



The Liberator

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS

BOSTON, NOVEMBER 9, 1860.

FEDERAL AND STATE ELECTIONS. On Tuesday last, the Presidential struggle...

For Lincoln and Hamlin. Maine 5 Pennsylvania 27 New Hampshire 5 Ohio 22 Vermont 5 Michigan 6 Massachusetts 15 Indiana 13 Rhode Island 4 Illinois 11 Connecticut 5 Iowa 4 New York 35 Wisconsin 4 New Jersey 7 Minnesota 4

For Bell and Everett. Maryland 8 Tennessee 19 Virginia 16 Kentucky 12 Louisiana 6

For Breckinridge and Lane. Delaware 3 Florida 13 North Carolina 10 Texas 7 South Carolina 4 Georgia 10 Arkansas 9 Alabama 9 Missouri 9

For Douglas and Johnson. 000!!! - 000!!!

In this State, the vote for President stood as follows:—Lincoln, 104,467; Bell, 22,017; Douglas, 34,007; Breckinridge, 6,072. Lincoln's majority over all, 42,301. For Governor, the vote is, Andrew, 101,802; Lawrence, 33,078; Beach, 34,094; Butler, 6,791. Andrew's majority over all, 38,838.

PENNSYLVANIA A. S. SOCIETY. The twenty-fourth annual meeting of this Society was held in the Town Hall, Kennett Square, Chester County, commencing on Thursday, Oct. 26th, at 11 o'clock, A. M.—James Mott, President of the Society, in the chair.

Business Committee—May Grew, Mahlon B. Linton, Simon Barnard, Robert Purvis, Oliver Johnson, H. P. Grosier, Lucretia Mott, Thomas Whitson, and Sarah Pugh.

Finance Committee—Chandler Darlington, Alice Jackson, E. M. Davis, Samuel Penlock, Joseph A. Dugdale, Isaac Mendenhall, and Abby Kimber.

Nominating Committee—John Cox, George Atkinson, Sarah Barnard, Edwin H. Coates, Jolly Longshore, Stephen Smith and Rebecca Plumly.

The following resolutions were offered, and, after a discussion extending through five sessions, adopted: 1. Resolved, That we regard with great satisfaction the agitation that is now rocking the country to its centre on the question of slavery, confident that its effect will be such an enlightenment of the public mind and change of the public heart that this momentous issue, as must eventually in the overthrow of the system.

2. Resolved, That in the action of the various ecclesiastical bodies of the North, we see indubitable evidence of the power with which the anti-slavery sentiment of the country presses upon them, sometimes exerting from them faint and unwilling testimonies against slavery, and sometimes eliciting hearty denunciation thereof; and that, in the course of such exertions as Dr. Cheever, we see indications of a regenerated and purified Church, against which Anti-Slavery Societies can have no controversy.

3. Resolved, That as long as the fugitive bondman may be recaptured and re-enslaved on Pennsylvania soil, Pennsylvania cannot be called a free State; and that, for the honor of our Commonwealth, for the sake of justice to the slave, for the love of the absolute Right, we will earnestly strive to obtain from our Legislature the enactment of a law which shall protect the personal liberty of every human being on its soil, when that liberty has not been forfeited by crime.

4. Resolved, That one of the most important signs of the times which the last year has developed, is the sympathy with John Brown, which has extensively pervaded the North, and found expression in the pulpit, on the platform, and through the press; indicating that, whatever theories men may hold respecting State rights and constitutional obligations, there lives and burns in the Northern heart a genuine admiration of heroism, and a genuine sympathy with the victims of oppression.

5. Resolved, That while we hail, as a token of greatly improved public sentiment, the existence of the Republican party of the United States, and while we rejoice to see men coming up into it from the other political parties, we protest against the inconsistency of Abolitionists giving it their support; first, because such support involves a pledge to return the fugitive slave, and, second, because the Presidential candidate of its party is heartily opposed to the political enfranchisement of colored men, is in favor of a fugitive slave statute, and though he has 'very distinctly made up his mind' that Congress possesses the constitutional power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, yet is not in favor of such abolition, excepting with the consent of a large number of the slaveholders of the District.

6. Resolved, That the experience of a quarter of a century of anti-slavery labor has confirmed our faith in the principles on which our enterprise is founded, in the wisdom of the measures by which we have sought its accomplishment, and in the certainty of its final triumph; and that, thus confirmed and strengthened, we commence the labors of another year in abounding hope that, at its close, we shall rejoice in its success, as we rejoice to-day over the results of the past.

7. Resolved, That in the death of Theodore Parker, the American slave has lost a faithful friend, and the Abolitionists a valuable coadjutor, whose great intellect, and large heart, and tireless energies, were devoted to the cause of philanthropy, and were ever most promptly given in the service of those who, by reason of their suffering or their wrong, most needed sympathy, protection, or championship.

Those who participated in the discussion were Lucretia Mott, J. M. McKim, H. P. Grosier, May Grew, Oliver Johnson, Chandler Darlington, Edward M. Dray, Mahlon B. Linton, Thomas Garrett, Anne R. Dickinson, Robert Purvis, Edwin H. Coates, Elizabeth Barnard, William Thorne, Cole Jackson, and Dr. Stebbins. Some of the speakers professed to regard the U. S. Constitution as an anti-slavery instrument.

What an absurdity in view of its history, and of its present construction and administration, by the nation ever since its formation! It is so objected to the 5th section. Dr. Stebbins was visible in his denunciation of the Anti-Slavery movement, and limitation of the Republican party. (For a full report of the proceedings, copy seven columns from the Liberator, dated 1st Nov. 1860.)

The Annual Meeting of the Executive Committee was read by Mr. McKim. It was largely occupied with the most forcible and discriminating review of the Harper's Ferry affair, and the noble character and devotedness of Capt. John Brown. We make the following extract from it, relative to political action:—

The position of this Committee on the question of supporting candidates for office is not a doubtful one. Their views of the Constitution and its requirements have often been expressed, and have undergone no change. Regarding that instrument as a league with oppression, illegitimate in its nature, and in its results disastrous, they cannot by word or act become parties to its obligations. Intending, as often as occasion may require, to aid the fugitive in his escape from slavery, they cannot, expressly or by implication, agree to send him back to his master. Sympathizing with all men everywhere who upon the yoke, and for the recovery of their liberty, they cannot stand pledged in the interest and meaning of the phrase, to 'support domestic insurrection.' Objecting to all unequal distribution of political rights, they cannot be understood as agreeing to an arrangement by which, in the most important features of the government, one class of citizens has 'three-fifths' more of privilege than any other; especially when that class are the owners of slaves who use their extra power for the perpetuation of their system. As a matter of conscience, therefore, of personal honor, and of self-respect, the members of this Committee, and those whom they represent, cannot, by overt act or implied admission, come under obligation of support to the Constitution. Neither can they take any active part in the politics of the day, or be numbered among the recognized supporters of Abraham Lincoln for the Presidency. Holding, as they do, that the Federal compact is an infamous bargain, binding the free States to the support of slavery, the only duty they recognize in regard to it is that of laboring for its annulment. They cannot vote or take an active part in politics until that compact is either dissolved, or so construed, by authority recognized to be competent, as will give their suffrage, in the eyes of the world, the unambiguous meaning of a vote against slavery.

But, these considerations apart, there are other arguments of great weight against supporting for President the Republican candidate in the pending crisis. His past course in the matter of a Fugitive Slave Law; his present readiness to return the escaping bondman; his avowed willingness to discriminate against the black man in the award of political rights; and his declared hostility, except in a contingency not probable, to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia—are facts, which, in the estimation of discriminating minds, disqualify him for the votes of uncompromising Abolitionists.

But, having said this, it is due to truth and candor to admit that, as between him and his opponents, and on the issues involved in the present contest, the election of Abraham Lincoln will be a great and encouraging triumph. It will mark a hopeful epoch in the progress of our cause. It will show that amid all the corruption and demoralization that have prevailed, the nation is not totally depraved; that the predominant feeling in the country is in favor of liberty, assuring us, at the same time, that this feeling will in due season ripen into a conviction that will brook no further compromises with slavery. Regarding the matter in this light, we shall hail the election, should it take place, of Abraham Lincoln, as a most gratifying occurrence.

From the administration of Mr. Lincoln, as distinguished from his election, we are warranted in entertaining no confident hopes. His election, as the act of an individual, so constrained by the oath of office and surrounding circumstances, must be a continual support of slavery. Let not, therefore, any satisfaction here expressed be understood as based on expectations of what will be done by the incoming national administration.

LETTER FROM WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON. The following letter was read to the meeting by Mr. McKim:—

BOSTON, October 11, 1860. MY DEAR FRIEND: Since I promised to attend the anniversary of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society at Kennett, I have been suffering from a severe attack of bronchitis; and though at the present time it is considerably mitigated, I am under positive medical prohibition, in reference to public speaking, for some time to come; hence I must again disappoint my Pennsylvania friends—most deeply to my own regret and loss, for their magnetic presence is ever most delightful and strengthening to my spirit. I can only beg to be affectionately remembered to them all, and invoke upon their deliberations the blessing of the Infinite Father.

Twenty-five years ago this evening, I was in a cell in the Leverett street jail in this city—a device of the city authorities to save my life against the murderous designs of an infuriated mob of (so called) 'gentlemen of property and standing,' on account of my anti-slavery principles. Previous to my imprisonment, I was in the hands of the rioters for a time, who tore the clothes from my body as they dragged me through the streets, and who made the most desperate efforts to take me where they could apply a coat of tar and feathers, and commit such other outrages as their ungovernable malignity might suggest. Rescued at last, by the Mayor and his posse, it was deemed indispensable to my personal safety to commit me to prison! This was the only governmental protection that was vouchsafed to me. You remember all the circumstances of that memorable event, and I need not repeat them. Nearly all the prominent actors therein have been called to their final account, but the sacred and glorious cause which they madly attempted to overthrow is now shaping the destiny of the nation.

The Liberator, copying seven columns from the Liberator, dated 1st Nov. 1860. The Annual Meeting of the Executive Committee was read by Mr. McKim. It was largely occupied with the most forcible and discriminating review of the Harper's Ferry affair, and the noble character and devotedness of Capt. John Brown. We make the following extract from it, relative to political action:—

The position of this Committee on the question of supporting candidates for office is not a doubtful one. Their views of the Constitution and its requirements have often been expressed, and have undergone no change. Regarding that instrument as a league with oppression, illegitimate in its nature, and in its results disastrous, they cannot by word or act become parties to its obligations. Intending, as often as occasion may require, to aid the fugitive in his escape from slavery, they cannot, expressly or by implication, agree to send him back to his master. Sympathizing with all men everywhere who upon the yoke, and for the recovery of their liberty, they cannot stand pledged in the interest and meaning of the phrase, to 'support domestic insurrection.' Objecting to all unequal distribution of political rights, they cannot be understood as agreeing to an arrangement by which, in the most important features of the government, one class of citizens has 'three-fifths' more of privilege than any other; especially when that class are the owners of slaves who use their extra power for the perpetuation of their system. As a matter of conscience, therefore, of personal honor, and of self-respect, the members of this Committee, and those whom they represent, cannot, by overt act or implied admission, come under obligation of support to the Constitution. Neither can they take any active part in the politics of the day, or be numbered among the recognized supporters of Abraham Lincoln for the Presidency. Holding, as they do, that the Federal compact is an infamous bargain, binding the free States to the support of slavery, the only duty they recognize in regard to it is that of laboring for its annulment. They cannot vote or take an active part in politics until that compact is either dissolved, or so construed, by authority recognized to be competent, as will give their suffrage, in the eyes of the world, the unambiguous meaning of a vote against slavery.

But, these considerations apart, there are other arguments of great weight against supporting for President the Republican candidate in the pending crisis. His past course in the matter of a Fugitive Slave Law; his present readiness to return the escaping bondman; his avowed willingness to discriminate against the black man in the award of political rights; and his declared hostility, except in a contingency not probable, to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia—are facts, which, in the estimation of discriminating minds, disqualify him for the votes of uncompromising Abolitionists.

But, having said this, it is due to truth and candor to admit that, as between him and his opponents, and on the issues involved in the present contest, the election of Abraham Lincoln will be a great and encouraging triumph. It will mark a hopeful epoch in the progress of our cause. It will show that amid all the corruption and demoralization that have prevailed, the nation is not totally depraved; that the predominant feeling in the country is in favor of liberty, assuring us, at the same time, that this feeling will in due season ripen into a conviction that will brook no further compromises with slavery. Regarding the matter in this light, we shall hail the election, should it take place, of Abraham Lincoln, as a most gratifying occurrence.

From the administration of Mr. Lincoln, as distinguished from his election, we are warranted in entertaining no confident hopes. His election, as the act of an individual, so constrained by the oath of office and surrounding circumstances, must be a continual support of slavery. Let not, therefore, any satisfaction here expressed be understood as based on expectations of what will be done by the incoming national administration.

LETTER FROM WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON. The following letter was read to the meeting by Mr. McKim:—

BOSTON, October 11, 1860. MY DEAR FRIEND: Since I promised to attend the anniversary of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society at Kennett, I have been suffering from a severe attack of bronchitis; and though at the present time it is considerably mitigated, I am under positive medical prohibition, in reference to public speaking, for some time to come; hence I must again disappoint my Pennsylvania friends—most deeply to my own regret and loss, for their magnetic presence is ever most delightful and strengthening to my spirit. I can only beg to be affectionately remembered to them all, and invoke upon their deliberations the blessing of the Infinite Father.

Twenty-five years ago this evening, I was in a cell in the Leverett street jail in this city—a device of the city authorities to save my life against the murderous designs of an infuriated mob of (so called) 'gentlemen of property and standing,' on account of my anti-slavery principles. Previous to my imprisonment, I was in the hands of the rioters for a time, who tore the clothes from my body as they dragged me through the streets, and who made the most desperate efforts to take me where they could apply a coat of tar and feathers, and commit such other outrages as their ungovernable malignity might suggest. Rescued at last, by the Mayor and his posse, it was deemed indispensable to my personal safety to commit me to prison! This was the only governmental protection that was vouchsafed to me. You remember all the circumstances of that memorable event, and I need not repeat them. Nearly all the prominent actors therein have been called to their final account, but the sacred and glorious cause which they madly attempted to overthrow is now shaping the destiny of the nation.

So far as the North is concerned, a marvellous change for the better has taken place in public sentiment in relation to the anti-slavery movement. The struggle for freedom of speech and of the press has every where been fought, and the victory won. A general enlightenment has taken place upon the subject of slavery. The opinions of a vast multitude have been essentially changed, and secured to the side of freedom. The conflict between free institutions and slave institutions is seen and acknowledged to be irrepressible—not of man's devising, but of God's ordering—and it is deepening in intensity daily, in spite of every effort of political cunning and religious sophistry to effect a reconciliation. The pending Presidential election witnesses a marked division between the political forces of the North and of the South; and though it relates, ostensibly, solely to the question of the further extension of slavery, it really signifies a much deeper sentiment in the breasts of the people of the North, which, in process of time, must ripen into more decisive action.

So far as the South is concerned, she has apparently waxed worse and worse—more and more desperate—revealed more and more of savage brutality and fiendish malignity, until her crimes and atrocities, not only as perpetrated upon her debauched slaves, but as inflicted upon Northern citizens and strangers within her limits, have become too numerous for record, and almost too horrible for belief.

Has all this the sign that the end is rapidly approaching? Peaceably, or by a bloody process, the oppressed will eventually obtain their freedom, and nothing can prevent it. Trusting that it may be achieved without the shedding of blood, I remain, Yours, for liberty and equality for all mankind, WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

J. MILLER McKIM.

DEAR BROTHER: I have written a long letter, but I have not time to throw of the impression, and I have not time to send it. I have written a long letter, but I have not time to throw of the impression, and I have not time to send it. I have written a long letter, but I have not time to throw of the impression, and I have not time to send it.

This elaborate letter, of more than two columns, is particularly directed at a statement made in the Christian Register of New York City, and Dr. Bacon's letter to the 'Reformed Dutchman' of his clerical brother, who edits that paper, is not so much, since the stupidity of the latter, on this occasion, has equalled his malignity, which is saying a great deal. In short, Dr. Bacon has, on this (among many) occasions for applying to the church, a dishonest dealer in regard to slavery, because, among the accusatory expressions of the particular article in question, there are so many and so inaccurately worded that he was able to confute it without telling a direct falsehood. So, with characteristic craft, he proceeds to use the verbal advantage gained thus gained to make the impression that the substance and meaning of the article in question were unassailable.

I propose to show, by an examination of Dr. Bacon's defence, that it is a mere trifling against the force of the defence, and an equivocal expression to which it replies, and that Dr. Bacon's action in 'The American Board' has always been a maintenance of the complicity of that body with slavery, and a series of dishonest attempts to evade or discredit the charge of such complicity.

The Reformed Dutchman's article, headed 'More Consistency'—while it shows very justly that Dr. Bacon and others have countenanced and sided complicity with slavery in the American Board while they discountenanced and opposed such complicity in the American Tract Society—uses the ineffectual expression that these same persons 'are opposed to resolutions about slavery' in the Board, and in their own church bodies. I have designated by italics the word which 'fitted' this expression to be triumphantly pronounced upon by Dr. Bacon. He proceeds to say:—

'For myself, the affirmation that I am opposed to resolutions about slavery in the Board is ludicrously false. Was I opposed to resolutions about slavery in the meeting of the Board at Hartford six years ago?—or in the meeting at Hartford five years ago?—or in the meeting at Detroit two years ago?—or in any other meeting of the Board since I became a member of it?'

Let us see what account the Annual Reports of the Board give of Dr. Bacon's action at the five meetings which he thus triumphantly specifies.

1. 'The meeting of the Board at Brooklyn fifteen years ago'—namely, in 1845.

At this meeting, a report, covering eight closely printed octavo pages, was made by Dr. Woods of Andover, and eight others, to whom, the year before, had been given the consideration of sundry memorials on 'the existence of slavery among some of our missionary churches.'

This report admitted (p. 68) that slavery was existing in the Cherokee and Choctaw tribes when the missionaries entered on their labors there; that, notwithstanding the opportunity thus given of preaching against slaveholding, from the beginning of their labors, as a sin against God and man, they had received slaveholders into their churches, as Christians, indiscriminately with others; that, at the time of this report, fifteen slaveholders were connected with the Cherokee, and twenty with the Choctaw missionary churches; and that, 'in regard to the kind and amount of [public] instruction given by the missionaries in relation to slavery,' there is a substantial agreement among all the missionaries in the following testimony given by Rev. Mr. Byington (p. 69): 'We give such instructions to masters and servants as are contained in the epistles, and yet not in a way to give the subject a pre-eminence. For then it would seem to be personal, as there are usually but one or two slaveholders at our meetings.'

In spite of the avowal of these disgraceful facts in regard to the missionaries, and their action, Dr. Woods and his Committee proceed to declare (p. 61) that these missionaries 'have been faithful in their work'; and they close their report without recommending the slightest change, either in the course of the missionaries, or in the course of the Board with regard to them; a report which was, in effect, giving the memorialists against slavery 'leave to withdraw,' without even the courtesy of a direct answer.

This report, with a motion for its adoption, and several motions for its amendment, were referred to a Committee of six, of whom Chief Justice Williams, of Hartford, (afterwards the zealous defender of slavery in the American Tract Society) and Dr. Bacon, of New Haven, were the first named members.

This Committee recommended 'the adoption of the report without amendment'; (p. 62.)

The question was taken by yeas and nays. The affirmative vote of LEONARD BACON is recorded with that of Nehemiah Adams and others, and the record concludes (p. 63) with this statement:—

'As no person voted in the negative, the report was unanimously adopted.'

So much for Dr. Bacon's action at Brooklyn 'about slavery.'

2. 'The meeting at Hartford six years ago'—namely, in 1854.

At this meeting, the portion of the Prudential Committee's Annual Report relating to the missions to the Choctaws, Cherokees and Dakotas was referred to a Committee of seven, the first two being Dr. William T. Dwight and Dr. Bacon. Their report praised 'the faithful labors of the missionaries,' (p. 22) and recommended the passage of the following resolution, (p. 24) which was discussed, and finally adopted, by the Board:—

'Resolved, That the Board acknowledge, with gratitude to God, the wisdom and fidelity with which, so far as appears from the documents submitted to them, the Prudential Committee are advising and directing the missionaries among the Choctaws, in conformity with the principles asserted by them in their correspondence with those missions, reported to the Board in 1848.'

While the resolution thus proposed by Dr. Bacon, and adopted by the Board in 1854, plainly approves 'the wisdom and fidelity' manifested in a certain correspondence between the Prudential Committee and their missionaries; in 1848, it leaves entirely in the dark (as it was designed to do) what the purpose, and the result, of that correspondence were.

On turning to the Annual Report for 1848, presented at a meeting held in Boston, we find that the documents referred to are the famous correspondence between Rev. Dr. Treat (one of the Secretaries of the Board) and the Choctaw and Cherokee missionaries, in which the latter thus candidly describe their slavery position.

Extracts from the letter of the Cherokee missionaries on slavery, signed by Elijah Butler, Moderator, and S. A. Worcester, Clerk:—

'In regard to the question of rejecting any person from the church simply because he is a slaveholder, we cannot for a moment hesitate. For (1.) we regard it as certain that the Apostle, who was our pattern, did receive slaveholders into the communion of the Church; and we have not yet been able to perceive any such difference between their circumstances and ours as to justify us in departing from their practice in this respect. And (2.) our general rule is to receive all to our communion who give evidence that they love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity; and we cannot doubt that many slaveholders do give such evidence.'

'Nor can we even make it a test of piety, or a condition of admission to the privileges of the Church, that a slaveholder should oppose a determination not to give and take a slaveholder.'—Said Annual Report, 1848, p. 93.

'Conventional exchanges of masters are so inseparable from the existence of slavery, that the churches could not consistently receive slaveholders to their communion, as all, and of the same kind, would be such exchanges. We regard it, therefore, as necessary to

DEAR BROTHER: I have written a long letter, but I have not time to throw of the impression, and I have not time to send it. I have written a long letter, but I have not time to throw of the impression, and I have not time to send it. I have written a long letter, but I have not time to throw of the impression, and I have not time to send it.

This elaborate letter, of more than two columns, is particularly directed at a statement made in the Christian Register of New York City, and Dr. Bacon's letter to the 'Reformed Dutchman' of his clerical brother, who edits that paper, is not so much, since the stupidity of the latter, on this occasion, has equalled his malignity, which is saying a great deal. In short, Dr. Bacon has, on this (among many) occasions for applying to the church, a dishonest dealer in regard to slavery, because, among the accusatory expressions of the particular article in question, there are so many and so inaccurately worded that he was able to confute it without telling a direct falsehood. So, with characteristic craft, he proceeds to use the verbal advantage gained thus gained to make the impression that the substance and meaning of the article in question were unassailable.

I propose to show, by an examination of Dr. Bacon's defence, that it is a mere trifling against the force of the defence, and an equivocal expression to which it replies, and that Dr. Bacon's action in 'The American Board' has always been a maintenance of the complicity of that body with slavery, and a series of dishonest attempts to evade or discredit the charge of such complicity.

The Reformed Dutchman's article, headed 'More Consistency'—while it shows very justly that Dr. Bacon and others have countenanced and sided complicity with slavery in the American Board while they discountenanced and opposed such complicity in the American Tract Society—uses the ineffectual expression that these same persons 'are opposed to resolutions about slavery' in the Board, and in their own church bodies. I have designated by italics the word which 'fitted' this expression to be triumphantly pronounced upon by Dr. Bacon. He proceeds to say:—

'For myself, the affirmation that I am opposed to resolutions about slavery in the Board is ludicrously false. Was I opposed to resolutions about slavery in the meeting of the Board at Hartford six years ago?—or in the meeting at Hartford five years ago?—or in the meeting at Detroit two years ago?—or in any other meeting of the Board since I became a member of it?'

Let us see what account the Annual Reports of the Board give of Dr. Bacon's action at the five meetings which he thus triumphantly specifies.

1. 'The meeting of the Board at Brooklyn fifteen years ago'—namely, in 1845.

At this meeting, a report, covering eight closely printed octavo pages, was made by Dr. Woods of Andover, and eight others, to whom, the year before, had been given the consideration of sundry memorials on 'the existence of slavery among some of our missionary churches.'

This report admitted (p. 68) that slavery was existing in the Cherokee and Choctaw tribes when the missionaries entered on their labors there; that, notwithstanding the opportunity thus given of preaching against slaveholding, from the beginning of their labors, as a sin against God and man, they had received slaveholders into their churches, as Christians, indiscriminately with others; that, at the time of this report, fifteen slaveholders were connected with the Cherokee, and twenty with the Choctaw missionary churches; and that, 'in regard to the kind and amount of [public] instruction given by the missionaries in relation to slavery,' there is a substantial agreement among all the missionaries in the following testimony given by Rev. Mr. Byington (p. 69): 'We give such instructions to masters and servants as are contained in the epistles, and yet not in a way to give the subject a pre-eminence. For then it would seem to be personal, as there are usually but one or two slaveholders at our meetings.'

In spite of the avowal of these disgraceful facts in regard to the missionaries, and their action, Dr. Woods and his Committee proceed to declare (p. 61) that these missionaries 'have been faithful in their work'; and they close their report without recommending the slightest change, either in the course of the missionaries, or in the course of the Board with regard to them; a report which was, in effect, giving the memorialists against slavery 'leave to withdraw,' without even the courtesy of a direct answer.

This report, with a motion for its adoption, and several motions for its amendment, were referred to a Committee of six, of whom Chief Justice Williams, of Hartford, (afterwards the zealous defender of slavery in the American Tract Society) and Dr. Bacon, of New Haven, were the first named members.

This Committee recommended 'the adoption of the report without amendment'; (p. 62.)

The question was taken by yeas and nays. The affirmative vote of LEONARD BACON is recorded with that of Nehemiah Adams and others, and the record concludes (p. 63) with this statement:—

'As no person voted in the negative, the report was unanimously adopted.'

So much for Dr. Bacon's action at Brooklyn 'about slavery.'

2. 'The meeting at Hartford six years ago'—namely, in 1854.

At this meeting, the portion of the Prudential Committee's Annual Report relating to the missions to the Choctaws, Cherokees and Dakotas was referred to a Committee of seven, the first two being Dr. William T. Dwight and Dr. Bacon. Their report praised 'the faithful labors of the missionaries,' (p. 22) and recommended the passage of the following resolution, (p. 24) which was discussed, and finally adopted, by the Board:—

'Resolved, That the Board acknowledge, with gratitude to God, the wisdom and fidelity with which, so far as appears from the documents submitted to them, the Prudential Committee are advising and directing the missionaries among the Choctaws, in conformity with the principles asserted by them in their correspondence with those missions, reported to the Board in 1848.'

While the resolution thus proposed by Dr. Bacon, and adopted by the Board in 1854, plainly approves 'the wisdom and fidelity' manifested in a certain correspondence between the Prudential Committee and their missionaries; in 1848, it leaves entirely in the dark (as it was designed to do) what the purpose, and the result, of that correspondence were.

On turning to the Annual Report for 1848, presented at a meeting held in Boston, we find that the documents referred to are the famous correspondence between Rev. Dr. Treat (one of the Secretaries of the Board) and the Choctaw and Cherokee missionaries, in which the latter thus candidly describe their slavery position.

Extracts from the letter of the Cherokee missionaries on slavery, signed by Elijah Butler, Moderator, and S. A. Worcester, Clerk:—

'In regard to the question of rejecting any person from the church simply because he is a slaveholder, we cannot for a moment hesitate. For (1.) we regard it as certain that the Apostle, who was our pattern, did receive slaveholders into the communion of the Church; and we have not yet been able to perceive any such difference between their circumstances and ours as to justify us in departing from their practice in this respect. And (2.) our general rule is to receive all to our communion who give evidence that they love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity; and we cannot doubt that many slaveholders do give such evidence.'

'Nor can we even make it a test of piety, or a condition of admission to the privileges of the Church, that a slaveholder should oppose a determination not to give and take a slaveholder.'—Said Annual Report, 1848, p. 93.

'Conventional exchanges of masters are so inseparable from the existence of slavery, that the churches could not consistently receive slaveholders to their communion, as all, and of the same kind, would be such exchanges. We regard it, therefore, as necessary to

WESTERN OPERATIONS. SPRING DALE, Cedar Co., Iowa, November 2, 1860.

The responsibilities of those who are laying the foundations of a new State, both personal and public, cannot be too strongly enforced or deeply felt. It may seem reasonable to suppose Iowa as destined, one day, to exert the most commanding influence of any interior State of the Union. What Virginia has been, Iowa may be. Its agricultural resources are beyond the globe. Its richness, Illinois will be equalled, but the extremes of drought or its opposite will affect them very differently. Either extreme will affect Iowa far more than this State. Where I now am, no whole year. And yet the crops are truly lamentable. I saw the best of wheat sold the other day for fifty cents the bushel; and corn can be had in cargo for fifty cents.

But the peculiarly hard times, during the two last years, have made havoc of many high hopes and fair prospects. The final result, however, will be good. Whoever is compelled to sell eighty acres of his farm to pay for the other eighty, will doubtless be enriched by the change. Nature probably laughs at my child of hers, who expects to grow rich by buying large extents of Iowa prairie, and then mortgaging it to secure payment. She probably never intended soil or sunshine to be held as property; and 'comp d soli' by too much of the latter is only a parallel to an excess of half-worked land, and mortgaged for security besides. That is a 'comp d soli' and often proves fatal. And it is a fearful evil here, at the present time.

The result is disastrous every way. Roads, bridges and all such improvements are hindered. Education suffers; manners, morals, all virtues, public and private, are sadly affected; and an Anti-Slavery, and other Progressive Platform, share in the general calamity. And yet the people are really desirous for the proclamation of the gospel of truth. I never addressed more attentive audiences than in this State. A little 'border ruffianism' here, last night, is the only exception. Even Republicans, who would vote for Lincoln though a Virginia galloway impeded over them, are yet regretting that my stay is so short.

After all, it is doubtful whether, with our present field forces, we shall set wisely to attempt much on this side of the Mississippi. We may secure our word and work too widely for the highest general good. When will the Lord of the harvest send forth laborers equal to the demand?

Spring Dale is celebrated as the military rendezvous of the Harper's Ferry Host, and their West Point Academy during the last winter before their conquest of the 'Old Dominion.' I have just come from the house and the rooms and the parade ground where they spent the winter of 1857-8, and am now writing in the cosy little home of the noble mother of the brave young Coppies—a gentle, quiet little Quaker woman as the world often sees. Barclay is at home, and suffering most severely from an old complaint—the asthma. At times, he is compelled to sit up day and night. The last night was an instance, and a severe one.

Mrs. Coppie was a widow in Ohio, almost twenty years ago, with five small children. For several years she supported them by teaching school. When the eldest was seventeen, she removed to this almost unknown region. But disease and death pursued her here; and when the noble Edwin suffered his martyrdom, two only remained. But the faith and fortitude of the mother still survive. May she live to see her highest hopes realized, and the death of her beloved boy gloriously avenged, in the total downfall of American Slavery!

My labors in Iowa are necessarily limited. Mrs. City, Muscatine and two or three other smaller places, are all that remain to visit this year. Then the Conventions at Mendota, Illinois, and Adrian, Michigan, will close this campaign.

PARKER PILLSBURY.

REFUGEES FROM ARKANSAS AND TEXAS. What shall I say for the victims of oppression from Arkansas and Texas!

The southern counties of Kansas were poor enough. God knows, from the entire destitution of crops this season, and could hardly sustain themselves. But now there are thrown upon them hundreds of families, white and colored, who have only recently escaped the land of blood and whips with their lives! Friends of the oppressed! what shall be done! Our people there assure me they would gladly divide their bread with them—but they have none to divide! As appeal came up to me to-day from them in the simple language—'We beseech you are a friend of the oppressed. What shall we do? Go back we cannot!—the grave—stay here, we starve. Is there any help for us? I have sent them some temporary aid; and I echo now their voice to our eastern friends. What shall they do? They are victims of oppression, no more belonging to Kansas than to Massachusetts or New York. But they are our brethren. They have, in the midst of a perverse generation, stood up for man—claimed their inalienable rights—made 'secure' the chains of oppression! They now, to-day, stand erect on free soil in God's own image! What shall they do? Their persecutors show us that they bore a faithful testimony for the right. Are not suspected of crime. Their offence is, not being a slavery!

The colored portion of these refugees 'might have chosen masters, and gone into slavery,' we are told, and 'been



