THE LIBERATOR

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY
AT NO. 25, CORNHILL, BY
ISAAC KNAPP,

Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Editor.

TERMS: *Two dollars per annum, payable in advance — $3.00 if not paid within the time of subscribing.*

Letters on business, addressed to the publisher, must be post paid. Communications, in order to shield us from the frequent imposition of our enemies, TRUST, should be addressed to the editor, or to him from the Post Office by us, with the postage paid.

No advertisement making one square, or a space of equal dimensions, will be inserted three times for less than a dollar.

AGENTS.

MAINE.
Jos. Dugan, Hallowell. Nathan Winslow, Portland.

NEW-HAMPSHIRE.
J. P. Hayes, Plymouth. Willard Russell, Amherst.

VERMONT.
John Bennett, Woodstock.

MASSACHUSETTS.
C. Wright, Northampton. Wm. Henderson, Hanover
J. Bartlett, Mansfield. Wm. Carruthers, Amesbury
J. Tyrrell, Sunderland. Mills.
J. Bowen, Lynn. Isaac Lothrop, Nantucket.
Charles Fenderson, Enoch Perkins, Newton.
J. Kimball, Lynn. Elias Richards, Weymouth.
J. Ela, Lowell. Thos. J. Dennis, Falmouth.
J. Boyd, Springfield. Wm. C. Stone, Watertown.
Jos. Ricketson, Dighton. Elis. Mansfield, Otterville.
Henry C. Jackson, Fall River.

RHODE ISLAND.
Jos. Allen, Providence. Elias Smith, Providence.

CONNECTICUT.
Chas. W. Burton, Brooklyn. Thos. Kinne, Jr. Norwich.

NEW-YORK.
J. P. Bishop, Utica. R. G. Williams, N. Y. City.
Henry Wright, Rochester. Thos. Van Rensselaer, "
S. S. Marsh, Albany. Sam'l. Dutton, Canandaigua.
Jacob Jackson, Utica. Jas. C. Pallet, Skaneateles.

PENNSYLVANIA.
J. C. Hurst, Pittsburg. T. Hamilton, Russellville.
J. P. Gantz, Allegheny. J. Kent, Andrew's Bridge.
J. Pierson, Pittsburg. John Cox, Homorton.
Jacob Fallon, Jr. Swan. Rev. Chas. A. Boyd, Erie-
Erie Co.

OHIO.
C. P. Bidwell, Cincinnati. Jas. Austin, Marlborough.
J. W. Harrison, " Lot Holmes, Columbiana.
Wm. Green, " S. Miller, Jr. Sandyville.

Thos. Cuthbert, Leila, Michigan Territory.
Archibald Bever, Cape Hayti.

BOSTON.

THE LIBERATOR.

OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD, OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND. NO. 34.

VOL. VIII. BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS. FRIDAY, AUGUST 3, 1838.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 3, 1838.

SILAS JOHNSON, EDITOR PRO TEM.

THE BALLOT-BOX A REMEDY FOR NATIONAL CRIMES!—DR. BEECHER'S SERMON ON DUELING APPLIED TO SLAVERY.

In the Liberator of the 20th ult., we published the article of a Boston entitled, 'The Remedy for Duelling,' as recited before the Presbytery of Long Island, on the 16th ult.—more than 52 years ago—by Rev. Dr. Beecher. We once expressed an intention of using the extracts from it for the purpose of applying its powerful arguments and illustrations to the case of slavery. We shall now proceed to satisfy the expectations thus excited; and in doing so, we shall take the liberty of omitting the word dueling and its correlative terms and phrases, and of inserting in their place, the words, slaveholding, &c. as the case may require. The words inserted by us will be enclosed in [] so that no one may doubt their use to Dr. Beecher. We shall also insert appropriate heads to the several extracts which we shall copy.

And as the Doctor's arguments are legitimately and fairly applied to the case of slavery, let the reader judge. Yet not wholly so, for we shall apply with tenfold force, especially when it is considered, that the crime of slaveholding, as it is, is one of the LEGITIMATE FRUITS and APPENDAGES of slavery. These two crimes, in this country at least, stand connected with each other as *cause* and *effect*; and both take on the peculiar institutions of the South. It is slavery, operating on the part of the slaveholder to destroy all reverence for liberty as a principle, undermine in his regard for the sacredness of human life, and inspiring a spirit of unmingled selfishness, a contempt of equal rights, an impatience of moral restraint, and a spirit of cruelty and tyrannism, out of which dueling grows as naturally as weeds spring up in an uncultivated garden. That such is the case, we have evidence enough, that the practice of dueling recedes into a state of comparative disuse and disrepute, in proportion as it is carried out in the practice of the people the obligations of the so called 'code of honor' (but which is really the code of MURDER,) were imposed at the north; but they were thrown off when they appeared from among us. Yet, whether the spirit of dueling has again become rife in our midst, and a disposition has been manifested to relinquish the rights and liberties of the north to protect the domestic institutions of the south—to lay the liberty of the press and the right of petition under the ban of proscription, and to sacrifice upon the bloody altar of southern despotism—there has been found a northern representative in Congress, a son of New England, who could so far forget his obligations to his country and his duty to God, as to take his bitterest enemy to take that of another. We mean the blood of Colley, and to his living MURDERER and to the blood of all who have thus 'died in their sins.' As illustrations of the corrupting influence of SLAVERY, who that knows enough of human nature to trace effects to their appropriate cause, can for a moment doubt, that if slavery had been continued in the free States until the present moment, the barbarous system of dueling would also have prevailed to a great extent? Or that, if the south had abolished slavery, no such thing would have ensued? As Dr. Beecher truly says, there is a *relationship* in crimes, which renders familiarity with one a *hardmaker to familiarity with another*; and never was this relationship more clearly manifested than in slaveholding and slaveholding.

Surely, then, if Dr. Beecher's argument is sound—if it is right and proper for us to put down dueling by a resort to the ballot-box—much more have we a right, and much more is our duty, thus to put down the MORE MURDEROUS and SEVERE, if we may thus discriminate one of the branches of the tree of despotism, who shall forbid us to lay the well-sharpened axe at its root? If to vote for duelists, is a practice in direct opposition to the precepts of the christian religion,' what a damning offence must it be in a people who vote for men who are BOTH DUELISTS AND SLAVEHOLDERS? Yea, a man combining in himself both these characters, and who is besides a notorious GAMBLER and PROFANE SWEARER, has been toasted by Rev. Hubbell Wesley, the commercial clergyman of Boston, and the successor of Dr. Beecher, as 'WORTHY TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES!' *Horrible!* How appropriate is the scathing and terrible language of Pollok:

'The prince, and people, verate, however named,
Or praised, who, knowing better, acted thus,
Wicked, and received, as he deserved,
Divinest. But the servants, FRIEND, what tongue
Dare shall execrate? * * * * * *
The evils that should sufficiently accuse,
Are therefore left to angels, and seed
Come glowing from the lips of eldest hell.'

We cannot forbear to repeat the substance of a former remark, viz: that we consider it peculiarly fortunate at this important crisis, when an effort is about to be made to induce the friends of impartial liberty to arrest themselves of their right of suffrage to overthrow slavery in the District of Columbia, to prevent its further extension, and to annihilate the odious traffic in human flesh wherever it is carried on under the authority of Congress—when the propriety of resorting to this powerful instrument is doubted by many of the well-meaning, though timid friends of our cause—and when our opponents, in some quarters, are endeavoring to intimidate us by their false accusations—in such circumstances, we say, we consider it peculiarly fortunate that we have found so able a champion of our rights and principles, and powerful an exponender of our principles and responsibilities,—and one, too, who is regarded, what is his past conformity to your wishes, when his profligate private life demonstrates that he is prepared to betray you the first moment he shall find it for his interest? Dispense with moral principle, and with virtue, and all is gone. You can find no substitute; honor is a cobweb, and patriotism an empty name in the hour of trial. The single circumstance, that the interest of the [slaveholder] will not come in conjunction with your interest, is your only security that, if able, he will not sport with your liberties as wantonly as he has sported with, or is prepared to sport with, the [liberty] of his neighbor. Admit, that there are instances, in which men destitute of principle have acted with integrity in public stations; can you tell me *how many thousands have betrayed their trust for want of it?* These are exempt cases—the persons did not happen to be tempted. But do you, dare no better pledge of rectitude than the mere absence of temptation? Will you confide in thieves and swindlers to legislate, because two in a thousand, though utterly unprincipled, may have been found in their interest to cheat you? It is in trying emergencies, when the price of perfidy is high, and temptation imperious, that unprincipled men are weighed in the balance and found wanting. And will you commit criminals and traitors to command your armies, because they might answer in time of peace; or intrust your lives to quacks in medicine, because under slight indispositions, they might suffice to administer herb-drink? Why does this forgery, this confidence in the [slaveholder] still survive the extinction of moral principle? One crime of equal magnitude in any other case, would decide his fate forever. The failing merchant, convicted if dishonesty, is revoked in scorn; the receipt of a bribe by a judge, is irrevocable infamy; perjury cancels forever all confidence; the thief solicits in vain the public suffrage; the highway robber can find none to exercise charity, none to palliate his crime; and the common murderer, might he live, would be doomed to linger out a life of disgusting infamy. But the [slaveholder,] who in cold blood, or with bitter malice and burning rage [strikes down the liberties of his neighbor, can find enough to exercise charity and palliate his crime: a whole state, a whole nation, to testify by their votes that they consider it nothing.

THE PECULIAR EDUCATION NO EXCUSE.

But alas! the [slaveholder,] *frail man*, is overcome by temptation. He has peculiar sensibilities, habits of education, and modes of thinking, which in this *one case* led him astray, without inferring at all a general tendency of principle, religious or moral. In plain language, because the [slaveholder] is *educated* a [slaveholder,] the crime of [man-stealing] in him is very small, and is consistent with religious and moral principle. If men, then, are only educated to thieving, assassination and robbery—if, by habit and false reasoning, they are so familiarised to crime as to rob, and steal, and destroy life without much compunction, they are *only honest men*, and are fit to superintend the affairs of the nation.

MEN DESTITUTE OF PRINCIPLE NOT TO BE TRUSTED.

But were it admitted—did we even know that some one [slaveholder] was in fact a man of principle, and overcome by stress of temptation only, would it be safe to place such a man in a legislator? Would you, had his crime been common murder, an act of robbery or perjury, though you knew he had been surprised or thrust into it by powerful temptation—Would it not manifest him, if not unprincipled, at least too feeble and flexible to stand before the numerous and powerful temptations to which his station would expose him? A coward may be an honest man, but certainly a coward should not be intrusted with the command of armies. Besides, this lightly passing over crimes of the deepest dye, I may even say, this rewarding them with the profits and honors of the state, confounds in the public mind the distinction between virtue and vice, and weakens that abhorrence of crime, which is the guardian of public morality.(3) Elevate swindlers to office, and who shall guarantee the integrity of the common people? Elevate adulterers, and who will punish incontinence? Elevate murderers, and who will be the avengers of blood?

SLAVERY A SYSTEM OF DESPOTISM.

The system of [slavery] is a system of despotism, trending directly and powerfully to the destruction of civil liberty. A free government is a government of laws made by the people for the protection of life, reputation, and property. A despotic government is where life and all its blessings are subject to the caprice of an individual. Those maxims and practices, therefore, which remove life, reputation, and property, from under the protection of law, and subject them to the caprice of an individual, are the essence of despotism. Nor is it material whether this is done by open violence, or by the application of unlawful motives which as effectually answer the purpose. Every man conformed to the laws of his country has a right to the peaceable enjoyment of life and all its immunities. Nor has any individual a right, directly or indirectly to interrupt this enjoyment. * * If the despotic principles of [slavery] terminated in theory, they might excite our compassion as fellowing insect, which was drunk at Philadelphia on the 4th of July:

'Hail, Columbia, happy land!
Hail, ye Americans!—the *epaulle* of American liberty, the *champion* of human rights—always first in the charge, the last in the retreat. His long service, endeavoring to shield the rights and self-sacrifice, demand the highest civic honors his country can bestow.'

(3) Here is a truth of the highest importance, which is too generally overlooked. Of all the crimes which have blackened the pages of history, no one is more pernicious or heven-daring, than that of holding and treating the image of God as property! And yet how slightly! it is passed over! and how little is thought of it! Alas! what have the people of this country to do with the morals of the people! The election to office, of men who are guilty of this crime, and admitting them to the pulpit and the communion table, has well nigh confounded in the public mind! all distinctions between virtue and vice; and unless the eyes of the people are speedily opened, there is too much reason to fear that they will be left of God to wax worse and worse, until at length, when the measure of their iniquity shall be full, a fate more dreadful than that of Sodom or Tyre will overtake them! Shall we continue to provoke the judgments of heaven by countenancing the worst of crimes, and electing to office the vilest of criminals? Shall we stand still, nor the steadily behold the demolitions of the brain; but their practical influence is powerful and fatal, as inimical to our rights in *fact*, as it is in theory; tending directly and powerfully to the destruction of civil liberty.

EQUAL LAWS UNSATISFACTORY TO SLAVEHOLDERS.

Equal laws are essential to civil liberty; but equal laws are far from satisfying the elevated claims of [slaveholders.] That protection which the law affords to them in common with others, they despise. They must have more—a right to decide upon, and to redress their own grievances. When we please, [say they,] we will avail ourselves of the law; and when we please, we will legislate for ourselves. For the vulgar, the dull forms of law may suffice; but for a [system] so sacred, and for feelings so refined and sensitive as ours, they are vastly inadequate. Nor shall they restrain our hand from the indictment of [domestic institutions,] or prosecute the wretch who shall presume to impeach them.' Is this liberty and equality? Are these gentlemen, indeed, so greatly superior to the people? Is their [system] so much more important? Are their feelings so much more sacred? Is pain more painful to them, or self-government less their duty than ours? Must we bear all injuries which the law cannot redress? Must we stifle our resentments, or, if we must not, in one of murders, overleap upon the gallows, while they with impunity express their indignation, and satiate with blood a revengeful spirit?

PECULIAR SENSIBILITIES OF SLAVEHOLDERS.

But education, it is said, has inspired these men with sensibilities peculiar to themselves, for which the cold process of law has made no provision. So has the education of the savage given him peculiar feelings, for the gratification of which, the dilatory forms of law are equally inadequate. But will you let the savage loose with tomahawk and scalping-knife, because education feelings can find no consolation in the regular administration of justice? The feelings for which the law makes no provision, are feelings for which it ought not to provide—unequally feelings—he haughtiness of pride and relentless revenge, and which, instead of a dispensation for indulgence, deserve the chastisement of scorpions. To reduce such unruly spirits, the law should brandish its glittering sword, and utter all its thunders. * * * * If they will not take the trouble to govern their temper—if they will not encounter that self-denial which the laws of God and man inculcate—if they will be savages in a civilized land, let them be treated as savages. And when they [rob,] elevate them to the gallows, and not to posts of honor.

JUSTICE SHOULD BE ADMINISTERED IMPARTIALLY.

The administration of justice ought, above all things, to be impartial. The rich and the honorable ought to be equally liable to punishment for their crimes with the poor; and, according to their desert, punished with equal severity. But while [slaveholders] bear sway, this can never be. It is a fact, that the man who steals a shilling is more likely to be punished than one who steals human beings.] Is this equal? Shall petty thefts excite indignation and be punished with severity, while [men-stealers] with bold impunity walk on every side?

SLAVERY INSPIRES CONTEMPT FOR LAW.

A sacred regard to law is indispensable to the existence of a mild government. In proportion as obedience ceases to be voluntary, and the contempt of law becomes common, must the nerves of government be strengthened until it becomes in essence, if not in name, a monarchy. We must have protection; and the more numerous and daring the enemy, the more power must be delegated to subdue and control them. That contempt of law, therefore, which is manifested by the [slaveholder,] is a blow at the vitals of liberty. It is the more deadly, because, from the genius of our government, the example has a peculiar influence.

PERNICIOUS EXAMPLE OF SLAVEHOLDING LEGISLATORS.

In despotic governments the example of the legislator may not be so pernicious. Chains, dungeons, racks and gibbets, may keep the people in their place, although their rulers should give themselves no lessons in vice. Viewed also in such an elevated distance, the example loses much of its power. But under the mild government of a republic, there is no such distance between the rulers and the ruled, and no such terrific restraints to deter from the imitation of their example. To elevate to office, therefore, [slaveholders,] the deliberate contemners of law, is to place their example in the most conspicuous point of view, and to clothe it with powerful influence and public virtue. Select for your rulers men of profligate example, who contemn the religion and despise the laws of their country, and they need not conspire to introduce despotism, for they will soon introduce it—you will flee to it, as the damned will flee in the day of judgment to rocks and mountains, to shield you from the operation of more intolerable evils.

SLAVERY IMPAIRS THE LIBERTY OF SPEECH AND THE PRESS.

The tendency of [slavery] to restrain liberty of speech and of the press, is also direct and powerful. The people have a right to investigate the conduct of their rulers, and to scrutinize the character of candidates for office; and as the private and moral character of a man is the truest index, it becomes them to be particular on this point. But who will speak the truth, when [slavery] is the idol of the [slaveholder] While bent upon promotion, and desperate in his course, he is prepared to swell in death the lip that shall publish his infamy.

ENCROACHMENTS OF SLAVEHOLDERS ALARMING.

Nor let any imagine that the influence of this engine of despotism is small; it is powerful already, and is every year becoming more so, as [slaveholding] increases; and God only knows where its influence will end. The actual encroachments of Britain, when we first began to resist them, were not one half so alarming as the encroachments of [slaveholders.] * * * * And shall lawless despots at this day perform what all the fleets and armies of England could not? * * * * If the road to Washington was beset with robbers—if they sacrificed yearly as many as are now slain [by slaveholders,] could the wretches live unmolested? Their crimes notorious, could they mingle in society? Could they look the people in the face, and glory in their shame? Could they enjoy the confidence of the people, and receive their suffrages, and be made the guardians of civil liberty?

GLARING INCONSISTENCY.

The inconsistency of voting for [slaveholders] is glaring. To profess attachment to liberty, and vote for men whose principles and whose practices are alike hostile to liberty—to contend for equal laws, and clothe with power those who despise them—to enact laws, and intrust their execution to men who are the first to break them; is a farce too ridiculous to be acted by freemen. * * * * Annihilate your criminal code—level to the ground your prisons, and restore to the sweets of society, and embraces of charity, their more innocent victims. Be consistent. If you tolerate one set of villians, tolerate them all; if [slaveholding] does not stagger your confidence, let it not waver at inferior crimes.

HYPOCRITICAL PRAYERS.

In our prayers, we request that God would bestow upon us good rulers; *rust men, ruling in the fear of God.* But by voting for [slaveholders] we demonstrate the insincerity of such prayers—for which, by invoking the name of God, it is left to our choice whom we will have, we vote for murderers. Unless therefore, we would continue to mock God by hypocritical prayers, we must cease praying for good men, or we must cease to patronize men of blood. Do we not pray also for the preservation of liberty, and the continuance of national prosperity? And do we not know that good rulers are the chosen instruments of the divine blessing; and that when God would chastise a people, unprincipled rulers are the rod of his anger? When therefore, the selection of rulers is left to ourselves, shall we disregard his chosen instruments of mercy, and expect his blessing? Shall we put into his hand the rod of his anger, and expect to escape chastisement?

PUBLIC SENTIMENT—THE PEOPLE RESPONSIBLE.

Laws in republics depend for their prompt execution, upon a correct and efficient public sentiment. The highway robber need not publish his daring exploits in a newspaper to attract notice. A common indignation glows in the public mind—in all directions the son of violence is pursued, and if the offender is found and convicted, is sure to die. * * * The great officers of government, and other influential characters, dare not, if disposed, connive at the crime. The public indignation, like a high swollen river, would sweep away any one who should presume to turn aside, or obstruct its course. But the frequency of the crime [of slaveholding] and its immemorial impunity has deadened the public feeling. May disappoint, but do not sufficiently abhor the crime; the people are *sorry*, but are not indignant. * * [Slaveholders] are apprised of this debilitated state of public feeling, and are therefore not afraid to contravene the feeble public will. It is not to be concealed, however, and dreadful, but a puny stream which they dare to oppose, and which they have learned to manage. * * We blame our rulers, but by whom are such men made rulers, and by whose authority are they kept? Are we not to wink at this most accursed sin? * * The traitor is in the citadel; we have ourselves put him there, knowing also that he would let the criminal go; of course, we are necessary to his escape and to the preservation of justice, as really as if with our own hands we unbarred and threw open the gates of his prison. Indeed, by removing the only restraints which [slaveholders] can be subjected to, viz: the necessity of their appointing them to legislate, we remove all fear of legal punishment—all fear of pecuniary loss—all fear of disgrace. We say to the aspiring politician, 'be of good courage, and a strong party will be ready to stain upon your character, no impediment to your promotion. If you *please* not to [rob] your fellow men, we shall be glad; but if you do please to [rob] them, it shall not have the weight of a straw to prevent your elevation.' By removing, in this way, all restraints from the commission of the crime, we encourage it, though indirectly, yet really and effectually, as if we rewarded the culprit from the public treasury. Nay, by elevating to important stations men whose hands are stained with blood, we do little less than reward them *for* their crimes; and it has been asserted, and by men long conversant in the affairs of state, that [slaveholding] is a passport to honor.

CONTEMPT FOR THE PEOPLE—HYPOCRITICAL PROFESSIONS.

The contempt with which [slaveholders] treat the opinions and feelings of the community, is a reason why we should cease to confide in them. The people, whatever men of honor may think of them, constitute the strength, the virtue, and glory of the nation; and their opinions and wishes deserve respect from those who legislate for them. But little do [slaveholders] care for our opinions or our feelings. They move in a sphere too much above us, to let themselves down to the standard of our conceptions, or to give themselves concern about our desires or aversions. When an election is depending, when they need our votes to gratify their ambition, or satiate their avarice, then indeed they sympathise most tenderly with the people; then the people are every thing; their wishes are sacred, and their voice is the voice of God. But let this end be accomplished, and neither liberty, nor patriotism, nor the voice of the people, nor the voice of God, will avail to deter them from the most barbarous and despotic. Shall we then vote for men who treat with contempt our opinions and our feelings, who basely prostrate our laws, when we have nothing to be afraid of, and who trample on liberty through all the dizzy windings of hypocrisy, when their promotion depends on our will? What are all their professions of patriotism, contradicted by their conduct? And shall we confide in such? Let them plead for liberty with the tongue of men and angels, and adore her cause with the fervor of seraphs, they are hypocrites—mere sounding brass and tinkling cymbals.

(More next week.)

JEFFERSON.—A Florida paper denounces Thomas Jefferson as an abolitionist to the core! Why, this writer says, he wishes to have been one, and conjures the inhabitants of that territory to 'pause before they offer incense on his altar.'

A GOOD EXAMPLE.—Our City Authorities, we believe, have laid the Narrative of James Williams distributed throughout the city, a copy left with every family, and in every store and office; and yet, we have reason to believe, that not 1 in 10 took it. Last evening, $12.37, and the service of a boy, it was given away in less time than it cost us paper.

CONGRESS.

EXTRACTS FROM ADAMS' SPEECH.

(Continued from the 3rd page.)

FRIDAY, JULY 6, 1838.

Mr. ADAMS said, that at the conclusion of the morning hour the day before, he had been discussing the conduct of this Government towards Mexico from the commencement of the last Administration to the present time; and was having been in the habit of that conduct, that the Mexican Government had the object been to practise a systematic course of fraudulent policy towards that Government, worthy of a Tiberius or a Ferdinand of Aragon. In order to express that charge, he had read the letter in which has a right to know and to understand it, aright; the printing of the voluminous document that had accompanied the Message of the President to the subject of our Mexican relations, and which lie on the table, would be necessary. But it had been refused by a vote of the House. Still Mr. A. presumed that this would not inhibit him from using those papers as matters of reference; and between this time, and the next session of Congress, (when this part of the subject, he hoped, would be freely and fully discussed,) he should prepare himself to prove the assertion he had made with regard to the conduct of the Government towards Mexico, by the evidence which such a reference would afford. At present, he should merely touch upon this part of the subject in a general way.

He had stated, the day before, that before the United States acknowledged the independence of the Mexican Republic, a proposal was made by them to the Government of the United States through the agency of Mr. Torrens, then Charge d' Affairs from the Republic of Columbia, that the independence which had been previously recognised by Mr. Monroe, that the limits between the two countries be fixed; according to the 3d article of the treaty of Washington, of the 22d of February, 1819, between the United States and Spain, drawing the line and establishing the landmarks, by commissioners appointed by both Governments, in the same manner as was provided by the 4th article of that treaty. The note of Mr. Torrens containing this proposal, dated the 16th of February, 1824, is among the papers communicated to this House at the special session of Congress, last October, in the documents from the Mexican Legislature in answer was given to the note of Mr. Torrens does not appear in the document, and is not within my recollection. The answer to the note, if any was given, may be among the unpublished papers of Congress, not communicated, and lying on the table, or it may be among the archives of the Department of State.

It would be recollected by members of that House that, on account of impending difficulties there had not been an American Minister to Mexico for two or three years after the acknowledgement of the independence of that Republic. Two attempts were made to make such an appointment; neither of which was successful. The first person selected to fill that station was General Andrew Jackson, who did not accept the appointment. The second, was Ninian Edwards, who accepted it, but was prevented, by circumstances within the memory of us all, from entering upon the discharge of its duties. A year or more elapsed, after the note of Mr. Torrens, and there was yet no minister to Mexico. At length Mr. Poinsett was appointed. Among the documents laid upon the tables of members of that House, there was a letter of instructions from the Secretary of State, dated March 26, 1825, to Mr. Poinsett, containing a reference to this proposal of the Mexican Minister to the United States and Mexico. It begins with a copy of the treaty defining that line, and says that that part of the treaty remained to be executed, after the recognition of Mexican independence. After this same letter there was the following paragraph:

'Some difficulties may possibly hereafter arise between the two countries from the line thus agreed upon against which it is desirable to guard, as much as practicable; and as the Government of Mexico may be supposed not to have any disinclination to the fixation of a new line, which would prevent such difficulties, the President wishes you to sound it on that subject, and to avail yourself of a favorable disposition, if you should find it, to propose the establishment of the Sabine approaches our great Western mart nearer than could be wished. Perhaps the river Mississippi may not be unwilling to establish that of the Rio Brasson de Dios, or the Rio Colorado, or the Snow mountains, or the Rio del Norte, in place of the Sabine. The portions of both the Red river and branches of the Arkansas are thrown on the Mexican side, and the navigation of both those rivers, as well as that of the Sabine is made common to the respective inhabitants of the two countries. When the countries adjacent to these waters shall come to be thickly inhabited, collisions and misunderstandings may arise from the community thus established, in the use of their navigation, which it would be well to prevent. If the Sabine were so altered as to throw altogether on one side Red river and Arkansas, and their respective tributary streams, and the line of the Sabine were removed further west, all causes of future collision would be prevented. The Government of Mexico may have a motive for such an alteration of the line, of its own, in the fact that it would have the effect of placing the city of Mexico nearer the centre of its territory. If the line were so altered, in the greater part, if not the whole, of the powerful, warlike and turbulent Indian nation of the Comanches would be left on the side of the United States; and as an equivalent for the proposed cession of territory, they would stipulate to restrain, as far as practicable, the Indians from committing hostilities and depredations upon the territories and people, whether Indians or otherwise, of Mexico.'

Then followed an argument to show the expediency and propriety of this line, and the passage thus concluded:

'But if you shall find that the Mexican Government is unwilling to alter the agreed line in the manner proposed, and that it insists upon the execution of the third and fourth articles of the treaty before mentioned, you are authorized to agree to the recognition and establishment of the line as described in the third article, and to the demarcation of it forthwith, as is stipulated in the fourth.'

Of course the minister was instructed upon the supposition that the Government of Mexico would be willing to alter the line by providing a new one running more westwardly from that of the Sabine, established by the treaty with Spain. But if she were not willing to accede to this, he was instructed to propose commissioners to make a survey, with a view to establishing a line. This proposition, as had been stated the day before, was found to be exceedingly disagreeable to the Mexican Government. Yet, at a still later period, (1827,) a new proposition, of a more specific and particular, to the same effect, was made by the Government to Mexico. In the instructions from the Department of State it was said:

'The great extent and the facility which appears to have attended the emigration of citizens from the Government of the United Mexican States, for large tracts of country to citizens of the United States, in defiance of the prohibitory edicts of that but little value place placed upon the possession of the province by this Government. These grants seem to have been made without much or any judging according to our opinions of the value of land. They have been made to and apparently, in contemplation of settlers, citizens of the United States. These emigrants will carry with them their principles of law, liberty, and religion; and therefore, such is their number, they will be prepared to amalgamate with the subjects of the Mexican of Mexico, so far as political freedom is concerned, in the progress of time may be allowed. But collisions would be avoided on other subjects. Already some of these collisions have manifested themselves with considerable violence, and have not been without bloodshed. These collisions may be reasonably called the sympathies and feelings of the two nations, and lead to misunderstandings.'

* Afterwards, that vote was reconsidered, on motion of Mr. ROBERTSON, of Virginia, (which he was the Chairman, to select such portions of the Narrative of James Williams, as most, it was thought, would be read with the greatest interest, and the printing of 2000 copies of the same, for the use of the House, was ordered, by a vote of 90 to 70.

"Then there was a further argument proposing an alteration of the line:

'The boundary which we prefer is that which, beginning at the mouth of the Rio Nueces, shall ascend that river to its source, and from its source, extending this river to its source, and from its source, by a line due north, to strike the Arkansas, and thence the course of the southern bank of the Arkansas, to its source, in latitude 42 degrees north, and thence that parallel of latitude to the South Sea. The boundary thus described would, according to the United States' Tanner's Map, published in the Department of State, Texas within the limits of Mexico, and the whole of the Rio Nueces and the Arkansas, as far up as it is probably navigable, within the limits assigned to the United States.' If that boundary be unattainable, we would, as the next most desirable, agree to that of the Colorado, beginning at its mouth, and ascending the river to its source, and thence by a line due north to the Arkansas, and thence, as above traced, to the South sea. This latter boundary would probably also give us the whole of the Red river, would throw us somewhat further from Santa Fe, but would strike Arkansas possibly at a more eligible point. To obtain the first described boundary, the President authorizes you to offer to the Government of Mexico a sum not exceeding one million of dollars. If you find it impracticable to procure that line, you are then authorized to offer, for the above line of the Colorado, the sum of five hundred thousand dollars.'

"Now, these two propositions were made when Texas was free, slavery having been abolished by law in that province; and Mr. A. said that he referred to them at the time, because they had then already been grants of land made to citizens of the United States in that province, laying the foundation of that spirit lately and at present so manifest in this country, of grasping at that territory. He had said that this proposition of altering the boundary between this country and Mexico was highly disagreeable to the latter. The minister from this Government had been authorized to make a treaty of commerce as well as of limits. He says:

'I waited on the Secretary of State, by appointment, the morning of the 12th instant, in order to discuss the manner of conducting the negotiations for the treaties of commerce and of limits between this country and Mexico. It was agreed to treat the two subjects separately.

'With respect to the treaty of limits, I suggested the advisability of the Government of Mexico being held itself bound to carry into effect the treaty of limits concluded with the King of Spain, 12th of February, 1819, until it would suit the Mexican Government, from the independent character of this [Mexican] Government to lay aside that treaty altogether, and to endeavor to make a new boundary which would be more easily defined, and which might be mutually more advantageous. The Secretary expressed himself much gratified by this suggestion, and proposed that the two Governments should forthwith appoint commissioners to make a reconnoissance of the country bordering on the line forming part of the 14th Article of the Spanish treaty, so as to obtain such information in regard to that portion of our respective territories as would enable us to act understandingly on the subject.'

There was the proposition. The minister proposed that the commissioners should be appointed to trace the line, under the treaty of 17-95, 'so as to enable us to act understandingly,' &c. He continued:

'I objected to this proposal the limited powers of the President of the United States, and that such an appointment could not well be made until the next meeting of Congress. He replied that his Government would be very averse permanently to fix the limits between the two nations on the very slender information they at present possessed of that frontier country.'

There is the first answer to the first proposition; and it required no great depth to understand the feelings with which that proposition was regarded by Mexico. The letter proceeds:

'After some further conversation on the subject, it was agreed that he should address a note on the subject, in views of this [Mexican] Government in relation to the proposed convention of limits. This has not yet been received.'

Well, continued Mr. A., then follows the note of the 20th of July, 1825, in which the Mexican Secretary of State distinctly proposes that the two subjects of negotiation be treated separately, and without reference to one another.

'We might then, if your excellency thought proper, and this is the opinion of the President, proceed immediately to negotiate the treaty of commerce, leaving on one side the point of limits; and that we might negotiate on the subject, the two Governments might name their commissioners, who, on examining together the country within a given latitude, from one sea to the other, might present exact information, upon which the limits might be established, as is desired.'

To this Mr. Poinsett objects, as he had done before. Then follows a letter dated in March, 1826, and written by Mr. Poinsett to Mr. Clay, nine months afterwards:

'By the colonization law passed in August, 1824, the General Government reserved twenty leagues of land from the frontiers of neighboring nations, and fen leagues from the sea shore, which cannot be granted by the States except with the previous consent of the Executive. Having learnt that the Governor of Texas has consented to a grant of land made by the State of Coahuila and Texas, of a tract situated within that limit, on the Red river, I called the attention of the Secretary of State, and told Espinosa that I should not consider any grant as valid that was made while these grants were pending, and that I should the protection of country being included by the treaty within the limits of the United States. He admitted that the objection was proper, and engaged to write to the State of Texas on the subject.'

Here Mr. Poinsett undertakes to protest against grants of land, on the ground that the territory in question may be annexed to the United States. On the 24th of March, a few months after this, he says:

'This Government has appointed General Teran to examine the country near our respective frontiers, and to obtain such information as will enable them to treat upon that subject understandingly.'

The Government of Mexico at this time felt so deep an interest in this matter of the boundary, that, without waiting for the treaty, they undertook, by their own authority, to settle the line. This was indignity to a proceeding at home, to a question now pending, and which Mr. A. wished were settled, as indeed it must be, one way or another, before long; and it was now a question whether Maine should come in, and run her own boundary line, without reference to the wishes or action of Great Britain.

At a later period, (continued Mr. Adams,) Mr. Poinsett says, under date of the 6th of October, 1826:

'The only act passed by the Congress, since the commencement of their session, of any importance, is the appropriation of fifteen thousand dollars towards defraying the expenses of the commissioner, General Teran, appointed by this Government to examine and report upon the country which lies contiguous upon the boundary between the United States and Mexico, agreeably to the views of this Government, as expressed in their communication of the 24th of March last. The commission has not set out on this expedition for want of funds, Congress having appropriated what the Treasury does not at this moment command. It is the convenient arrangement of the President and Secretaries, I have sought to convince them of the usefulness of this expedition, until the treaty of limits is finally settled. I fear, I fear, in reply, that the public is so anxious to have that question settled, that they think it politic so to act as to prevent, and acquire their desired better to adjust that delicate point as soon as possible.'

There is a subsequent document in which there is a formal acknowledgement that the Republic of Mexico possessed the right separately to draw this line.

On the 19th of March, 1828, Mr. Obregon, Mexican Plenipotentiary from Mexico to the United States, informed their Secretary of State, Mr. Clay, that the Mexican Government had appointed General Teran to perform (separately) the scientific operations and surveys necessarily preparatory to the execution of the treaty of limits. In this notification Mr. Clay answered on the 24th of March; and in that answer says:

'The treaty to which you are understood to refer, lately concluded at Mexico, has not yet been received, nor consequently, has it been laid before the Senate, and consequently it can not, in relation to its execution, give any intelligence, and the necessary instructions to the Mexican Minister, and to the Minister of the United States at Mexico, the President thinks it proper to wait the arrival of the ratified treaty.'

Then there was a further argument proposing an alteration of the line:

'The boundary which we prefer is that which, beginning at the mouth of the Rio Nueces, shall ascend that river to its source, and from its source, extending this river to its source, and from its source, by a line due north, to strike the Arkansas, thence following the course of the southern bank of the Arkansas, to its source, in latitude 42 degrees north, and that parallel of latitude to the South sea. The boundary thus described would, according to the United States' Tanner's Map, published in the Department of State, Texas within the limits of Mexico, and the whole of the Rio Nueces and the Arkansas, as far up as it is probably navigable, within the limits assigned to the United States.' If that boundary be unattainable, we would, as the next most desirable, agree to that of the Colorado, beginning at its mouth, and ascending the river to its source, and thence by a line due north to the Arkansas, and thence, as above traced, to the South sea. This latter boundary would probably also give us the whole of the Red river, would throw us somewhat further from Santa Fe, but would strike Arkansas possibly at a more eligible point. To obtain the first described boundary, the President authorizes you to offer to the Government of Mexico a sum not exceeding one million of dollars. If you find it impracticable to procure that line, you are then authorized to offer, for the above line of the Colorado, the sum of five hundred thousand dollars.'

Now, these two propositions were made when Texas was free, slavery having been abolished by law in that province; and Mr. A. said that he referred to them at the time, because there had then already been grants of land made to citizens of the United States in that province, laying the foundation of that spirit lately and at present so manifest in this country, of grasping at that territory. He had said that this proposition of altering the boundary between this country and Mexico was highly disagreeable to the latter. The minister from this Government had been authorized to make a treaty of commerce as well as of limits. He says:

'I waited on the Secretary of State, by appointment, the morning of the 12th instant, in order to discuss the manner of conducting the negotiations for the treaties of commerce and of limits between this country and Mexico. It was agreed to treat the two subjects separately.

'With respect to the treaty of limits, I suggested the advisability of the Government of Mexico being held itself bound to carry into effect the treaty of limits concluded with the King of Spain, 12th of February, 1819, until it would suit the Mexican Government, from the independent character of this [Mexican] Government to lay aside that treaty altogether, and to endeavor to make a new boundary which would be more easily defined, and which might be mutually more advantageous. The Secretary expressed himself much gratified by this suggestion, and proposed that the two Governments should forthwith appoint commissioners to make a reconnoissance of the country bordering on the line forming part of the 14th Article of the Spanish treaty, so as to obtain such information in regard to that portion of our respective territories as would enable us to act understandingly on the subject.'

There was the proposition. The minister proposed that the commissioners should be appointed to trace the line, under the treaty of 17-95, 'so as to enable us to act understandingly,' &c. He continued:

'I objected to this proposal the limited powers of the President of the United States, and that such an appointment could not well be made until the next meeting of Congress. He replied that his Government would be very averse permanently to fix the limits between the two nations on the very slender information they at present possessed of that frontier country.'

There is the first answer to the first proposition; and it required no great depth to understand the feelings with which that proposition was regarded by Mexico. The letter proceeds:

'After some further conversation on the subject, it was agreed that he should address a note on the subject, in views of this [Mexican] Government in relation to the proposed convention of limits. This has not yet been received.'

Well, continued Mr. A., then follows the note of the 20th of July, 1825, in which the Mexican Secretary of State distinctly proposes that the two subjects of negotiation be treated separately, and without reference to one another.

'We might then, if your excellency thought proper, and this is the opinion of the President, proceed immediately to negotiate the treaty of commerce, leaving on one side the point of limits; and that we might negotiate on the subject, the two Governments might name their commissioners, who, on examining together the country within a given latitude, from one sea to the other, might present exact information, upon which the limits might be established, as is desired.'

To this Mr. Poinsett objects, as he had done before. Then follows a letter dated in March, 1826, and written by Mr. Poinsett to Mr. Clay, nine months afterwards:

'By the colonization law passed in August, 1824, the General Government reserved twenty leagues of land from the frontiers of neighboring nations, and ten leagues from the sea shore, which cannot be granted by the States except with the previous consent of the Executive. Having learnt that the Governor of Texas has consented to a grant of land made by the State of Coahuila and Texas, of a tract situated within that limit, on the Red river, I called the attention of the Secretary of State, and told Espinosa that I should not consider any grant as valid that was made while these grants were pending, and that I should the protection of country being included by the treaty within the limits of the United States. He admitted that the objection was proper, and engaged to write to the State of Texas on the subject.'

Here Mr. Poinsett undertakes to protest against grants of land, on the ground that the territory in question may be annexed to the United States. On the 24th of March, a few months after this, he says:

'This Government has appointed General Teran to examine the country near our respective frontiers, and to obtain such information as will enable them to treat upon that subject understandingly.'

The Government of Mexico at this time felt so deep an interest in this matter of the boundary, that, without waiting for the treaty, they undertook, by their own authority, to settle the line. This was indignity to a proceeding at home, to a question now pending, and which Mr. A. wished were settled, as indeed it must be, one way or another, before long; and it was now a question whether Maine should come in, and run her own boundary line, without reference to the wishes or action of Great Britain.

At a later period, (continued Mr. Adams,) Mr. Poinsett says, under date of the 6th of October, 1826:

'The only act passed by the Congress, since the commencement of their session, of any importance, is the appropriation of fifteen thousand dollars towards defraying the expenses of the commissioner, General Teran, appointed by this Government to examine and report upon the country which lies contiguous upon the boundary between the United States and Mexico, agreeably to the views of this Government, as expressed in their communication of the 24th of March last. The commission has not set out on this expedition for want of funds, Congress having appropriated what the Treasury does not at this moment command. It is the convenient arrangement of the President and Secretaries, I have sought to convince them of the usefulness of this expedition, until the treaty of limits is finally settled. I fear, I fear, in reply, that the public is so anxious to have that question settled, that they think it politic so to act as to prevent, and acquire their desired better to adjust that delicate point as soon as possible.'

There is a subsequent document in which there is a formal acknowledgement that the Republic of Mexico possessed the right separately to draw this line.

On the 19th of March, 1828, Mr. Obregon, Mexican Plenipotentiary from Mexico to the United States, informed their Secretary of State, Mr. Clay, that the Mexican Government had appointed General Teran to perform (separately) the scientific operations and surveys necessarily preparatory to the execution of the treaty of limits. In this notification Mr. Clay answered on the 24th of March; and in that answer says:

'The treaty to which you are understood to refer, lately concluded at Mexico, has not yet been received, nor consequently, has it been laid before the Senate, and consequently it can not, in relation to its execution, give any intelligence, and the necessary instructions to the Mexican Minister, and to the Minister of the United States at Mexico, the President thinks it proper to wait the arrival of the ratified treaty.'

FRIDAY, AUGUST 3, 1838.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. GARRISON being in Brooklyn, Conn., all letters intended for his private perusal, and for publication, should be addressed directed to him at Brooklyn. Communications for the Liberator should be addressed to Boston as before.

LETTER FROM JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

The following letter from Mr. Adams, expressive of his warm sympathy with those who are struggling in the cause of human rights, was read at the meeting of the Mass. A. S. Society, at the Marlboro' Chapel, on Wednesday last. It will send a thrill of pleasure through the hearts of all the friends of liberty and humanity, and cause oppressors and tyrants to quake with fear.

QUINCY, 25th July, 1838.

EDMUND QUINCY, ESQ., Boston:

Dear Sir—I have received your kind invitation in behalf of the Committee of Arrangements of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, to attend their celebration of the Anniversary of the day upon which Slavery was abolished in the Colonial Possessions of Great Britain.

It would give me pleasure to comply with the invitation; but my health is not very firm; my voice has been affected by the intense heat of the season, and a multiplicity of applications from societies, political and literary, to attend and address their meetings, have imposed upon me the necessity of pleading the privilege of my years and declining them all.

I rejoice that the defence of the cause of human Freedom is falling into younger and more vigorous hands. I, at in three-score years from the day of the Declaration of Independence, if self-evident truths should be yet struggling for existence against the degeneracy of an age pampered with prosperity and languishing into servitude, is a melancholy truth from which I should in vain attempt to shut my eyes. But the summons has gone forth. The youthful champions of the rights of human nature have buckled and are buckling on their armor, and the scouraging overseer, and the lynching lawyer, and the servile rophist, and the faithless scribe, and the priestly parasite, will vanish before them like satan touched with the spear of Ithuriel. I live in the faith and hope of the progressive advancement of Christian Liberty. You and expect to abide by the same faith. You have a glorious and sublime career before you, and it is a renewed consolations of my last days, that I am able to cheer you in the pursuit and exhort you to be stedfast and unmovable in it. So shall you not fail, whatever may betide, to reap a rich reward, in the blessing of him that is ready to perish upon your soul.

I am, Dear Sir, faithfully,

Your friend and servant,

J. Q. ADAMS.

PRO-SLAVERY DEMOCRACY TAMED!

There is nothing like adversity to quell the turbulence of human passion, and humble the pride of those who have long felt themselves secure in the possession of place and power. Misfortune, indeed, works wonders in its influence on political parties, no less than upon individuals; often leading them suddenly to exchange a tone of unsparing denunciation, and bold defiance towards an unpopular body of men, for one of the mildest deprecation, and even cringing obsequiousness. Time was, when both the great political parties which divide the country, vied with each other in their interest to denounce abolitionists in the most unsparing manner, as 'fanatics,' 'incendiaries' and 'cut-throats;' and when they even contended furiously with each other, to see which should have the most, and which should have the least interest! That was the time of our numerical weakness, when unprincipled politicians, who could not appreciate the power of Truth, supposed in their madness, that we could never be strong enough to cope with their mighty influence, lest upon abuse has worked greatly to our advantage, and that the measures which they had planned as the means of our utter dissolution and annihilation, have caused us to grow mightily, so that at length we are enabled to stand up before them a powerful host, clad in armor which no weapons of theirs can penetrate. The administration party having until recently felt secure in the possession of political power and patronage, has been less affected than the other party, in its aspect towards us, by our unparalleled growth. Now, as the clouds of misfortune are gathering thick around their path, and the prospect before them wears a threatening and dubious aspect, *mark their altered tone!* Instead of loading us with curses and excretions, they now condescend to argue the question calmly and dispassionately of his immediate neighbor, it would be not gratifying to me to dwell upon the tone of the addresses, which we have received at her hands has been as universally friendly as the early and constant solicitude manifested by the Democracy of Maine in the prosperity of her sister Republics, and more particularly in that of our

MOVEMENTS IN THE METHODIST CHURCH.

So numerous are the important events to which the public attention, in its onward progress, is constantly falling forth, that we find it utterly impossible, in a weekly sheet, to keep pace with them. Nor are we ever compelled, by force of circumstances, either to notice some subject of great importance in a very brief and superficial manner, or not to notice them at all. This must be our apology for having published scarcely any thing relative to the recent movements, in the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the anti-slavery cause, in the Methodist Episcopal Church. But these movements are too important to be thus slightly passed over, and we intend to make up by the prominent facts connected with them, in after our readers.

It is well known that a very large majority of the Methodists, both in New England, and a considerable minority in some of the western Conferences, are decidedly opposed to slavery, and that the Bishops and editors are of the same church, among whom many of the leading men are decided, Dr. Fisk and Bishop Hedding, are highly hostile to our holy cause. It will also be remembered, too, that the last General Conference, composed of delegates from all the annual Conferences, not only decided against the anti-abolitionism, and admonished the preachers 'wholly to refrain' from all anti-slavery movements. This admonition, however, did not accomplish the object for which it was given—it did not silence the church being so incorrigibly anti-abolitionist as to believe that they ought to obey God rather than men! They ceased not to agitate the question, day and night, and converts to the anti-slave cause, from year to year, greatly multiplied. In consequence of this church power to have some effect, in order to bring their moral power to bear more effectively against the system of slavery, and particularly against a branch of it, called the Methodist church of the foul abomination. Preachers' Anti-Slavery Societies were formed in several of the Conferences, and at the meeting of the New England Conference last year, such a decided and strong expression of opinion for the action of that body was made, as to induce the presiding Bishop refused to entertain, boldly to propose that they were opposed to the advice of the last General Conference; and thus by the hand of ecclesiastical power and despotism, the business of the anti-slavery cause was for the time warded off. This minister slavery was by them, it was understood to be sanctioned by an unanimous vote of the Bishops, excited the just indignation of all the lovers of religious liberty, and brought the faithful abolitionists to hold their peculiar views more extensive and powerful than ever before. Finding it impossible to act on the subject in a Conference capacity, resort was had to Methodist Anti-Slavery Conventions. The first of these meetings, which we recollect, was held in Lynn, in the last autumn, and the second and last, a few months after, at Scituate. These Conventions were well attended, and their proceedings sent dismay through the ranks of the pro-slavery party in the church. The cry of 'abolitionism' and 'schism' was raised, and the rod of ecclesiastical pressure held up to frighten those who had ventured to exercise the inalienable right of free speech and corresponding action on this all important question. Meanwhile, Zion's Watchman, under the direction of its bold and indefatigable editor, continued to pour a flood of light into every part of the church where its rays were not intercepted by the shield of ecclesiastical usurpation; and converts to the cause of human rights and religious purity were rapidly multiplying under the faithful labors of such heroes as Brown, Scott and George Storrs. The Bishops and the whole pro-slavery portion of the church were driven to desperation. They saw clearly that if something was not done to check the cause of impartial freedom, the whole northern portion of the church would soon be entirely abolitionized. They recklessly determined to use the tremendous ecclesiastical power placed in their hands, by the discipline of the church, to accomplish their unholy purposes. They began in the New York Conference, by arraigning several preachers, who had attended the Utica Convention, on the charge of 'contumacy and insubordination,' and depriving them of some of their ministerial functions. They also issued a condemnatory Bull against Zion's Watchman, in the following words:

'Resolved, As the sense of this Conference, *that any of its members or probationers who may patronize Zion's Watchman, by writing in recommendation of its character, by recommending it to our people, by obtaining subscribers, or by collecting or remitting money for it, shall be considered guilty of* INDISCRETION, *and be* CENSURED *by the Conference.*'

Another resolution was adopted as follows:

'Resolved, That in the judgment of this Conference, it is incompatible with the duty which its members owe to the church, as its ministers, for them to be engaged in attending anti-slavery conventions, delivering abolition lectures, or forming anti-slavery societies, either out of the church, or in any way agitating the subject so as to disturb the peace and harmony of the church, and that they be, and hereby are affectionately advised and admonished to refrain from all these things.'

Such were the despotic measures resorted to in a case where the majority of the Conference were on the proslavery side. But in New England, where the majority were in favor of abolition, the inquisitors were compelled to resort to other means to effect their purposes. Of the proceedings of the New England Conference we have spoken heretofore, though in a very brief manner, on account of its important transaction, however, we have furnished our readers no account. During the session of the Conference, a paper was presented, entitled a 'Plan of Pacification,' which was referred to a committee consisting of six abolitionists and four anti-abolitionists. This committee not being able to agree, the Rev. Mr. Cox, of the Maine Conference, was permitted to present the paper to the Conference as his own responsibility, and the question was then put on its adoption, after speeches by Bishop Soule and Dr. Fisk—no abolitionist making any reply. The following is a copy of the paper alluded to, which it is important to publish, in order that the reader may be distinctly understood.

'COMMON GROUND.

Whereas the Methodist Episcopal Church in the North has been, and still is greatly excited on the subject of American Slavery, and the means which should be used for its removal from the church—and

Whereas we deem it of vital importance that the peace of the church should be secured, in order to her prosperity—

And whereas it is recognized as a cardinal virtue in religion by our blessed Lord, that his followers should be 'Peace Makers,' and love one another—and which will give even as tests of discipleship—

Therefore, the undersigned, ministers of said church, after mutual consultation, have agreed to adopt the following Principles and Measures for the purpose above named.

PRINCIPLES.

We believe that the system of American Slavery is a great moral evil; and that the relations springing from this, which bind an innocent race to perpetual bondage to others against their will, are sinful; although we concede that the Master who sustains this relation, is not, in every case necessarily guilty.

MEASURES.

We agree that, in any action we may be disposed to take on this or any other subject, we will

1. Never attack an officer, clergyman or private member of the church in a public Journal or Lecture, or publicly arraign the official acts of any church officer; but all such difficulties shall be adjusted according to the discipline of our church. Provided, however, that this shall not prevent courteous investigation of principles and opinions.

2. We agree that we will not countenance any member in leaving his proper work to lecture upon this or any other subject, without the sanction of the proper authorities of the church.

3. No paper shall be established ostensibly for the purpose above stated by our aid or sanction, or shall be countenanced by us, which claims to be controlled by any Methodist or Wesleyan Society, or having a popularity attached to it peculiar to our church.

4. We agree that no Societies or Conventions claiming the character specified in section 3d, shall receive our approbation or aid. Our conviction is that, in the present state of affairs, the peace of the church claims at our hands that organizations of the character should not exist.

5. We hold that our ministers and private members are as liberty-men as shall it be regarded as an offence for them thus to do) to connect themselves as they may choose with any Anti-Slavery Society independent of the church;—provided, however, that our action in such cases shall not contravene the principles of this agreement.

6. It shall not be regarded as an offence by us—but considered just—that prayer be offered in public for the master and his slaves, or for the abolitionists and slave-traders. But we recommend that Apostolic language be used, as far as may be, in such devotions.

7. Our preachers have liberty not only to read our Rules once a quarter in the Societies, and once a year to the whole Congregation, but to explain at these seasons any part of our discipline.

8. We hold that our people have the right of petitioning the General Conference through the Annual Conferences, for a redress of grievances, or to bring their moral power to bear more effectively against the system of slavery, and particularly as a branch of it called the Methodist church of the foul abomination. Preachers' Anti-Slavery Societies were formed in several of the Conferences, and at the meeting of the New England Conference last year, such decided and strong expressions were given for the action of that body, that the presiding Bishop refused to entertain, boldly to propose that they were opposed to the advice of the last General Conference; and thus by the hand of ecclesiastical power and despotism, the business of the anti-slavery cause was for the time warded off. This minister slavery was by them, it was understood to be sanctioned by an unanimous vote of the Bishops, excited the just indignation of all the lovers of religious liberty, and brought the faithful abolitionists to hold their peculiar views more extensive and powerful than ever before. Finding it impossible to act on the subject in a Conference capacity, resort was had to Methodist Anti-Slavery Conventions. The first of these meetings which we recollect, was held in Lynn, in the last autumn, and the second and last, a few months after, at Scituate. These Conventions were well attended, and their proceedings sent dismay through the ranks of the pro-slavery party in the church. The cry of 'abolitionism' and 'schism' was raised, and the rod of ecclesiastical pressure held up to frighten those who had ventured to exercise the inalienable right of free speech and corresponding action on this all important question. Meanwhile, Zion's Watchman, under the direction of its bold and indefatigable editor, continued to pour a flood of light into every part of the church where its rays were not intercepted by the shield of ecclesiastical usurpation; and converts to the cause of human rights and religious purity were rapidly multiplying under the faithful labors of such heroes as Brown, Scott and George Storrs. The Bishops and the whole pro-slavery portion of the church were driven to desperation. They saw clearly that if something was not done to check the cause of impartial freedom, the whole northern portion of the church would soon be entirely abolitionized. They recklessly determined to use the tremendous ecclesiastical power placed in their hands, by the discipline of the church, to accomplish their unholy purposes. They began in the New York Conference, by arraigning several preachers, who had attended the Utica Convention, on the charge of 'contumacy and insubordination,' and depriving them of some of their ministerial functions. They also issued a condemnatory Bull against Zion's Watchman, in the following words:

'Resolved, As the sense of this Conference, *that any of its members or probationers who may patronize Zion's Watchman, by writing in recommendation of its character, by recommending it to our people, by obtaining subscribers, or by collecting or remitting money for it, shall be considered guilty of* INDISCRETION, *and be* CENSURED *by the Conference.*'

Another resolution was adopted as follows:

'Resolved, That in the judgment of this Conference, it is incompatible with the duty which its members owe to the church, as its ministers, for them to be engaged in attending anti-slavery conventions, delivering abolition lectures, or forming anti-slavery societies, either out of the church, or in any way agitating the subject so as to disturb the peace and harmony of the church, and that they be, and hereby are affectionately advised and admonished to refrain from all these things.'

Such were the despotic measures resorted to in a case where the majority of the Conference were on the proslavery side. But in New England, where the majority were in favor of abolition, the inquisitors were compelled to resort to other means to effect their purposes. Of the proceedings of the New England Conference we have spoken heretofore, though in a very brief manner, on account of its important transaction, however, we have furnished our readers no account. During the session of the Conference, a paper was presented, entitled a 'Plan of Pacification,' which was referred to a committee consisting of six abolitionists and four anti-abolitionists. This committee not being able to agree, the Rev. Mr. Cox, of the Maine Conference, was permitted to present the paper to the Conference as his own responsibility, and the question was then put on its adoption, after speeches by Bishop Soule and Dr. Fisk—no abolitionist making any reply. The following is a copy of the paper alluded to, which it is important to publish, in order that the reader may be distinctly understood.

'COMMON GROUND.

Whereas the Methodist Episcopal Church in the North has been, and still is greatly excited on the subject of American Slavery, and the means which should be used for its removal from the church—and

Whereas we deem it of vital importance that the peace of the church should be secured, in order to her prosperity—

And whereas it is recognized as a cardinal virtue in religion by our blessed Lord, that his followers should be 'Peace Makers,' and love one another—and which will even give

LITTERARY.

From the Emancipator.

ODE

FOR THE FIRST OF AUGUST.

To Jesus Christ, Christ, the Tyrant of the Indy Indies; the Old, commissioner of Satan, is responsible to Jesus, in the British West Indies, is responsible to God.

Oh, rejoice upon the glorious sea,
—That image of what man should be,
So nobly great, so boldly free!
Ye isles that gem the rolling waves,
Bright gardens of old song!
Though then the mariner's waters have,
And dash your palmy shores along!
How long, ye fairest of earth's flowery groves,
When every rapture song-bird roves,
Those free-born echoes have been broken
By the sob, and anguish token,
By the groan, and deep, low prayer,
Of the vengeance-seeker, Despair!

Think ye that it rose in vain,
That wild cry of Nature's pain,
Like the beechnut's loose chaff
Or the slanking of his chain,
And his curse of tyrant reign,
—Rose to God's all-tender ear,
And up-called the hurricane,
O'er the mountain and the plain,
In its terrible career,
With the dread tornado strain,
The wrecker of his year.

Isles of lovely, isles of bloom,
Isles of blood-breathed perfume,
Isles of glory, isles of palm,
Isles of plenty, isles of balm,
Gardens such as Eden's were;
Lovely as the wave pure river
Is the islands of the blest
Were scarce of you the harbinger!
Around, the sea-sent gales, that stole
To the away the tropic heat,
Are as cooling, and as sweet,
As the odors, that were air
In Elysian gardens fair,
For the happy that were there.

Lovely lands, if ye were given,
Where eternal summer smiles,
To mind, the mariner of heaven,
Who beholds the happy isles,
From the mast-head, or the sea,
As his lone watch he beguiles
With some song of ocean free;
What a scorn the foe of Eden
Long hath made you!—as he made
Old Paradise—while he did redden
Gushing fons and silver stream,
Playing in the moon's white beam,
With the blood of many a weeper,
With the cores of many a sleeper,
Dash'd with many a bitter thong!
Isles of Beauty, what a glory
He hath made you, who hath crushed
The curst spoiler's head, all gory,
For whose laugh those blood-founts gushed,
In his triumph-years of wrong!

Fearful is the hurricane,
In its horrid midnight reign,
Where the sweet grove, and the forest,
With wild crashes tell its coming;
And its war-cry echoes scorst
Where the—[illegible] o'l is blooming!
But what least that tornado came,
And, beneath the lightning flame,
En'n the jungle's beasts were tame—
I behold, on one lone isle,
The negro mother calmly smile;
Though the day of doom seem'd near,
And the tyrant quaked with fear.

She beheld in each red glare,
That fell so fast, so fearful there,
The answer of her long breathed prayer!
And when morn at length did dawn
On her lord's devoted dwelling,
And she heard, as fell the crash,
Sounds of woe, and fearful yelling,
On the troubled tempest swelling,
Then arose her song of praise;
And she bared a deep red gash,—
"Twas all reeking from the lash,
And she laughed to see the blaze!

His dark eye on the billows glaring,
How sighed e'en now you swarthy vassal!
Sad to see you sail advancing,
O'er the wave, an ocean castle,
With streamer gay, and fairy tassel;
For a vision so entrancing
Ye'n sighs his bosom had wont weal!
—Wild as those free waters dancing,
Look once more! and list the peal—
Such as ne'er the sons of wassail
Yelled forth—which he hath given,
Long, long, and free as air to heaven!
The scented Indian gales are riven
By a sound, unheard before;
And the sun goes down at even,
O'er a land of slaves no more.

By the boy's clear shining bosom,
'Neath the palm and orange blossom,
Where the citron was perfuming,
And all tropic flowerets blooming,
Bent the Creole, in the morning,
Sister dark isles, in curls, adoning,
O'er that Nature-polished mirror,
Where, alas, there was no error,
And she sigh'd her twin to mark,
So beautiful—but ah! so dark!

Her baby slumbered on the rushes—
It was fair, but was a slave;
Merry at the morning brushes,
And begotten by the brave!
But a tear of Nature gushes
Her dark lash, and eye to love;
For the Heliot hiss—oh God!
Floweth in that baby's blood!

But, beneath the moonlight's shining,
When that morning sun had set,
I could mark that creole, twining
Her baby's brow, with fairy net;
With all flowers and odors wet;
And her voice was clearly singing,
Like the nereids o'er the sea;
While the free bells were ringing,
Smile, poor baby, thou art free!

And, the Indian isles among,
Echoed forth one joyous song;
We are free as the proud water
That along the sea-sand dasheth!
And the Sea, (tad's image!) laughter,
Joyous now, our green isle splasheth
With free spray, where once he taught her
Deep as lash, the isle that lasheth.
Now no more the lightning flasheth
Terrible, but sent in vain;
And no more the rent earth gasheth,
'Neath the hell-born hurricane;
As avenger, which we prayed
Wilt no longer be displayed!
Rest ye tempests! or, alas,
Tear the lands where tyrants are!
Rend their heaven-affronting flags,
On the lofty, lofty, Andes!
But, ye tempests, go your ways,
Where the mirror-banners blaze
On the low isle, and the crags,
On the strong fortress, and the sea,
Of old England, and the Free!

Queen of the Free! Like him who reigns,
O'er the Universe enthroned,
Thou hast Earth for thy domains—
By thy mandate the world is bound!
Never shall the day be—
[illegible] thy throne forgotten
Never shall thy [illegible]
Long welcome, death thy way!
Ere thy red, the lamb-skin, [illegible]
Rings, oh reign, authroned daughter
Of Earth's noblest, free-souls,
Ere thy sun, the sun, in its stead,
Ocean not more free, the white!
Like a star new-risen there
On the mountain of her glory,
Reign, oh reign, victorious!
O'er the isles so long in sad to story;
And, upon thy spotless pillow,
When thou sinkest sweet in rest,
Sleep, for it is thou isles all!
And thy tyrants, the lowest,
Hath, for many a sighing thrall,
Bowing to the earth, unblest,
Like the rush, or weeping willow,
Giving cheering aims for gall;
And the all of joy, for sadness,
And for sackcloth robes of gladness,
And like summer lightning playing
In the far horizon; still,
With its thunders not affaying,
That no longer rumble wild!
Are the terrors of thy throne
Been to calm, to cool, alone!
Gleaming o'er the dark blue sea,
With wonds of far-heard majesty,
Thunders, that in angry burst,
Shake the sea, the isles, the world,
By thy virgin hand controlled,
Grasped by England's lion bold,
While aha,—the rule of love—
Fine her olive-bearing dove!

Dove of the Church, thy wing is free!
Spotless, 'neath its shadows, be
The blest fold of him, who sent
The sweet plumes, like her's that went
To the flooing world of yore,
And the dove-cross-branch bore!
And we bail the gorgeous day,
When the chain is torn away,
From the healing hand shall heal,
Of the Church—[illegible] part;
Not with freedom about alone,
And the jubil-trumpet blown,
But with all sweet praise outpoured
To the pow'r-avenging Lord!

And, amid the storied aisles,
Of England's old Cathedral piles,
Let embosted choire employ
Cebelian's universe of joy;
With holy diapason swell,
This immortal praise to tell:
Where now yet Te Deum rose,
O'er Jehovah's vanquished foes,
So energetic, so sublime!
Be it like that glorious time,
When, beside the red-sea wave,
Rank like lead the Memphian brave,
'Gainst our God that dared to rave!
They were sunken in the sea,
God had triumphed gloriously;
And above his people's head,
Beauteous was his smile, that led
The column of his victory!
God's guiding-star to fight the free!

NOTE.—This ode must be considered *retrospective* and *conditional*, or the contrary, according as the Peers reject or pass the bill for unconditional abolition.

PEACE.

EXPLANATION OF JOHN 2; 15.—To L. W.

FALL RIVER, July 10th, 1838.

MY BROTHER:—A writer over the signature of L. W. asks, 'how can the above passage be made to harmonize with the literal exposition of Christ's precept, "Resist not evil"?' The whole passage is—'When he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep and the oxen; and poured out the changer's money, and overthrew the tables, and said to them that sold doves, take these things hence—make not my Father's house a house of merchandise.' See Matt. 21, 12, 13. Mark 11: 15, 16, 17. Luke 19: 45, 46.

EXPLANATION.—L. W. takes for granted, the very thing to be proved, viz. that Christ either or designed or actually used the scourge to whip the men. There were sheep and oxen in the temple. Whips are *generally* used to whip beasts, not men. If L. W. says Christ made the scourge to scourge the men—or that he actually scourged them with it, let him prove it. There is nothing in the passage to prove it. Even admitting that he '*drove*' out the men—this is no evidence that he *designed* or used the scourge for them. I deny that he struck the men, or that he designed the scourge for them.

Again. Suppose L. W. reads the passage thus—'He made a scourge of small cords and drove them all out of the temple, *both* the sheep and the oxen.' (1) The Greek particle admits of this translation. (2) The connexion demands it, for the men were in the temple after the sheep and oxen were driven out, and Christ told them to take these things away and not make his Father's house a den of thieves. (3) The character of our Saviour and his whole deportment through life, forbid the supposition that he designed the scourge for the men, or used it on them. I would enter my protest against that picture in some children's books, which represents Christ with a great whip cutting men over the head and shoulders. believe it teaches a falsehood.

Again. If this passage justifies resistance to evil at all, it does not justify resistance to evil threatened or done to us—to our property, liberty or life—to our friends or country—but to our RELIGION—to our GOD. Contempt of God, profanation of his holy name, desecration of his holy temple, (if it can be found on earth,) are to be resisted and punished by scourges, fetters, stocks, prisons, gallows, swords and guns. This was the construction put on this passage by the Puritan Fathers, when they punished Sabbath breaking, blasphemy and contempt of God, with fines, whips, prisons and death; by Pizarro, when he butchered several thousands of Peruvians because their Inca cast a monk's breviary on the ground; by Charlemagne, when he converted the Germans with fire and sword; and by the Papists, when they tortured and burnt men to cleanse the church of heresy. If it teaches resistance to evil at all—it teaches that the church is to be purified of soldiers, of slaveholders, thieves and robbers—of cheats, liars, adulterers, blasphemers, rum-sellers, and rum-drinkers—by whips, scourges, swords and guns. Is L. W. prepared for this? I. Does he think it teaches directly or indirectly any such doctrine?

H. C. W.

DISCRETIONARY POWER OVER LIFE.—TO A CONSERVATIVE.

FALL RIVER, July 12th, 1838.

MY BROTHER:—A writer in the Liberator, signing himself 'A CONSERVATIVE'—(a taking name in these times, by the by,) complains that I do not state the question at issue in the peace discussion fairly—that I endeavor to expose the sophistry of my statement of the question—i. e. DISCRETIONARY POWER OVER LIFE, OR NO POWER. He says this is not the question—but this is—'*Have individuals and society a right to defend themselves against the sword?*'

I know not what may be the question at issue in the mind of 'A Conservative,' but this is not the question at issue with *practical peace men*—i. e. *true peace men*. They do not doubt that men have a right to defend themselves, their property, liberty, lives, their fellow beings and their religion. All men have a right to defend themselves in individuals and communities. Here there is no question at issue on that point. Peace men and non-killers perfectly agree as to the right of self-defence.

But the question—here we are at issue. The peace man says, stop and die yourself, and thus overcome evil. The war man says—inflict suffering and death on the evil doer. Property and life are sacred—to be defended by inflicting death, rather than by the life of the aggressor—by individuals, governments and the fundamental principle of all efficient efforts to promote peace. The contrary is the foundation principle of all war. Peace says, 'Let the sword be hid, war, no slavery, no anarchy, no bloodshed, no the *non-killing* principle.' That life may be taken as a penalty for crime, or in self-defence, is the favorite doctrine of warriors, of tyrants, of slaveholders, of gamblers, and pirates—the principle which has made the earth the great slaughter-house of the human race. The contrary principle never shed a drop of blood.

Now suppose 'A Conservative' (not indeed of life, peace and order, but of the ferocious principle that it is right to 'kill, slay, and destroy,' in self-defence,) thinks it right for individuals and society to take life in self-defence. Somebody must use power, and in defence of what, life may be taken. He assumes the power of life and death over man. Who shall limit the exercise of this power? Who say when it may be exercised? Who shall say when it may be exercised? Who shall say when individuals or society are to take life. 'A Conservative' will not; I presume, pretend that the Christian's only guide has determined the crimes or the acts for which life may be taken. It follows that, the question of power or discretion is to be settled by man—that God has invested man with the tremendous power of life and death over man, and left it to his reason, conscience, judgment, or DISCRETION to say when, how, and for what life may be taken. This is the ground taken by Blackstone, by every Constitution of the United States and by all human governments. It was the principle on which the Pilgrims acted when in 1676 they passed the following order:

'It is ordered by the court that whosoever shall shoot off any gun on any necessary occasion, or at any game whatsoever, in dwelling or a-wood—shall forfeit five shillings for every such shot till further liberty be given.'—Laws of Plymouth Col. page 176.

Man, the image and representative of God on earth, classed with wolves, and made lawful game—to be shot down like a wolf, as man shall see fit!!

On this principle the Puritans acted, when in 1637, they butchered the Pequods—which is related by one in the following style. 'The number of Indians was about 400. It was a fearful sight to see them *frying* in the fire, And the streams of blood quenching the same, and the horrible scent thereof—but the victory seemed a SWEET SACRIFICE, and they gave the PRAISE THEREFOR to God.' For this horrible principle 'A Conservative' pleads, when he pleads for the right to take life in self-defence, unless he will show that God has defined the limits of this dreadful power over life in the hand of man.

'A Conservative' indeed! but of a principle which has made this earth the *charnel-house* of a slaughtered race; which has plunged the nations, kingdoms and governments of this world into an ocean of blood. Against such a principle, as a man and a Christian, I would in the name of God and humanity proclaim war—never-ending war—till the principle, and every blood-stained system built upon it, be destroyed. All *Conservatives* of this man-killing principle, must give up Christianity. All Conservatives of Christianity, of the peace and good order of society, must abandon that principle—the light which shines in darkness, sin and holiness, love and hate, life and death, are not more opposite. So the question at issue is—

DISCRETIONARY POWER OVER LIFE,
OR
NO POWER.

H. C. W.

THE WAGES OF INIQUITY TO THE TREASURY OF THE LORD.—The following item of information appeared not long since in the Washington Christian Herald:—We have not seen it in any northern paper:

☞ We observe with pleasure that the Rev. John C. Smith, of Georgetown, has been very successful in his efforts for the American Tract Society, during a tour of two weeks in South Carolina and Georgia, having acknowledged in the Charleston Observer the receipt of about $200, for that excellent institution.

Had the American Tract Society sent 'Rev. John Smith,' or any other agent, to collect funds among the priests of Juggernaut, or even among the umpires of our own neighboring rectangle, for circulating Christian tracts, the whole Christian world would have cried out at the profanation. And yet we doubt not that the worshippers of horses would have cheerfully contributed a still larger sum than $2000, 'for that excellent institution.' If they could thereby have obtained an implied acquiescence of those whom the Tract Society represents, in their claims to be considered as good citizens and good Christians as others. And certainly, the whippers of men and ☞ women may well consider it a cheap purchase to have gained such a testimony of Christian fellowship and confidence from the Tract Society at the price of only 'about' two thousand dollars. Why, they would give a million a year, rather than lose it. But the day is not far distant, when they will find to their sadness, that the fellowship of the church for slavery is *what money will not buy.*

—*Emancipator.*

FREE DISCUSSION.—A late number of the Missionary Herald contains an instructive and cheering account of a public discussion between the missionaries and the Hindoos on the merits of the Hindoo religion. This reminds us of the primitive age of Christianity, when its divine Founder held daily disputations with the scribes and Pharisees—when the synagogues, the market and the sea shore were the theatres of free and public discussion. Paul challenged the Grecian philosophers on Mars Hill, and disputed daily in the school of one Tyrannus. There was no fear of impairing the sublimity of religion by making its discussions too common—no sacred places of religious instruction should become the arena of debate—no fear that the dignity of the Christian ministry would suffer, by meekly instructing opposers—no sensitiveness lest the Holy Spirit should be grieved, or lest the piety of the true worshippers should evaporate, the first moment the truths of religion should be treated as literal facts, and human beings encouraged to treat them as facts by making them the subject of free social discussion. When shall the infidelity, and error, and superstition, and impurity, and heathenism, of the *United States of America* be assailed by a band of Christian ministers, who like their divine Master, shall everywhere shall invite free public discussion, and go out into the highways and hedges to carry on the moral warfare? Abolitionists have made a few experiments at discussion in respect to one of the public sins of our land. Who will profit by the hint, and put on the whole armor of God, and go forth to the contest? We ought to have a good many teachers of religion in this country, who 'are thoroughly educated' and trained for such public discussions.—*Friend of Man.*

TEXAS BY ANNEXEL! We congratulate the country on the intelligence that Congress has adjourned without annexing Texas to the United States. So far, so well. We hope it will be long before the pretexts and colors, of various sorts, may arise as often as they choose the concern, to pass, What have Abolitionists accomplished? Ask the South Carolinians, the Texas legislature has answered, and the world knows, that Abolitionists, with the help of the equally blood-stained Whigs, have effected the object. But both together, have been too strong for the slaveholders. Ask Mr. Adams whether Abolitionists have done nothing to stay the progress of slavery? Ask Mr. Calhoun