeal to reason and justice, without either passion or retaliation, will avail to calm the passion of my antagonist, and make him explain, apologize, and offer satisfaction, this is the best possible termination of the affair.

If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. I will by all means try this method first. It may be that I shall, by this simple and easy method, transform an enemy into a friend; or work which the whole police of the city, backed by the army and navy of the United States, could not accomplish.

This, manifestly, is the first thing to be tried. Moreover, this would certainly be successful in a large number of cases which are now prolonged and made more bitter by violence and retaliation. Is it not true that 'A soft answer turneth away wrath'; and also that 'Grievous words stir up anger'?

In cases where this does not succeed, but where the violence of my assailant is continued or increased, I have to decide on the spot whether it will be better for me and my brother (I must try not to lose sight of his welfare, however regardless he may be of mine), to bear with perfect quietness whatever his passion may inflict—in the hope that, when passion has subsided, he will see, repent of, and acknowledge his injustice—or to use my strength to restrain him without injuring him. If I adopt the former of these two methods, if I bear his insults and assaults with a patience manifestly proceeding not from fear or meanness of spirit, but from good-will to him and conscientious self-control, and if this course produces the desired effect, and he comes to me on the morrow to acknowledge his fault and offer reparation, this is the second best possible termination of the affair.

Again, I shall have gained my brother! And that man will be, ever after, more likely to befriend me, and more likely to control himself, than if I had returned his injurious treatment. Moreover, as in the case before supposed, I am sure that this method would succeed in a certain proportion of cases. God's arrangement for mankind is, that wrong-doing should breed self-reproach, and that this should tend to confession and amendment. I will trust to God's arrangement!

On the other hand, if my bodily strength is sufficient, and I judge it best to use that in self-defence—grasping my opponent, and, without injuring him, holding him so that he cannot injure me—this method also is at my option. The right of self-defence is unquestionable, and circumstances may show this to be the best way of using it. And if, while I thus prove to my opponent my physical superiority, my language and demeanor, manly and yet friendly, can show him his fault, and make him sincerely regret it, this is the third best possible termination of the affair. Again, I have gained my brother!

Suppose, finally, that all these methods fail to preserve me, as they all sometimes will fail; for Non-Resistance must often receive the cross before the crown, and triumph only through suffering, and the followers of Jesus and Paul, in this heavenly path, will still sometimes meet with foes as powerful and unrelenting as theirs; if all these resources fail, and I am killed on the spot, what then? Have I erred, have I acted foolishly, have I thrown my life away by refraining from the return of injurious violence upon my adversary? I do not think so; but let us deliberate!

LOVE YOUR NEIGHBOR AS YOURSELF! LOVE EVEN YOUR ENEMIES! OVERTCOME EVIL WITH GOOD!

Let us make the application of these rules to a particular case. Stealing is an evil and a crime, unhappily too common in all communities. It is an injury to individuals, and an offence against society. Theft is one of the recognized evils which it is the duty and interest of us all to overcome. But it is to be overcome with good, not with evil.

A man who has lost property by theft sometimes knows the thief, and knows where he possesses property of equal value. Shall he steal that, and thus restore the disturbed equilibrium of property? This might compensate for the loss, but would it remove the evil? Is it a right method of proceeding?

Nobody will say so. Instead of removing the evil, it has doubled the evil. If one thief is an offence against good morals and the welfare of society, two thefts must be yet more so. This is not the proper mode of proceeding. Nobody uses it, nobody would justify it. On the contrary, it is the interest of the person robbed, and of the whole community, to pay a sacred regard to the laws of property, and to show, by their whole conduct, that they respect and scrupulously observe those rights which the thief has violated. Only thus can they justify themselves in complaining of him, and applying remedial measures to him, as a thief. If they show themselves dishonest in the very case in question, with what face can they accuse him of dishonesty?

(1) See Letter of Dr. DANIEL MANN in the Liberator of March 16th, 1850. In the course of it, Dr. M. says—Moral measures, so long as they serve effectually, are doubtless most proper. If we can persuade the robber to desist from his trade, and leave us unharmed, or if we can run away from them, and thus prevent mischief, it is well to do so. But if our own safety, or that of others, requires other means of protection, involving danger or destruction to the aggressor, I know of no just restriction of our right to use them, according to the apparent necessities of the occasion. The same power which gave me a tongue to persuade, and legs to run away from them, and thus to be able to fight, and so far as I can see, gave me the right to use either of these three remedies against wrong, according to the exigencies of each occasion.

Let me test this matter by proceeding at once to the strongest possible case, an injury threatened to my wife; my dearer and better self, to whose protection I am bound even more by present love than by the long-standing compact under which I promised her protection.

Of course, all I can do shall be done for her safety. My strength, my life, shall interpose between her and harm, and he who would assault her must pass over my body. It is the duty of us both to suffer wrong rather than do wrong, but I, as the stronger, choose to take upon myself the suffering for both. I shall meet the violence of the assailant as I did in the former case, but, while my life lasts, the assault must be made upon me, not upon my wife. She is to be safe while I live. So far all is plain. But may I, fearing lest the sacrifice of my life be not sufficient to avert the threatened injury, may I proceed to kill the assailant? doing for my wife what I am conscious that the Christian law forbids me to do for myself? committing an injury to prevent the commission of an injury!

I have said above that the rules of right and wrong, the principles of morality and religion, remain quiet undisturbed by our private exigency, and that such exigency does not at all release us from obedience to them. I have said, further, that the Christian rule of love to all, even the injurer—and of invariable abstinence from injury on our own part—and of the use of good only, never of evil, in the work of overcoming evil—is the best rule I know, or can possibly conceive of. And, finally, I have admitted that this rule, though best, incomparably best, on the whole, does not in all cases secure the bodily safety of him who practices it.

It would seem that the question is already answered. Shall I demand, in the case of my wife, a different rule of action from that which God has appointed for the whole human race, which he has so appointed because it is the best possible rule, and which I myself have recognized as the best possible rule, both for the whole and for every individual?

My wife and I constitute (perhaps) one five-hundred-millionth part of the human race. No possible injury can be threatened to, or inflicted upon us, which was not recognized and contemplated in that system by which God governs the race, and in that system also by which He has appointed that they shall govern themselves, namely, the Christian system. No possible injury can be inflicted upon us which has not already been inflicted in thousands of other instances, without occasioning, or requiring, any change in the rule. Who are we, that we should rebel against it? Who are we, that we should demand to be better protected, more thoroughly cared for, than the rest of mankind? that we should demand a better destiny than that afforded us in God's world, and under his laws?

Is there not a sound, a just, a grand meaning in that saying of the great Teacher, that a man may lose his life by saving it, and may save his life by losing it? To me it seems plain that the true safety and interest, both of me and my wife, lie in placing ourselves, and in keeping ourselves, in conformity and co-operation with this great Christian law, and in trusting to the consequences of such conformity to Him who made the law.

But it is not merely the 'higher law' which points in this direction. Let me descend to the region where my opponents in this debate have (as they think) their strong hold, the ground of present success and bodily safety, and see if they have that realm wholly on their side.

What says the voice of history? What says the applause of men in regard to those who have disdained to purchase the bodily safety and temporal interests of their nearest and dearest by a violation of duty? What made Mrs. Hemans select for the subject of her beautiful dramatic poem (The Siege of Valencia) one of two instances which the history of Spain records, in which a Christian knight refused to surrender the city which had been given him to defend, even when the Moorish besiegers made the lives of his captive children the price of his fidelity? Was it not because men had honored his fidelity as glorious, even at the cost of such a sacrifice? What made Miss Edgeworth describe the wife of Vivian as saying—when he had abandoned his principles and his honor to regain her lost fortune—'And you did consider me? And that did weigh with you? Oh, this is what I dreaded most!' cried lady Sarah. 'When will you know my real character? When will you have confidence in my wife? What pain can be so great to me as the thought of my husband's reputation suffering abatement?'

My wife is not less noble in soul than Vivian's. She, too, would seem to be protected at the sacrifice of my principles—of the rule of right—for all his children, our common Father, having made for all His children, must be supposed to have intended for her also. We will together take the risk of siding by that law.

Then—to glance, in passing, at the results of the opposite course of action—would that course absolutely insure us success? Does violence in defence always conquer violence in offence? Do they that take the sword for what are called good reasons—that is, because they are assailed—never perish by the sword?

I come, lastly, to the case of the slaves! a case, certainly, of great urgency, of the very highest importance, appealing in the most moving manner, to our humanity, to our sense of justice, and also to our self-interest, since the whirlpool that has engulfed the slave is also, year by year, drawing more and more of our rights and interests into its pernicious vortex.

That natural instinct which prompts us to defend ourselves from injury, and those reasons which make clear our right to use all means accordant with the law of love for this object, apply equally to the giving of aid to a suffering or oppressed neighbor. We are not at liberty to refuse any aid which he asks, and which is within our power to give. And, if the case be one of such extreme urgency that he cannot even ask, if he be imprisoned unjustly in a dungeon, or fenced so securely within certain bounds that a tyrant has prescribed, that his voice cannot reach those disposed to help him, so much the more should help be given; in a case like that, the right is clear for any human being to interpose between the oppressor and the sufferer, to demand for him his rights, to help him in the attainment of them, and to obstruct those measures of the tyrant which would prevent his attainment of them. This is one of the very purposes for which strength of body and strength of will were given us; and the possession of these qualities is the condemnation of him who refuses to use them for such a purpose. Well sang one of the poets of freedom—

'Men! whose boast it is that ye Come of fathers brave and free, If there breathe on earth a slave, Are ye truly free and brave? If ye do not feel the chain, When it works a brother's pain, Are ye not base slaves indeed? Slaves unworthy to be freed?'

All the circumstances of the case make manifest this right of any third party, any individual, or any community, to interpose with the slaveholder for the relief of the slave. If the Good Samaritan had met the robbers in the act of attacking their victim, and had been able to prevent, or to cut short, their outrage, should he not have done it? The necessities of the traveller were the same, the right of the Samaritan to help was the same, as when the help was ultimately given. The robbers, as robbers, had no rights whatever. The function of robbery is evil from beginning to end, it has no right to exist on the earth, and they who exercise it are, so far, utterly and entirely in the wrong. It would have been absurd in the extreme for the robbers, in such a case, to have said to the Good Samaritan—'What right have you

to interfere with us?'—Everybody had a right to interpose with them. It is useful to say so plain a thing as that the traveller was under no obligation to the robbers, as robbers? that no duty required him to deliver up his property to them, or to submit, in any manner or degree, to their injustice? that he owed no duty of submission to them, or what whatever?

Alas! yes! In the circumstances of our country, considering the sort, and the amount, and the presumptuous arrogance, of the oppression which we practice—considering the position held by our national government in support of it—and considering the complicity openly maintained with it by our religious teachers—it is needful to affirm, and to maintain, a thing so obviously true as this—

The slave is one who has been stolen—either at his birth or at some subsequent period—from that natural liberty which is the right of every human being, and which the American Declaration of Independence declares to be inalienable. If he was thus stolen at birth, he was also stolen from the natural right of his mother to protect him, to educate him, and to make arrangements for his future welfare. The whole course of discipline under which he is placed, however varied (perhaps) by capricious indulgence from time to time, is a course of injustice. His relation of plundered person neither imposes, nor includes, the slightest obligation or duty to the plunderer.

On the other hand, the slaveholder is a robber. His claim of property in the body and soul of a brother man is grossly and impudently false, his enforcement of that claim is utterly unjust, and all the means by which he enforces it are shameful and wicked. His hold upon his victim, alike when he was first seized (whether at the birth of the victim or at any subsequent time, and by whatever means he has come into possession of his victim) and at every moment of his continued detention, is an outrage. He has no just claim upon the brother man whom he calls a slave, no right over him, no right to prevent his taking his natural liberty at any moment, no right to prevent, or object to, or complain of, the help which any humane person may give him. And no labor, or service, or duty, is due from the person thus robbed to the robber.

But, still further, the slaveholder, like every other sort of robber, is a dangerous person in the community. He is injuring its interests, not less than the interests of his particular victims. He is spreading false principles, helping to break down morality and religion, obstructing honest industry, and freedom of speech and of the press, infringing upon the rights even of those whom he admits to be free men and fellow-citizens, and doing all this by a series of overt acts manifestly prejudicial to his immediate neighbors and to the community. The slaveholder, then, as such, is a public nuisance; a nuisance such as it is the first duty of any properly constituted government to abate; a person dangerous to the community, who, if he perseveres in this attitude, should be taken in charge by the police, and put under restraint.

But, unfortunately, all governments are neither properly constituted nor well regulated. In fact, there are in the world, even now, more specimens of governments grossly tyrannical and unjust, than of those which rightly perform their proper function. We have then to consider whether—when a government obviously and grossly neglects its function of removing public nuisances, and preserving the rights of quiet and honest men—individuals may not, to the extent of their ability and opportunity, and in the use of right means, kept within a right sphere of operation, (each individual being his own judge in regard to all these,) do those things which the government has criminally neglected?

Suppose, for instance, that in the region between Jerusalem and Jericho, in the life-time of Jesus, an organized band of robbers had become so powerful as not only to work their will throughout that territory, but even to have bribed the local government to permit and favor their depredations! Would this fact have made the slightest difference in the right of the Good Samaritan to help the traveller after he had been plundered, or to defend him if he had been present at the time of the assault? Would such a state of things have given the robbers in the slightest manner or degree a right to rob, or imposed upon the traveller the slightest duty of consenting to be robbed, or interfered with the absolute right of any third person to help the victim? I assume that it would not! I assume that the right of help, inherent in every human being, is not so forfeited by the appointment of a particular official helper, that others must remain quiet and inactive in the cases where he chooses to neglect his duty. I assume that Florence Nightingale was right in breaking down the door of the arsenal in the Crimea! I assume that any man has the right to help any slave to his freedom, entirely irrespective of the fact that in this country the great gang of robbers called slaveholders have secured the complicity of the government in their depredations!

I have come, then, to these conclusions: THE SLAVEHOLDER HAS NO RIGHTS WHATSOEVER OVER THE SLAVE. THE SLAVE, AS SUCH, OWES NO DUTY OR SERVICE WHATSOEVER TO THE SLAVEHOLDER.

Help to the slave in the recovery of his freedom is a thing which the slave has a right to receive, which every third person has a right to give, and which is no wrong or injustice to the slaveholder, whether it be given secretly or openly.

I have said that the slave, as such, owes no duty or service to the slaveholder. This is perfectly true. But both the slave and the master are human beings, and, in that capacity, each has duties to the other; each is bound to practise towards the other the law of love; the great and glorious law which God has appointed to regulate the intercourse of all men with each other.

Unfortunately, and most culpably, the master ignores, disregards and tramples under his feet the law of love. So much the worse for him. But the wrong-doing of the master to the slave, does not in the slightest degree release the slave from his duties to God, and his obligation to obey God's law of love. The slave has duties to perform as well as rights to vindicate. God calls upon him, as well as upon other men, to forgive his enemies; to love his enemies; to return good for evil; and to overcome evil with good.

These are hard duties. They are hard for all of us. Even we, educated, cultivated people, of the privileged class, with so little injustice to undergo, with such ample means of knowing our duty, and with such strong incitements to perform it, how hard do we find it to exercise due forbearance under the trivial specimens of injury that we meet with! How few of us, in the course of our whole lives, have met even once with an injury equivalent to the infliction of thirty-nine lashes with a cow-hide, upon the bare back, bringing blood at every stroke! It is a great deal to ask of the slave that he forgive his enemies; that he slaveholder, who sold away his wife, and yet constantly told his Northern visitors, after this, as well as before, that he was well treated, happy and contented; the slaveholder's son, who ravished his daughter; the overseer, who has flogged him, kicked and cursed him, laughed his marfoid miseries to scorn, treated him worse than a dog; and the pro-slavery person, who, knowing all these things, has kept on repeating to him the infamous lie that God has appointed him to this condition, and that God requires him to do faithful service to the villain who has robbed him of everything; it must be very hard to fulfil the duty of forgiveness to these, or to return good for their evil. Nevertheless, such is God's command! such is the duty of the enslaved man! and such, also, is his interest; for it is his interest to be entirely and absolutely in the right.

How is the slave to return good for the slaveholder's evil? So destitute, so impoverished is his condition, so limited are his means, that I see but one way in which he can do so; but one positive action by which he can contribute to the real welfare of the slaveholder. Happily, that one way is precisely coincident with the right path of duty towards himself. His first duty of good-will to the slaveholder is utterly to refuse any longer to be a slave! to put a stop, by this unchangeable determination, and by prompt action in accordance with it, to a relation in which the slaveholder was sinking himself deeper and deeper in sin and in manifold evil.

I do not consider 'Uncle Tom' to be the highest type, either of the many character of the Christian character, in the relation he bore to various slaveholders. I would not be understood as making unreasonable demands upon those poor, ignorant, oppressed, cheated and humbugged creatures; it is much, if, like Uncle Tom, they refrain from stealing, lying, drunkenness and lust, in all which things their masters are constantly setting them evil examples; and from hypocrisy, such as they see to be practised by their masters' ministers, which would perhaps give them some indulgence; it is much, if, like him, with heroic self-control, they can subdue the natural desire for vengeance, can rise above wrath and passion, and sincerely pray for those who persecute and despoil them. But there is another duty, of not less importance, to be performed by the true man, the true Christian, who is claimed as a slave.

Quiet, continuous submission to enslavement in complicity with the slaveholder. It is acquiescence in the double injustice he is doing, both to himself and to the slave. It is the duty of a man and a Christian not only to protest against this, but, if he will, acting in the right way, to put a stop to it. The slave is able to put a stop to it, and to do this in the right way, by utterly refusing to be a slave; by showing himself a man, and taking possession of a man's rights. This, then, is his duty, alike to himself and to the slaveholder. And circumstances must decide whether this duty shall be performed in the most satisfactory manner, by a firm, manly, open declaration made to the face of the slaveholder, or by the attempt to escape. Such is the duty of the slave, as I regard it.

But the slave is poor, ignorant, weak, uneducated, unable to combine with his fellow-slaves, or take counsel with more intelligent persons as to the best course of action. He is hemmed in on every side with restrictions, doubts and dangers. He has been, too far, the most helpless of human beings; to our in-speakable disgrace, who have been living, not only in the same country with him, but in formal alliance with his tyrants. This could not go to his credit. The slave must help him, and we must help him!

How are we to help him? Of course, by using our courage and energy, our strength of body and mind, our wealth, our intelligence, our Christian principle, and our various means of combination and action, to do the right thing, in the right manner. To set the slave free, or help him to set himself free, by means accordant with our duty and his duty; that is to say, by means accordant with the Christian law of love.

If in any place the slaveholders are such, and the slaves such, and the numbers and character of the interfering freemen such, that a new arrangement can be made, giving the slaves their rights without banishing them from their native soil, leaving them therefore free, and in the enjoyment of such rights and opportunities as white freemen have in the Northern States, with a friendly and helpful disposition towards them on the part of the white population, (such as was actually realized in Antigua and Bermuda since the immediate emancipation of the slaves there, in 1834,) this would be the very best possible plan. This would fulfil our highest wishes, and effect a rational expectation of permanent prosperity and happiness. Unfortunately, however, the vicious and brutal characters, and the insolent and domineering habits, of the slaveholders and their parasites, place this best solution of the trouble almost out of the bounds of possibility.

If, in failure of this method, the thing could be accomplished which John Brown sought to do, without the resort to violent and bloody means, by the proposed to maintain it against the resistance of the slaveholders, namely; if places of secure retreat, well stored with provisions, could be established among the mountains of the slaveholding States, to which the slaves could repair and hold themselves safely entrenched, giving shelter to all fugitives, and in a short time draining the whole region of the entire laboring population, and leaving it so deserted until the proprietors of the land were willing to obtain laborers by treating them justly and paying them fair wages—this would be the next best solution of the difficulty; a solution infinitely preferable to a quiet continuance of the slaves in slavery. In such a movement, the slaves should of course take possession of all the provisions, and all the materials for clothing, on which they can lay their hands, both at its commencement and during its continuance; and all these, and much more, are their property, the avails of their unpaid labor. In a slaveholding country, the movable property, as a general rule, may be assumed rightfully to belong to the slaves. It is necessary, in accomplishing such a movement, to seize and put under restraint, until the departure of the persons of any slaveholders, until the departure of the slaves is safely effected, this would be perfectly right, for it is only what the government is a public nuisance; a person eminently dangerous to the community; and if the government does not do for itself in restraining him, any person who has the power may properly use all uninjurious means to do it.

In failure of these two methods, the next best thing to be done is to help as many slaves as possible to a safe removal from the land of bondage to some place of freedom. To inform them, as extensively as possible, of the existence of white friends and helpers, to give all needed material aid, with counsel and direction, and the personal superintendence of sympathetic freemen, where that shall seem best; to demand the slave's rights and effect his rescue by calmly and openly confronting the slaveholder, when so ever it will not be hazarded thereby; otherwise, to do the needful secretly; to protect the slave in some of the States called free, where that can be done, and to States called free, towards increasing the number of such sympathizers; and finally, to keep the freemen and their friends absolutely and entirely in the right, leaving the wrong where it now is, absolutely, entirely and exclusively on the side of the slaveholders.

It is said, that in transactions like these, as the result of them, violence would be sure to come; it is asked what those persons shall do who, beginning a right work by uninjurious means, are assailed in the prosecution of it with violence and injury?

I answer, they are to do just what a Christian, who believes in and endeavors to live by the law of love, is to do in any other case where he is met by violence and injury! He is first, and above all, to keep himself in the right. He is to leave un-fulfilled what good he can by right means, to be ready for the present all that he cannot do by right means, and to bear with fortitude, and without giving up the spirit of love, or departing from the manifestation of love, whatever evil may befall him.

J. B. YERRINGTON & SON, PRINTERS, 21 CORNHILL, LONDON.