THE LIBERATOR
IS PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY,
AT NO. 25, CORNHILL,
BY
Oliver Johnson, General Agent:
To whom all remittances are to be made, and all letters addressed relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper.

TERMS.—$2.50 per annum, payable in advance; or $3.00 at the expiration of six months.

ADVERTISEMENTS making one square will be inserted three times for $1.00. Other advertisements at same rates.

NOTE.—The pecuniary concerns of the Liberator are under the direct supervision of a Committee, consisting of the following gentlemen: FRANCIS JACKSON, EDMUND QUINCY, WM. BASSETT.

OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD, OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND.

VOL. IX. NO. 16.

THE LIBERATOR

BOSTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 13, 1839.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR. ISAAC KNAPP, PRINTER.

REFUGE OF OPPRESSION.

ADDRESS

To the citizens of the Seventeenth Congressional District in the State of Virginia, composed of the counties of Augusta, Rockbridge, Rockingham, Pendleton, Highland, Bath, Pocahontas, Randolph and Pleasant.

FELLOW-CITIZENS: As the term of my service, as your representative in the Congress of the United States, is now near at an expire, I take the liberty to call your attention to a few of the most prominent political subjects which operate on the public mind, and which, if not properly treated, will be productive of much evil to our country. Abolition stands first in importance, and therefore notice it first.

A few years ago, when the fanatics of the North commenced their crusade against the South, with a view to the overthrow of our peculiar domestic institutions, the hope was indulged by the friends of the Union, that the disorganizing flames of enthusiasm and bigotry in which the undertaking was engendered, would, before this time, have been quenched by the sober judgment of the country. That hope has been disappointed. The cloud, which was then little more than a speck in the distance, has now burst in a thunder-gust, portent over our heads. We are no longer at liberty to look with indifference upon this band of incendiaries; they have kindled a fire in our dwellings, which threatens to consume our property, our peace, our social comforts. They carry them in their hand by day, and only wait an opportunity to fire up the South, in a general conflagration.

What measures should we adopt to avert the threatened dangers; or what course take to soften, or postpone them, if not to avoid them altogether, is a question which I do not pretend to answer from every Southern man. Permit them to proceed but a little further; let the incendiaries which are scattered in their ranks, and their leaders be removed, and there will remain no alternative but a passive acquiescence in the assassinations, or an organized resistance to the Abolitionists—the first is not a spectre of the imagination. It is the better but sober truth. The Constitution, so important in their eyes, is a dead letter, and declares that they act in obedience to a higher authority. They have no regard for the Federal Union, no loyalty for the white man and his rights; but, in their fictitious phrasy, want for an opportunity to carry freemen out of that portion of our country. Protestant freemen offer that boon to those among us who bear the yoke of oppression; they assume to be commissioned by the Supreme Being for deliverance, as Moses was for the deliverance of the children of Israel from bondage in the land of Egypt. They seem not allowed to pause at any thing, however sacred in common, or their mad pretensions, lest reason should disturb their delusive dreams of midnight mutinies.

Nearly two centuries have elapse of four hundred years of their bondage, to bring the children of Israel into the land of Canaan, he was furnished with a rod, which at the command of his authority, he stretched forth his rod, and the Red sea opened, and a way was made for them. What evidence has the Abolitionist, that he is not the tool of the Prince of Darkness, or that he has been commissioned to 'deal damnation round the land on each' he judges the fit and proper? Being sent by the Abolitionists, instead of being commissioned to occupy the position of a separate society or association, seeking no aid from any other portions of society, they were not called to be their agent; but, in this respect, they have disapted their position. They have taken the political ground, that the Abolitionists are strangers, not amenable to them as alliance, offensive and defensive, with one of the great political parties of the day. Finding the Whig standard in the ascendancy, and the Democratic ascendancy, and knowing that Mr. Van Buren stands pledged, in the face of the country and of the world, to surrender to a powerful oppressed portion of the population of their designs, the Abolitionists have coalesced with that party in the North, and begin already to sound their triumph in the ear of 1840.

Now, fellow citizens, what say you? Will you rally under the banner of those who, whatever may be their motives, are declaring to preserve the constitutional compact which exists between the States of this country, or will you join the standard of those who seek, through a breach in this Federal bulwark, to dictate the terms of your domestic institutions? Will you be guided by those who are so desinitered with party phrensy as to be indifferent to the dangers with which we are threatened? Or there one of us who would be willing to see his country in ruins rather than see a rival political party triumph? I trust not. Every sign forbids that we should entertain so base a sentiment. Many of our fellow citizens, unconsciously, distinguished for abilities, have already surrendered, at the altar of patriotism, all minor considerations, and have rallied to the call of fellowship to their Northern brethren in the great cause of the Constitution. They think all longer of the ephemeral questions of the day; they look to the State of the country, and to secure its safety and prosperity as their paramount object. A Northern man, feeling with Southern feelings, if better able to ward off dangers than another, is not to be rejected. If, while he holds up the sacredness of the Constitution as a protection of Southern rights, he brings to his aid, through political influence or local situation, a Northern party, he should be no cause of rejoicing, as it but strength, on our means of defence.

Our attention to the vote upon the resolutions of Mr. Adams, relative to Abolitionists, at the last session, and on the 12th day of December last, you will see a manifest change of state of parties in reference to Abolitionists, and which, in my opinion, has resulted from a feeling that was already been presented. The fifth resolution in the series contained the practical, and effective principle which is by law to be applied. It declared that every petition or paper, of whatever description, which, at the present degree of the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, the States or Territories, or the slave trade among the States and Territories, should, on presentation, lie on the table, without being read or printed, and without any other action thereon. Now what was the vote upon the resolution? It is adopted, 126; against it, 70. Thirty Democrats, save one, from the slaveholding States, voted for it, and fifty-six votes were cast for it from the non-slaveholding States, the greater part of whom, however, without a solitary exception, belongs to the Whig party.

After these facts, is it too much to say that the Abolitionists have entered into a coalition with one of the political parties of the day? I have no suspicion that the coalition is entered into any expressed bargain or contract, but the parties to it are brought together by a purpose common to both—that of breaking down the Administration. The Whigs desire to break down the Administration—some of them, because they are Whigs, and prefer the Administration should be their wish to share in the spoils, and some, I believe, of the more gratification of vanquishing an opposing party; but Abolitionists have to do with the matter, quite different from any of these. They want Mr. Van Buren put out of the way, that they may erect their batteries in the District of Columbia, and from thence effectually bombard the slaveholding States. They expect to succeed in gaining this position, Virginia will be compelled to acquiesce in the abolition of her slaves, or making a common cause with the public enemy, to protect her property, to dissolve the Union, and if necessary, as she will be probably be the case, to stand upon her own ground. She can, in the contest, rely on the sympathy divine in his imagination a picture of the ruin that would follow the sudden turning loose of her slaves, and the consequent horrors, and I do not hesitate to say that the law of arms would be present.

If emancipation is ever to be effected, it should be by those who know the difficulty and delicacy of the subject. We are the objects of their tender mercies. They hate us, and denounce us, as pirates, man-stealers, tyrants. They are ready to turn the demon of discord among us, and to make us to drive us to strife for ourselves, whilst they screen themselves at a distance.

ROBERT CRAIG.

PROPRIETARY DIGNITY AND DECEPTION! The following original (!) ditty was drank at the recent anniversary of the Milton Social and Benevolent (!) Society, at Milton, and listed, in a company of about eighty ladies (!) and gentlemen (!):

The Ladies who have recently petitioned our Legislature to do away all distinction of color—in heaven's name, what for, we cannot tell—and may the same be granted, and be accomplished, in the Black Republican, the married ones, with a 'Milk and Molasses' Regency.

OHIO RESOLUTIONS.

The following are the resolutions adopted by a large majority of Ohio Democrats, at their recent State Convention in relation to Abolitionism. They were introduced by Mr. Hood:

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That in the opinion of this General Assembly, ours is a Government of limited powers; that all powers not delegated by the Constitution of the United States to the people; and that, by the Constitution of the United States, Congress has no jurisdiction over the institution of slavery in the several States of the Confederacy.

Resolved, That the agitation of the subject of slavery in the non slaveholding States is, in the opinion of this General Assembly, attended with no good; that the agitation in the South of the slavery question has been enhanced, and that it is a violation of the faith which ought ever to exist among the States in the same Confederacy.

Resolved, That the schemes of the Abolionists for the pretended happiness of the slaves are, in the opinion of this General Assembly, wild, delusive, and fanatical; and have a direct tendency to destroy the harmony of the Union, to rivet the chain of the slaves, and to destroy the security of our dear institutions.

Resolved, That all attempts to abolish slavery in the States of this Union, or to prohibit the removal of slaves from Maryland to other States, undermine the institutions of one portion of this country and another, with the view of destroying, in the opinion of this General Assembly, in violation of the Constitution of the United States, and destructive of the fundamental principles on which rests the union of these States."

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this General Assembly, the Abolitionists are guilty, in respect, to repeal any law now in force, imposing disabilities upon black and mulatto persons, thus placing them upon an equality with the white race, as the Legislature can do, and indirectly inviting the black population of other States to emigrate to this State, to the manifest injury of the white population.

Resolved, That the Governor be requested to forward copies of these resolutions to the President and Vice President of the United States, to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, and to the Executive of every State in the Confederacy.

ANTI-SLAVERY.

Abolition in Virginia

THE VIRGINIA PETITIONS—THE WHEELING MEETING—RESOLUTIONS AND ADDRESS OF THE PETITIONERS.

The following documents will explain themselves. They will hereafter, we believe, furnish not the least interesting chapter in the history of our country. Let them receive as they deserve, an attentive consideration.—(ED. CH. WITNESS.)

PUBLIC MEETING.

In pursuance of notice, the most numerous and respectable meeting which we have ever witnessed in the city of Wheeling was convened in the City Hall, on Saturday evening, January 12. On motion of Mr. Robert Morrow, the meeting was organized by calling CAPTAIN D. KEYS to the chair, and appointing Messrs. W. Wilson and James A Clark, was appointed Secretary.

James A. Clark, having explained the object of the meeting,

On motion of Charles L. Hoff, it was

Resolved, That the chairman appoint a committee of five to report resolutions for the consideration of the meeting.

Whereupon the chair appointed John I. Jacob, C. L. Hoff, Geo. W. Wilson, Benjamin F. Kelley, and James A. Clark; and the committee having retired for a short time, returned and reported the following preamble and resolutions, which, after several spirited and forcible addresses from Samuel Sprigg, Charles L. Hoff, Eli B. Swearingen, and James A Clark, were unanimously adopted.

PREAMBLE

Whereas, the citizens of Wheeling have observed with surprise and indignation, the presentation in the House of Representatives of the United States of certain petitions in relation to slavery and its operations, thereto, and purporting to be signed by certain citizens of Ohio county, deem it an act of justice to themselves and a duty due from them to the state at large, to investigate the source from whence these petitions originated, to ascertain what means have been used to procure signatures to the same, to disclaim for themselves as a people, all knowledge of the existence of such petitions until the moment of their presentation in Congress, and to repudiate with scorn the idea that the citizens of Ohio county would protect the authors or tolerate the circulation of such pernicious publications in this county. Therefore, be it resolved by the citizens of the city of Wheeling in public meeting assembled:

1. Resolved, That the deliberate opinion of this meeting that the said petitions were planned and written in Pennsylvania, by a few miserable fanatics and abolitionists, living close to the line dividing Pennsylvania and Virginia, who have taken advantage of that proximity to our state in attempting to disseminate their obvious principles and to scatter their detestable publications amongst our people.

2. Resolved, That with the exception of John Emery and two or three other names, this meeting is satisfied and convinced that the signatures to the said petitions were obtained by the grossest fraud and misrepresentation, and that this meeting upon examination have found that all the petitions which have been presented in Congress from the county of Ohio have been signed but by twenty-five persons, being the same individuals to each petition, and a part of those minors, and considering the distance and the secret manner in which them, is considered by this meeting as a gross and miserable failure to affix a libel upon the county of Ohio.

3. Resolved, That if any individual whose name is attached to the said petition shall be found to have united the law of the state, or to have conspired to prosecute him to the utmost rigor thereof, and we further pledge ourselves, that if at any time heretofore, the citizens of adjoining states, shall have come into our county, or hereafter shall come, and in like manner offend, we will use every exertion to have them apprehended and punished as aforesaid.

4. Resolved, That this meeting fully concur with the sentiment of Ohio county, in their order entered on record, requesting Mr. John Gilmor Jones to demand from Pennsylvania a justice of the peace of this county.

5. Resolved, That Abolitionists as a party or abolition as a doctrine has no existence in the county of Ohio.

6. Resolved, That to the slaveholding sections of the state we solemnly pledge ourselves that we will be at all times ready and prepared to assist them in maintaining our constitutional institutions, and in executing the laws made in defence thereof.

7. Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be signed by the chairman and secretary, published in the papers of this city, and the respective papers of the state, and that the National Intelligencer be requested to copy the same.

8. On motion of B. F. Kelley, Resolved, That a copy of the proceedings be forwarded to each of our members of our legislature, and to each of our representatives in Congress.

9. On motion, Resolved, That this meeting adjourn.

CHARLES D. KNOX, *Chairman.*

JAMES A. CLARK, *Secretary.*

MEETING OF THE PETITIONERS.

AT a public meeting of sundry citizens, of Ohio county, Va. held at the residence of The's Abercrombie, on the 5th inst. (February,) to take into consideration the proceedings of a meeting held in the town of Wheeling on January 12th, 1839, on the subject of the late petitions sent to Congress from this county.

On motion of John Gilmor, Esq., the meeting was organized by calling John Bonsheed to the chair, and on motion, Lyttleton Morris was appointed Secretary. The object of the meeting being explained by John Gilmor, Esq., on motion of Wm. Sheppard, it was resolved, that the chair appoint a committee of five, to report resolutions expressive of the views of this meeting.

Whereupon the chair appointed the following gentlemen: Chas. Grimm, John Emery, Samuel M. Bell, Thomas Abercrombie, and George Whitlam. The committee having retired for a short time, returned and reported the following preamble and resolutions, which were unanimously adopted.

Whereas, certain citizens of Ohio county, Va. having avoided themselves of the right guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States, have petitioned Congress to relinquish to slavery; and, whereas, certain abolitionists, who have, by common consent, deemed it an act of justice to themselves and a duty due from them to the state at large, to adopt and publish a preamble and resolutions, which, in substance, contain inflammatory and detestable publications among our people. The sense of our people, respecting the people of another state, is not calculated to strengthen the bonds of union, but rather to weaken them; and, whereas, such publications are calculated to foster the spirit of mobocracy. Therefore, be it Resolved,

1. That the Constitution of the Constitution of United States, are entitled to the full, free, and unrestrained right to petition Congress, and consequently no Legislature or public meeting can in any case deprive them of that right.

2. Resolved, That all men are by nature equally free and independent, and possess certain inherent rights, of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot by any compact deprive or divest their posterity, viz. the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety.

3. That the signers of the first and second resolutions adopted by the Wheeling meeting as state that the petitions were to be signed by unscrupulous means were in any way employed to keep the good people of Wheeling or any person from the knowledge of such petitions, and consequently, that they were not been published as signers to the petitions, there can be found no one who is a minor.

4. Resolved, That we, the undersigned, as well as the slaveholding parts of this state, we will at all times be found supporting all laws which are constitutional and require us to perform no immoral act; and at the same time will use on all proper occasions every constitutional means in power to have all unjust, unconstitutional, and immoral laws repealed.

5. Resolved, That we will spurn as the most base and inhuman, the person that would advise the revolt or rebellion of the colored population, or any resolution every attempt of the slaves to obtain by force their liberty, and protest against all attempts to hold us up to public view as the tools of our political enemy.

6. Resolved, That the laws of this commonwealth, neither in letter nor in spirit, prohibit her citizens to petition Congress on the subject of slavery.

7. Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting signed by our chairman and secretary, and that be published in all papers which published the proceedings of the meeting held in the city hall of Wheeling, on the 12th of January, and we pray Congress the respective papers of Ohio, Brook, and Marshall counties, the Madisonian, of Washington city, the Liberator, of Boston, the Emancipator, of New York, the Pennsylvania Freeman, of Philadelphia, the Christian Witness, of Pittsburgh, and the Philanthropist, of Cincinnati, to publish the same, and we pray our Governor, to each member of the General Assembly, and Congressmen of this state.

8. Resolved, That this meeting adjourn.

Previous to adjournment the following address was read to the meeting, unanimously approved of, signed, and ordered to be printed with the proceedings of this meeting.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WHEELING GAZETTE.

SIR—In your paper of the 10th ult. have been published two petitions and many resolutions, purporting to have been adopted by a public meeting of the citizens of Wheeling. Now, sir, as the aforesaid preamble and resolutions, contain a false and inflammatory character, we deem it due to ourselves and the public generally to make a few remarks on them; and by giving publicity to our sentiments, we hope to be able to undeceive our brethren, and vindicate the reputation of a portion of your fellow-citizens which has been deeply injured by the widely erroneous impression of the preamble and resolutions in question.

1. Then we would ask those who adopted the preamble, whether they meant that all the citizens of Wheeling attended the meeting, and if so, whether they adopted the preamble and resolutions? They say, "Whereas, *the citizens of Wheeling, &c.*" Would it not have been more correct for them to have said, "Whereas, *some citizens of Wheeling, &c.*"

2. In the preamble they state, that they "deem it an act of justice to themselves, and a duty due from them to the state at large, to adopt and publish a preamble and resolutions, which, in substance, contain inflammatory and detestable publications among our people." The sense of our people, respecting the people of another state, is not calculated to strengthen the bonds of union, but rather to weaken them; and, we ask, how is calculated to produce sectional animosities and strife. But we would ask the citizens of Wheeling, who voted for the adoption of such language respecting their neighbors of Pennsylvania, whether it is good policy in a commercial point of view to so disparage, and even speaking of the latter? Such invectives against them are adapted to prevent not only Pennsylvanian but also the people of any other state from coming to Wheeling, or even from passing through it, if they can avoid it, should they happen to think that Congress possesses exclusive legislative power over the District of Columbia, to regulate commerce of every sort—to determine on what condition they will admit new states into the Confederacy, or to abolish slavery in Maryland or in Texas as an integral part of our nation, however correct their political sentiments on other subjects, or however virtuous and intelligent the people be.

4. As the second resolution contains various misstatements which are deeply injurious to the signers of the petitions, we feel constrained to notice the glaring ority of contradicting them. We regret exceedingly that those who drew it up and adopted it, should give publicity to such misstatements, when they proposed means of ascertaining their correctness. Had they been treated in this manner, probably 'surprise,' indignation,' 'sorrow,' and other kindred feelings' would have transported them beyond all due bounds. What grossest fraud and misrepresentations have been resorted to, and secret practices, have been used to obtain the signatures to the petitions, with the exception of the signatures of John Emery, and two or three others, we know not, and we hope they are equally silent respecting the persons who, they say, signed the petitions though minors. Now, if we instead of insinuations, we had but thousand tongues, or taking for realities the reveries of fancy, they had applied to the signers for a statement of facts in relation to the petition, all necessary information would have cheerfully been given.

5. In the fifth resolution it is asserted, that abolition as a party, or abolition as a doctrine, has no existence in the county of Ohio." Now if this resolution be correct, why did the meeting, which sanctioned it, not so much indignant at sectarian sectarian meeting presentation of certain petitions in Congress from some of the citizens of this county? Whether there are abolitionists, or abolition doctrine in existence or not, in this county, we will not here give our opinion; but those who deny the existence of both, as the authors of the above resolution have done, must either be in themselves a more than ordinary penetration into the private sentiments of others respecting the secret wish Congress and the power of abolition should pursue in relation to slavery. It is strange that the authors of such a resolution did not appear to the meeting. Certainly the publication of it is calculated to diminish whatever credit might be thought due to the others with which it is connected.

In conclusion we would remark, that we accord to the citizens of Wheeling, in common with the citizens of every state in the Union, the right of the exercise of the express, without reserve, their opinion in reference to the merits of our petitions, and to send counter petitions to Congress, if they think proper, and if the information requires them to do so; but that they should not only cast us out of their protection as out-laws, but also intimidate us, and our friends, from the exercise of what the Constitution and Laws of Virginia permit us to do, and what the Constitution of the United States expressly secures to us, we do not, in the interest and welfare of our own country required us to do, is we fear, for them to fix an indelible stain on our national glory. We hope, for the sake of our country and the Father of his country, had he been present at the great meeting in Wheeling on the 12th ult. and had he seen the indignation and portrait which he must have possessed, when as an instrument in the hand of Providence, he achieved the liberties of his country? We wish that the persons who convened the meeting had read his Farewell Address before they assembled; had they done so, it is likely that the assembly and proceedings would have assumed a very different form from what they took. We would ask whether a preamble with no sharp as edge, if implied in inuendoes, would ever up by the roots the Tree of Liberty, which was planted by the unremitting toil of our forefathers, and watered by their blood? And are not such inflammatory proceedings calculated to banish out of our state the best portion of the inhabitants? If the citizens of Wheeling wish to produce a delay to the state, by expressing their indignation against the violators of her laws as well as the laws of Heaven; certainly they may have frequent occasions for indulging in such, and to express anathematize those who are in the cases in question breaking no laws human or divine.

JOHN BONSHEED, President.

John Gilmor, Esq.	John Emery,
Hugh Brownlee, Sr.	John Porter,
William Bonsfield,	Hugh Brownlee, Jr.
Tho's Abercrombie,	Peregrine Whitlam,
William Morrison,	Thomas Pollock,
Jacob Nash,	Robert Harrison,
Samuel Lewis,	Lewis Nuss,
John Humes,	George Whitlam.

We appeal to the order of the Ohio County Court calling upon Justice Gilmor to resign, with the reply of the latter. They are necessary to complete the history of this most extraordinary transaction.—(ED. CH. WITNESS.

Ohio County Court,
January Term, 1839.

It having been represented to the Court that John Gilmor, a Justice of the Peace for Ohio County, is contrary to the spirit if not the letter of the Act of the Legislature of Virginia, for the suppression of incendiary publications, and has thereby, in violation of said Act, by signing Abolition petitions, which said petitions were presented to the House of Representatives of the United States, by Hon. John Quincy Adams, and it appears that the said John Gilmor be requested to resign his office of Justice of the Peace forthwith, the same being the unanimous opinion of the Court, and the acting Justices of this county. A copy—Teste

JOHN M'COLLOUGH, CLERK.

Clerk's Office, Ohio County, Va., March 4th, 1839.

To the Worshipful the Justices of Ohio County.

The Sheriff, on the 1st inst. handed me a communication purporting to be a copy of an order of Ohio County Court, dated January Term, 1839; in which your honors request me to resign my office of Justice of the Peace, and in case I should refuse to inform you, that I will not comply with your request, for the following reasons:

1. In the preamble to the order you charge me with having violated the Act of the Legislature of Virginia for the suppression of incendiary publications, in giving judgment the signing of abolition petitions does not, either in letter or spirit, violate the act in question. I have acted in strict conformity to the letter and spirit of the act, and I do not, in the slightest degree, violate the act in question.

2. To comply with your request might be imputed to me a violation of my constitutionally construed into a tacit acknowledgement of guilt.

3. A compliance with your request would be a dangerous precedent, establishing the principle that a public officer, in a republican government the members of court on a political or moral question, is a sufficient cause to justify the majority to require the minority to resign.

4. The penalties of the act in question, being fine and imprisonment, I feel it my duty to believe that you have fallen into a mistake in regard to the spirit of the law; from the fact of your annexing a penalty of your own making, to the offence of signing.

I request, as an act of justice to me, that your honors will order the above reasons to be entered on record.

JOHN GILMOR.

The threats which are vouched in the preamble, and which, we believe, have been made, are in the form of a resolution. But perhaps the excitement, under which it was adopted, prevented the study of form, consistent. We consider truth to be the same in all cases, and we would apply its principles, to men, not who said a thing, but what is said." This objection to the petitions is taken from the mode in which they are presented, and the calm reason of a rational republican. It is not, however, our object to enter into a discussion of the merits of the petitions; to do this, would occupy too much of your paper; but we wish to show the injustice that is done to others by the presentation and expression of such petitions. We are sorry that any of our fellow-citizens should use such intemperate language respecting the people of an adjoining state, as to call them pernicious, and charge them with 'attempting to disseminate obvious principles' and detestable publications among our people. The sense of our people, respecting the people of another state, is not calculated to strengthen the bonds of union, but rather to weaken them; and, we ask, how is calculated to produce sectional animosities and strife. But we would ask the citizens of Wheeling, who voted for the adoption of such language respecting their neighbors of Pennsylvania, whether it is good policy in a commercial point of view to so disparage, and even speaking of the latter? Such invectives against them are adapted to prevent not only Pennsylvanian but also the people of any other state from coming to Wheeling, or even from passing through it, if they can avoid it, should they happen to think that Congress possesses exclusive legislative power over the District of Columbia, to regulate commerce of every sort—to determine on what condition they will admit new states into the Confederacy, or to abolish slavery in Maryland or in Texas as an integral part of our nation, however correct their political sentiments on other subjects, or however virtuous and intelligent the people be.

4. As the second resolution contains various misstatements which are deeply injurious to the signers of the petitions, we feel constrained to notice the glaring ority of contradicting them. We regret exceedingly that those who drew it up and adopted it, should give publicity to such misstatements, when they proposed means of ascertaining their correctness. Had they been treated in this manner, probably 'surprise,' indignation,' 'sorrow,' and other kindred feelings' would have transported them beyond all due bounds. What grossest fraud and misrepresentations have been resorted to, and secret practices, have been used to obtain the signatures to the petitions, with the exception of the signatures of John Emery, and two or three others, they know not, and we hope they are equally silent respecting the persons who, they say, signed the petitions though minors. Now, if instead of insinuations, we had but thousand tongues, or taking for realities the reveries of fancy, they had applied to the signers for a statement of facts in relation to the petition, all necessary information would have cheerfully been given.

5. In the fifth resolution it is asserted, that abolition as a party, or abolition as a doctrine, has no existence in the county of Ohio." Now if this resolution be correct, why did the meeting, which sanctioned it, not so much indignant at sectarian sectarian meeting presentation of certain petitions in Congress from some of the citizens of this county? Whether there are abolitionists, or abolition doctrine in existence or not, in this county, we will not here give our opinion; but those who deny the existence of both, as the authors of the above resolution have done, must either be in themselves a more than ordinary penetration into the private sentiments of others respecting the secret wish Congress and the power of abolition should pursue in relation to slavery. It is strange that the authors of such a resolution did not appear to the meeting. Certainly the publication of it is calculated to diminish whatever credit might be thought due to the others with which it is connected.

In conclusion we would remark, that we accord to the citizens of Wheeling, in common with the citizens of every state in the Union, the right of the exercise of the express, without reserve, their opinion in reference to the merits of our petitions, and to send counter petitions to Congress, if they think proper, and if the information requires them to do so; but that they should not only cast us out of their protection as out-laws, but also intimidate us, and our friends, from the exercise of what the Constitution and Laws of Virginia permit us to do, and what the Constitution of the United States expressly secures to us, we do not, in the interest and welfare of our own country required us to do, is we fear, for them to fix an indelible stain on our national glory. We hope, for the sake of our country and the Father of his country, had he been present at the great meeting in Wheeling on the 12th ult. and had he seen the indignation and portrait which he must have possessed, when as an instrument in the hand of Providence, he achieved the liberties of his country? We wish that the persons who convened the meeting had read his Farewell Address before they assembled; had they done so, it is likely that the assembly and proceedings would have assumed a very different form from what they took. We would ask whether a preamble with no sharp as edge, if implied in inuendoes, would ever up by the roots the Tree of Liberty, which was planted by the unremitting toil of our forefathers, and watered by their blood? And are not such inflammatory proceedings calculated to banish out of our state the best portion of the inhabitants? If the citizens of Wheeling wish to produce a delay to the state, by expressing their indignation against the violators of her laws as well as the laws of Heaven; certainly they may have frequent occasions for indulging in such, and to express anathematize those who are in the cases in question breaking no laws human or divine.

John Bonsheed,	John Emery,
John Gilmor, Esq.	John Porter,
Hugh Brownlee, Sr.	Hugh Brownlee, Jr.
William Bonsfield,	Peregrine Whitlam,
Tho's Abercrombie,	Thomas Pollock,
William Morrison,	Robert Harrison,
Jacob Nash,	Lewis Nuss,
Samuel Lewis,	George Whitlam.
John Humes,	

We appeal to the order of the Ohio County Court calling upon Justice Gilmor to resign, with the reply of the latter. They are necessary to complete the history of this most extraordinary transaction.—(ED. CH. WITNESS.

Ohio County Court,
January Term, 1839,

It having been represented to the Court that John Gilmor, a Justice of the Peace for Ohio County, is contrary to the spirit if not the letter of the Act of the Legislature of Virginia, for the suppression of incendiary publications, and has thereby, in violation of said Act, by signing Abolition petitions, which said petitions were presented to the House of Representatives of the United States, by Hon. John Quincy Adams, it appears that the said John Gilmor be requested to resign his office of Justice of the Peace forthwith, the same being the unanimous opinion of the Court, and the acting Justices of this county. A copy—Teste

JOHN M'COLLOUGH, CLERK.

Clerk's Office, Ohio County, Va., March 4th, 1839.

To the Worshipful the Justices of Ohio County.

The Sheriff, on the 1st inst. handed me a communication, purporting to be a copy of an order of Ohio County Court, dated January Term, 1839; in which your honors request me to resign my office of Justice of the Peace, and in case I should refuse to inform you, that I will not comply with your request, for the following reasons:

1. In the preamble to the order you charge me with having violated the Act of the Legislature of Virginia for the suppression of incendiary publications, in giving judgment the signing of abolition petitions does not, either in letter or spirit, violate the act in question. I have acted in strict conformity to the letter and spirit of the act, and I do not, in the slightest degree, violate the act in question.

2. To comply with your request might be imputed to me a violation of my constitutionally construed into a tacit acknowledgement of guilt.

3. A compliance with your request would be a dangerous precedent, establishing the principle that a public officer, in a republican government the members of court on a political or moral question, is a sufficient cause to justify the majority to require the minority to resign.

4. The penalties of the act in question, being fine and imprisonment, I feel it my duty to believe that you have fallen into a mistake in regard to the spirit of the law; from the fact of your annexing a penalty of your own making, to the offence of signing.

I request, as an act of justice to me, that your honors will order the above reasons to be entered on record.

JOHN GILMOR.

BURNING OF PENNSYLVANIA HALL.

Extract from Rev. Dr. Channing's Letter to Jonathan Phillips, Esq. on the Slavery Question.

I have now concluded my remarks on the topics suggested by Mr. Clay's Speech; and here you may expect me to close this long letter. Perhaps, but for leaving, as I do, that my engagements and duties will not allow me to write again on slavery, I am inclined to release my friend of all his promises on this subject. Allow me then to say a few words on a topic which has given me many painful thoughts, the more painful, because so far from being sentient, it has been, I refer to that gross outrage on rights and liberty, the burning of the Hall of Freedom in Philadelphia. I have felt this the more, because this Hall was erected for free discussion, was dedicated to Liberty of Speech, and, fundamentally, was generously designed, by some abolitionists a chance of being heard; but it was also intended to give the same privilege to others, who, in consequence of their peculiar unpopular opinions, might be excluded from the places commonly devoted to public meetings. This building was associated with the clearer light of an intelligent, spiritual being, that of communicating thought, and receiving such communication in return; more intimately associated with it than any other edifice in the country. And this was stormed by a mob; a peaceful assemblage was driven from its walls; and afterwards it was levelled to the earth by fire.

Various circumstances conspired to take this out of the class of common crimes. It was not the act of the ignorant, unprincipled, and of the young, who are in transport of fury. The incendiaries proceeded leisurely in their work, and distinctly understood, that they were carrying out the purpose of a large and respectable portion of the people. Passionate outbreaks may be forgiven. An act performed by the reckless fire and rage of the passions, may be forgiven, and force admitted in the community to counteract it. But when individuals, in cool blood, and for a reasoning moral purpose, undertake deliberately the work of the common enemy of all, then the outrage on law and right wears a singular character. The moment it appears, such a community may well feel the foundations of social order tottering beneath them. After the mob of Philadelphia, who expected that the next attack would be?

Another aggravation of this act was, that the blameless character of those who had erected and were occupying the Hall, by no means deterred, and did not stood. The assemblage thronging this edifice, was not made up of profligates, of the false, the lawless, the profane, but of those, whose presence was the glory of citizens of Philadelphia and visitors from other cities and States, who were second to none in purity of life; and they had to endure this outrage in consequence of what they believed, however erroneously, the will of God, and to accomplish what seemed to them a great work of justice and humanity. Never, I believe, in this country, was there collected in any other single spot of the land so many good and upright men and women, so many sincere friends of the slave. Never, I believe, in this country, a man whose genius and virtues would do honor to any land, whose poetry bursts from the soul with a force and sweetness, reminding us of an ancient prophet, and whose noble simplicity of character is said to be the delight of all who know him. In that crowd was Lucretia Mott, that beautiful example of womanhood. Who that has heard the tones of her voice, and looked on the mild radiance of her benign and intelligent countenance, can endure the thought, that such a woman was driven by a mob, from a spot to which she had gone, as the critic of humanity, as the friend of Christian sympathy? There were many others, worthy associates of those whom I have named, religious women, whose hearts were burdened with the infinite indignities heaped on their sex by slavery. Such persons the prejudiced and cruel refined classes, insulted, and to bring down violence on our heads, because they transgress conventional rules and the forms of good manners? That ignorance and corrupt people should treat the motives of the Abolitionists with scorn, cannot surprise us; but that any, who belong to what is called the respectable and refined class, should join the fierce multitude in persecuting men of worth and humanity, admits no excuse. Does it not show, that the line of separation between the high and low is not as broad as we sometimes imagine; that much which passes for refinement is only a form of vice; and that passions are stirred up by the concurrence of numbers, the friends of order? can set laws at defiance as boldly as the unhinged?

MAGNIFICENT ENTERPRISE.—Joseph Sturge, Esq., of Birmingham, Eng. has published a long letter in the British Emancipator, on the duty of supporting the general movement of the whole civilized world, in relation to the abolition of the Slave Trade, and of slavery itself; in which he calls on the Anti-Slavery Society, (the Christians of all denominations could act) founded on the principle of destroying these tremendous evils, through moral and religious influence. Joel Hiott, the editor of the Emancipator suggests the propriety of calling together from all civilized nations, a General Anti-Slavery Convention, to be held in Philadelphia in the month of May or June, 1840; and remarks that delegates or communications might be had from philanthropists in the United States, Texas, Denmark, Sweden, Holland, Jamaica, Hayti, Columbia, Mexico, India, Cape of Good Hope, Sandwich Islands, &c.

We have not room for the whole of Mr. Sturge's letter. To our mind it is conclusive, as we have heretofore expressed ourself, that the abolition of the slave trade not only tended to, but *by the abolition of Slavery itself*—*Zion's Herald.*

In the year 1807, England declared the trade piracy; and yet, in spite of the combined efforts of the civilized world, it is estimated that we have spent about twenty millions sterling in treaties with foreign powers, naval armaments, and the support of the African Squadron; thousands and ten thousands of British soldiers and sailors to secure its abolition. But so far from having effected the object of the trade, that the total exportation from Africa in 1807 was stated at 70,000 slaves per annum, has increased to at least 150,000, conveyed every year to the different parts of the world in the trade. Such are the wide spread horrors of the system at the present moment, that it has been estimated on data which can hardly be called in question, that at least two lives are sacrificed in procuring one living victim, in the internal wars fomented for the purpose in the interior of Africa, in the march to the coast, and in the agonies of the middle passage. The vessels now built for the purpose are the fastest sailers in the world; and it is said, that since the commencement of the war, the insurance offices at the Havana, cover the risk of a voyage for 15 per cent, and that they make profitable concerns. The unhappy beings are stowed into these miserably shallow vessels like bales of goods, and notwithstanding the dreadful loss of life, the profits in the trade are now estimated at fully 180 per cent. Besides this desolating traffic, which annually sacrifices about 150,000 lives, and 150,000 more, in Africa, an infernal trade from the slave-breeding to the slave-consuming states in North America, of the most revolting kind, has sprung up, which is annually consumed as from 50 to 100,000 human beings per annum. To this it is to be added, that upwards of five millions of the Southern population are in a state of the most cruel bondage in the western world.

SLAVERY—LEGISLATIVE REPORT.

Thomas Bradbury, of Worcester, Chairman of the Special Joint Committee appointed to inquire into the expediency of providing for the deliverance of citizens of Massachusetts, who may be imprisoned in Slavery, or liable to be sold as slaves,' reported, *"that it is inexpedient to legislate thereon*, and asked to be discharged from further consideration of the subject.

The people will discharge Bradbury from the consideration of this and all other legislative duties on the ground of his being a man, and *showing him* at the last election, and the Legislature did wrong in choosing him.

Rev. Ezra Lawrence of Nantucket, of the same committee, made a minority *Report*, which is printed in pamphlet form; and a copy of it, with Bradbury's Report, is before us. We admire this man for his fearless independence, as well as for his reason and humanity. *He* reports in his Report, that he has collected a great number of striking cases of the imprisonment of free citizens from the free States, who were to be sold into slavery, for the alleged offence of being colored. These cases are far more numerous and aggravated than we had supposed. Mr. Bradbury has not feared to stand up for the rights of the weak and the injured and the oppressed, and we honor him for so doing. We have very particularly pleased with the manner in which he has treated the Southern Slaveholders, who have spent his time in vain attempts to ridicule and insult respectable Northern citizens. It is just that they should give an notice that they will hear this season withdraw from legislation. If he should, it would be our wise act in the interest of the Commonwealth. We feel well pleased to pay him a salary.—*Lynn Pioneer.*

It is stated in the

MASS. LEGISLATURE.

Reported for the Liberator.

DEBATE ON MINOT THAYER'S REPORT CONCERNING THE DORCHESTER PETITION.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Monday, April 8.

Mr. Bradbury, of Nantucket, said he had hoped, Mr. Speaker, to be spared the necessity of saying any thing on the subject of this report. I had hoped to be able to let it pass the House in quietness and without discussion, in compliance with the expressed wishes of various persons most deeply interested in the matter. And even the report which I had reason to expect it would be, it would certainly, so far as I am concerned, have been permitted to take this course. But such, unfortunately, as it seems to me, is not the fact. It is, in some essential respects, a very different report, as well from what I had been anticipated to anticipate, as from what, in my judgment, it ought to be. I cannot, therefore, consent to let it pass unnoticed. Nay, I feel bound, for reasons which I shall presently state, to protest against its acceptance by this House.

The business of the day (a little past 6, P. M.) makes me feel the less scrupulous of occupying a little time on this subject, for I know the House would attend to no other business to-night, even if this were passed over. But they who cannot sympathize with the deep interest taken in this matter by the gentleman from Braintree, or who do not care to hear me talk about it, can go home to their suppers, and leave us to ourselves. There will be no other business done here to-night.

To the statement of facts contained in the appendix of this report, I know not, Mr. Speaker, that I have any objections to make. It is probably a true statement. Nor do I feel called on to undertake a defence of my proceedings. We may now, if we please, or neglect modes of procedure, which the Committee may have shown to have been exercised by any individuals, with respect to the 'Dorchester petition.' I am as free as the Committee, or as any other persons, to condemn the employment of all improper means, in getting up of petitions, either on this or on any other subject. And I will not disguise my conviction, that there is often a great want of care, of prudence, and right discrimination, manifested by those who procure signatures to the various petitions which come up to us here. I lament that it should be so. I have no apology, therefore, to offer for those who adopt or sanction this loose, careless way of obtaining signatures to memorials. On the contrary, I will not be behind the gentleman from Braintree himself, in expressions of severe reprobation of their practice. I think it tends to nullify the value of the right of petition. And I shall rejoice, if the investigations of the present Committee shall operate, in any degree, to induce greater circumspection in the exercise of this important right.

But why the gentleman from Braintree should have singled out *this* petition, and made it the object of so searching an examination, I am not quite able to conceive. For the petition from Dorchester is involved in no peculiarity of condition. An equally searching examination of some other petitions, which have been presented to this House, would prove them obnoxious to objections not less forcible, perhaps, than those urged against this. I think of even the petition of H. G. Otis and others that I have well sustained the shock of a similar onset. Why did not the gentleman pounce upon that, as he did upon the one of the women of Dorchester, and move the appointment of a special Committee to ascertain if any 'fraud' had been perpetrated in the obtainment of its signers?

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to state my objections to this report, I desire to acknowledge, and I do so with great satisfaction, the perfect justice it does to the motives of those who first originated it. I congratulate its author on the discovery he has made, touching 'the virtues and graces of the memorialists.' I knew, if he went into the investigation, he would make this discovery; I knew he would find them to be 'virtuous women,' notwithstanding the charge, on the occasion of my presenting their petition, that he did not believe there was one such among them.

(Here Mr. Bradburn was interrupted by Mr. Thayer, who stated, that he never made such an assertion. What he said was this, that he did not believe on were too virtuous women among them, who knew what they were about when they signed.)

Mr. Speaker, I can prove by a large majority of this House, that the gentleman from Braintree did make the assertion I have imputed to him. But as he denies the fact, I suppose it would not be in order for me to say any thing further about it, except perhaps to add, that I am perfectly willing to leave the point of difference between myself and the gentleman, to those who heard the remarks of the gentleman. But the gentleman's own explanation of what he said, which, from courtesy as well as from parliamentary usage, I am bound to accept, does not relieve the difficulty at all. It is, in principle, precisely the same as the expression, I understood him to employ. For it makes no difference whether he referred to one, or ten, or a hundred; in either case, the imputation were equally atrocious, and equally unworthy of a man who makes the slightest pretensions to politeness or honesty. I will not say of courtesyness, but of common decency.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that I felt bound to protest against the acceptance of this report by the House. I will now proceed to state my reasons. And I forewarn the House, that I shall prove that I have been grossly misled, or be involved in ignorance not less gross, while it is incomparably more disgraceful, than any which they have taken so much pains to prove upon the petitioners; incomparably more disgraceful, I say, because the latter is attended with fewer means of information, and prefer no claims to superior knowledge. At page 10th of their report, the Committee say:

'It is not necessary for the Committee to vindicate the policy of those statutes from the severe reproach with which they have been assailed. Adopted by the venerated fathers of New-England in the early period of its history, they were approved by the founders of the Commonwealth in the re-enactment of provincial legislation, and in recent time received the sanction of the statesmen who reared the fabric of the legal system of the Commonwealth. The bitter words which have been applied, while they are insulting to the memories of our ancestors, are unjust to their descendants.'

Mr. Speaker, the second of these three sentences contains three direct falsehoods, besides authorizing a fourth one by way of inference; and in the last, I charge the Committee with having uttered a fifth falsehood, and to have transcended the duties devolved on them by the order of this House, under which they have professedly acted.

Sir, it is not true, that the statutes whose abrogation is prayed for by the petitioners were 'adopted by the venerated fathers of New-England.' The statute-book of those fathers has never disgraced by its enactment upon its pages of any such atrocious laws. The fathers of New-England, bigots though they have been denominated, and perhaps with good reasons, were never guilty of so contemptible an exercise of the intellect, as to be led to the imputation of any moral qualities to the mere accident of color. *Their* marriage laws recognized no 'distinction' founded on a difference of complexion. The distinction made in those laws, was founded, not on the hue of the skin, but upon religion. It was the intermarriage of *Christian* and *Heathen*, and not of persons differing only in complexion, that our worthy ancestors legislated to prevent. I will read you an extract from their law on this subject. The law was enacted in October, 1705:

'And be it further declared and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that none of her Majesty's English or Scottish subjects, nor of any other Christian nation within this province, shall contract marriage with any negro, or mulatto,' &c.—*Ancient Charters and Laws of Massachusetts, p. 74b.*

'The whole law on this subject 'adopted by the venerated fathers of New-England.' But modern refinement, in its unchristian hatred of color, has stricken out the word 'Christian,' and inserted the word 'white.' Our venerated fathers' might have urged, in behalf of their law, something bearing the semblance of reason; for we know, that religious opinions do exert an influence on the character; but if there be any connexion between the mind and the color of one's face, I have yet that fact to learn; and in that case, I confess I should feel a little curiosity to learn, also, the such connexion exists.

Well, Sir, as no law like the present existed in the statute-book of the venerable fathers of New-England, it follows, of course, that no such law could have been among 'the re-enactments of provincial legislation.' Besides, Judge Dane, in his Abridgment, says expressly, that the provincial legislature followed, in this matter, the Levitical law. And what was the Levitical law on this subject? Why, simply that no Jew should marry a Heathen. It had no reference whatever to color, but was designed to preserve the purity of the Jewish faith.

And, Sir, it also follows, as a legitimate corollary from what I have just said, that it was not the law adopted by the fathers of New-England, which 'in recent time received the sanction of the statesmen who revised the whole legal system of the Commonwealth.' The present law, Sir, is of a character entirely different from that of our fathers, with which it has been confounded by this learned Committee.

The inferential falsehood, which I pronounced to be contained in the extract I read from the report, is this, that the present law has given universal satisfaction to the people of the Commonwealth, or, at least, that no opposition has been made to it, until the recent agitation of the question, which grew out of the presentation to this House of the Dorchester petition. It, Sir, an utterly false idea, that this law has met with no opposition till the present session of this Legislature. And the gentleman from Braintree, having been a member of this House for many years, should have known it to be false. Perhaps the Speaker here interrupted Mr. B., and said it was not in order to charge a member with uttering what he knew to be false.) Sir, I prefer no such charge against the gentleman from Braintree. I would here charge neither him nor any other member with intentional falsehood. But, Sir, I have an idea (perhaps it is only a fancy) which I wish to express; how shall I express it? by what name shall I call it? (The Speaker said, the gentleman might say it was incorrect, or inaccurate.) That, Sir, is quite as much as I mean to say. I say, then, that the idea in question is 'incorrect' or 'inaccurate'; and that the author of this report should have known it to be so. For, in 1831, this whole subject was brought up in this House. A bill, providing for the repeal of the laws now complained of, then passed the House, almost without a dissenting vote; and it failed of passing to be enacted, only in consequence of being crowded into the heel of the session, or of there being an insufficiency of time. On that occasion, the venerable Mr. Bancroft of Beverly, a member of the House, recited, in several speeches, several interesting facts of oppression, which he personally knew to have occurred under the operation of those laws. Among those facts was this, that a family of children were robbed of a valuable estate by the villainous yet perfectly legal interference of an avaricious uncle, who succeeded in proving that one of the parents was contaminated with a slight admixture of the African color—or perchance it was a few drops of the blood that once coursed in the veins of old King Philip. But during the time which intervened between the close of the session of the Legislature, and the opening of the next, a clamor about amalgamation was got up against this bill, which had passed the House by so unanimous a vote; and perhaps it was chiefly in consequence of this, that the subject was permitted to remain undecided at that our present session.

The falsehood contained in the last sentence of the extract read from the report, consists in accusing me of 'insulting the memories of our ancestors,' by 'applying bitter words' to their marriage laws. I suppose I do not know the meaning of the term, when I apply this part of their report to myself; for I know of no one, who has employed words more severe than I have on this subject; indeed, I believe I am the only one in the House, who has ventured, during the present session, to speak of our ancestors' marriage laws. But, Sir, I deny ever having 'applied bitter words' to the marriage laws of our ancestors.' I have spoken only of our own present laws on that subject, which I have shown to be utterly unlike those of our ancestors; and I am free to confess, that if I have not 'applied bitter words' to the former, it was only because I had no power to select such words. My abhorrence of them is too deep to be fully expressed by any words. I, therefore, that I had no reference, in any thing I may have said, to laws of 'our ancestors,' and have said nothing, at all applicable to any laws of theirs, if follows, necessarily, that the accusation brought against me, of 'insulting their memories, is without foundation in truth, that it is, what I have pronounced it to be, a falsehood.

But what if the laws on our statute-book, whose repeal is prayed for by the Dorchester petitioners, were originally 'adopted by the venerated fathers of New England,' and what if I had applied all the bitter words to them, which I am alleged to have done by the Committee? Would that authorize the Committee to charge me with 'insulting the memories of our ancestors?' Would it be 'insulting to the memories' of those ancestors, to complain against the laws they enacted, authorizing the hanging of persons as witches? or against those of their enactment which consigned Quakers to the halter, for daring 'to obey God rather than men,' and which, for the same reason, cut off the ears of Baptists, burnt their churches, and banished them into the wilderness of Rhode Island? If so, then I would say, let the memories of our ancestors be insulted. Let such insult be poured out upon their memories, without ceasing and without measure, until every vestige of such barbarous laws shall have been blotted from our statute-book!

But, again, suppose I had insulted 'the memories of our ancestors,' how could that have concerned this Committee? Who authorized them to give an opinion on the justice or propriety of my language? Certainly not I that this House gave them no such authority. The business committed to them by the House was very plain, and not to be easily mistaken. We authorized them to inquire if any 'fraud' was committed in procuring the names attached to the Dorchester petition, and to report to us. This, then, was their business, and their only legitimate business. It was therefore, that I asserted, that in writing an opinion on words used by me, or by any other person, either here or elsewhere, they had transcended the powers which were devolved on them by this House.

And now, Sir, that I have alluded to this subject—the disregard by the Committee of the instructions of the order of this House, under which they were appointed to act—I will advert to one other instance in which they have transcended their powers. It is still more flagrant, than the one of which I have just spoken. I will state it in the Committee's own language—awkward and un-English as that language chances to be.

'While they (the committee) do justice to the purity of purpose, they have felt constrained to express their deliberate conviction, that it is inconsistent with the modesty of a virtuous woman to solicit the repeal of laws restraining the union of the white and black races in marriage.'—'Compelled to declare their deliberate conviction!' Mr. Speaker, what compelled the Committee to such a declaration? Who required this work at their hands? Who erected them into a court of inquiry, for the settlement of questions of etiquette, or of morals? Not this House, certainly. Neither could this House have done so, even if it were disposed to do it, since it is not within their competency to establish courts, or Committees, for any purposes of this sort. The people did not send us here, to settle the disputed boundaries of woman's 'appropriate sphere,' or to say what is, or is not consistent with the modesty of a virtuous woman.' Of course, we could have conferred no such power on this Committee, even if we had desired to do so. I therefore charge the Committee with having, in this matter also, greatly transcended the powers devolved on them by this House, which having reluctantly, and by unjust the exercise of functions, which could not be legitimately exercised even by the Legislature itself. But suppose the House possessed these powers, and, instead of appointing this learned and refined Committee to inquire if any 'fraud' had been practised touching the Dorchester petition, had appointed them to consider and determine points of delicacy, of etiquette, or of female modesty. And suppose, that after holding numerous and protracted sessions, and bestowing, with anxious solicitude, much serious consideration and deep reflection on this matter of gravest moment, they should report, as the grand result of their deep anxious, and painstaking deliberations, 'that it is inconsistent with the modesty of a virtuous woman to solicit the repeal of laws restraining alliances between the two colors.' Would such a report, under such circumstances, be not exceedingly ridiculous? What, I ask, even in such an event, ought decent men to think of the Committee? Would they not find it difficult to determine, which was the more deserving of contempt, the report itself, or the idea, that it was in the power of such a Committee, by the exercise of an ineffable, to shamefully? What do they, in fact, pray for, that should so shock the Committee, reflected the delicate sentiments of modesty? They sue for the repeal of a law, which, in its operation, is cruel and unjust, which inflicts odium, most execrable, on honest men and women, which audaciously, and with blasphemy unspeakable, presumes to put asunder those whom God Almighty hath himself joined together, which, with rebellious spirit, rushes to disorder, and to disturb the order of heaven, and consigns them to all the infamy of bastardism. This, Sir, is what the petitioners ask for, and this is all they ask for. And for making this request, the *gentlemen* from Braintree, in this report, has dared to stigmatize them with doing that which is inconsistent with the modesty of virtuous women.' Sir, if that *gentleman* had ever been so fortunate as to obtain a wife, and been blessed with children worthy of a decent mother, or was it possible for him to rise to the moral dignity of a husband, capable of appreciating, and to form a conception of the inborn rights, and the just claims for protection, of innocent, spotless children,—he had never penned this vile, blackguard aspersion of the modesty of these petitioners; no, Sir, never, never. And if the gentleman from Braintree, in a moment of original constitution somewhat modified, I should have some hope of his repentance; but, as the case stands, I give him up.

Mr. Speaker, in recounting some of the falsehoods and improprieties discovered, except it shall be done through a mistake of my judgment. Besides, I am disposed, always, to lean to the side of charity; and therefore I charge all the falsehoods and usurpations in question, to the account of gross ignorance on the part of the gentlemen of the Committee, however, which as I said in the outset of my remarks, is more disgraceful in them, than any which they have charged upon the petitioners *could* be in the latter.

Now, Sir, it is because of the false statements made in the report concerning the proceedings and transactions of the duty devolved on them by the order under which they acted, by going beyond it, and treating on matters not within their competency to treat under that order; it is because of this, Sir, that I feel bound to protest against the acceptance of this report by the House.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I must advert to an argument (or what was probably designed as such) of this Committee. I allude to the attempt to show, that it is no more black or red, or mixed blood, that the Dorchester, does not make any distinction among our citizens on account of a difference in color. The report, at p. 8, says:

'The Committee are unable to perceive, that any law of Massachusetts operates rightly and fairly be considered as making distinctions among its inhabitants. The statute forbidding the white from uniting in marriage with the black, or red, or mixed race, forbids the colored from joining in nuptial rights with the white. * * * Where each race is treated alike, the supposed distinction, resting on no real difference, is too shadowy to be grasped by reason.'

This is the argument, of the thing intended as such by the Committee. Let us see what it is. It asserts, that because the law restrains the white person from marrying one of a black, red, or mixed complexion, while it also forbids the latter to marry the former, it therefore makes no distinction on account of a difference in color. Sir, the argument is as follows: Here is a premiss, which is admitted, I have either too little or too much 'causality' to perceive. Here is a married couple, whose complexions are alike. Yonder is a married couple, whose complexions differ. The latter, by this law, are stigmatized as living in a state of concubinage, and robbed of the common right of transmitting property to their own offspring; while the former, by the same law, are regarded as living in 'the state of holy matrimony.' Now, Sir, is there no 'distinction' made in the law between these two married couples? Can you conceive of a broader 'distinction'? And whence does it arise? Whence, but from 'a difference of color' in the first mentioned couple? But the petitioners, Mr. Speaker, are not altogether such fools, as this argument of the Committee supposes them to be. They needed not the aid of the gentleman from Braintree, to enable them to understand, that, if a colored person could not marry a white one, neither could a white person marry a colored one. And however important this information may be deemed by the Committee, and how much soever its discovery may have elated them, I almost question if the House, after all, will feel under any very extraordinary obligations to them for having communicated it to us.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I began, with protesting against the adoption of this report by the House. Were it obnoxious to only a moiety of the objections which I have urged against it—and those I have mentioned do not, perhaps, constitute a tithe of the number I have in mind—that moiety would still be enough, and more than enough to warrant the House in rejecting it. If the report be adopted, then it will go forth to the people, with all its errors, its misrepresentations, its falsehoods, sanctioned by the Legislature. But I am sure this Legislature, not to speak of the people, will not wish regard for truth and the right, to give the powerful influence of its sanction to this report; and I therefore confidently trust, that the report will not be adopted.

When Mr. Bradburn had finished,

Mr. Thayer, of Braintree, rose, in great warmth, to reply. Of his remarks, we shall attempt to give only the substance. Soon after taking the floor, he proposed an adjournment, giving as a reason for so doing, that he feared to be detained there after dark, in company with 'that man' (meaning Mr. B.) 'for he was so much in the habit of using a club in argument.' Mr. B.'s gentleman's reference to my visit to Marlboro' Chapel.

With regard to the gentleman's assertion, that he could find but six names on the petition, which legitimately belonged there, which were put there by the persons whose names they bore, or perhaps, with the object of the petition, it will be sufficient to say, that the contrary may be seen by a reference to the statement of facts drawn up by the gentleman himself, and appended to his report. The assertion is false. And if any argument be needed to demonstrate the object, whose fault was it but their own? The petition was before their eyes, and bore on its head and front, and within the narrow space of some two or three lines, an explicit, an unambiguous expression of its object. Yet, nevertheless, they chose to sign it, without knowing what they signed, is, to say the least, paying a sorry compliment to the circumspection of those women. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that the tremendous excitement, which the gentleman from Braintree has caused to be poured out on the floods of scurrility and blackguardism, which have been poured, without mercy, on the heads of those women, have been a means of inducing not a few of them to refrain from signing the petition, lest, owing to the public their connection with this matter. We all know, how sensitiveness of woman to public censure, especially when that censure comes in the form of ridicule and contempt, and is uttered in the dialect of Billingsgate. This sensitiveness, however, is rather a feeling most honorable to the female character, though, perhaps, which, if it chance to get, as it sometimes will, the ascendancy over the other powers of the mind, exposes them to great seeming disadvantages. Why, Sir, it would almost require the combined virtues of the angels themselves, to stand up unawed, and undismayed, before the ferocious attacks, and the contumelious treatment, with which the women of Dorchester have been assailed. And I cannot but think, that, if the object of their petition had been clearly and popular, instead of incurring public odium, had elicited every where songs of approval, instead of harsh notes of contumely and abuse, this whole affair of the Dorchester petition would wear an aspect very different from the one it now presents, and my friend from Braintree, and his chivalrous coadjutors in this valorous onset, would have been spared the necessity of the extraordinary efforts they have made, and been saved the mortification inevitably which these efforts have indubitably acquired for them.

Mr. Speaker, I beg the House to remember, that the author of the report has answered none of the objections urged by me, when I was up before, against their above mentioned report. Every word of my speech has been so much as noticed by that gentleman. They cannot be answered. The gentleman knows it. He has, therefore, most wisely confined his remarks to points on which there is no difference of opinion between us. But whether it was wise in him to occupy the time of the House in discussing such points, is a question which I leave for the determination of others. If the facts developed by the investigations of the before the Committee, on which I have undertaken to raise no doubt but about which the gentleman has chosen to talk, rather than attempt to reply to my objections, could be separated from the report (for those facts are all embodied in an appendix attached to the report,) I certainly should not object to giving the largest possible publicity under sanction of the Grand Court; for though I might perhaps anticipate little good, yet I see no reason for supposing any harm, would come of it. But this cannot now be done. We cannot now 'separate the tares from the wheat.' Will the Legislature of Massachusetts, then, consent to let a document, fraught with so gross misrepresentations and other egregious errors, go out to the people under the sanction of their high authority, and under the pretence of enlightening the public mind? I cannot. I will not believe it. I know the deep hostility of those who are opposed to the honest people of this Commonwealth.

Mr. Buckingham, of Cambridge, had never before, in all his legislative experience, seen a Committee of the Legislature treated with so much severity, not a report of such a committee attacked with so much virulence and ferocity. And for his part, he should be extremely sorry to have a report adopted by this House, against which there was so strong a feeling on the part of any members of the House. In consequence, he should vote sometimes adopted to get rid of troublesome matters, which he would like to see adopted in relation to this report. He alluded to the Congressional practice of killing a thing by laying it on the table, with the understanding that it should remain there. He hoped this course would be taken with the report; that the House would lay it on the table, and permit it to die as easily as it might. He moved, that the report be laid on the table.

Mr. Thayer, of Braintree, in a furious effervescence of passion, said he hoped the House would *not* lay the report on the table; and if they did, he should insist on having it called up again. He wished it acted on, and the Committee to be discharged. (The Speaker said, the Committee had made a full report on any subject entrusted to them, they had, in the opinion of the Chair, discharged themselves.)

WEDNESDAY, April 10.

Mr. Buckingham, of Cambridge, moved by request, that the House take from the table, the second colored report, touching the Dorchester petition. He made the motion to gratify his friend from Braintree, but he should vote against it himself.

Mr. Thayer, of Braintree, was very desirous the report should be taken up. He wanted it acted on. He wished to introduce an order asking the discharge of the Committee.

Mr. Bradbury, of Nantucket, said the report was laid on the table, with a perfect understanding on the part of the House, that it should remain and die there. As to discharging the Committee, the Speaker had decided that they had already discharged themselves. He, however, had hoped, the gentleman would, by now being taken up, though he thought the gentleman from Braintree had already compelled the House to consume quite enough of their time on this subject. But in truth, personally he would like well enough to hear the gentleman talk about it, if he would but reply to the objections which had been urged against the report; for, on the subject of those objections, he did not, the other night, say one word, except that he were, in his opinion, unworthy of notice. But Mr. B. did not suppose the gentleman from Braintree's report would be taken from the table, and the gentleman from Braintree, or any other member, should address the House on the subject, he should insist on being allowed to speak at least one hour, for he had, since coming into the House, been very severely worked on, and, as he thought, important ideas in relation to it, which he should feel called on to communicate to the House.

Mr. Buckingham, of Cambridge, said, if the gentleman attempted any discussion of the subject, he should withdraw his motion. The gentleman from Nantucket, I was told, gave me the other day, when I was out, one of the severest castigations ever inflicted upon man. I was informed of it by a good friend on entering the House. I should, therefore, if I stay, I quietly took my seat, and the only arrogance I attempted to return for his unmerciful attack was to feel as cheap as I could for half an hour. I hope both of the gentlemen will imitate, in some degree, my patience and forbearance.

Mr. Thayer, of Braintree, did not wish to discuss the subject. But he thought the House would do wrong to refuse to act on the report. He had no wish to injure the feelings of the gentleman from Nantucket. He had no wish to wound the feelings of that gentleman's heart, than he had of some out of the House. He was willing to alter the report, so as to remove his (Mr. B's) objection to it, since his objection related only to the view taken in it of the origin of the present law. He, Mr. Thayer, therefore, was willing to accommodate, wished to say so much on this subject, he would move, that the use of the Hall be granted them, for two weeks, after the adjournment of the Legislature, that they might be able to discuss the matter to their satisfaction, giving all who wished it a chance to remain and hear.

Mr. Shaw, of Bridgewater, thought the gentleman from Nantucket, had mistaken the intent of the law on this subject in the early history of our country. He thought the fathers had not been so Christian, in the same sense, in which, in the present law, the word white is employed.

Mr. Bradbury, of Nantucket, rose to reply, but having spoken twice on the question, was told by the Speaker, that he could not speak again.

Mr. Russell, of West-Cambridge, hoped the House would allow the gentleman from Nantucket to speak again, for he understood him to say, that he could point out five falsehoods in some half dozen lines of the report. (The House having voted to let him speak again,)

Mr. Bradbury, of Nantucket, was grateful to the House for their indulgence, and would occupy their time only for a moment, for he did not feel at liberty to occupy more time. He had not intended to be so long in his reply. To the question given into a discussion by him to make a speech. He said the member from Braintree had mistaken the matter altogether, in supposing the alteration he proposed making of the report, would remove his objections to it. He had no such objections to make. The report must be fully aware; objections, which could not be removed without cutting the report all to pieces, and destroying its whole centerture. He had no unkind feelings towards the gentleman from Braintree. He trusted he had spoken the truth in regard to his speech, though he might be thought by some to have regarded rather too rigidly, in his employment of words, a certain apostolic injunction, 'Rebuke them sharply.' And he was resolved not to be provoked into the indulgence of any improper feelings. He desired to cherish towards all those sentiments of kindness and good will, which in the respect could alone give him peace in the hour of death.

One word with regard to the opinion given by the gentleman from Braintree. The point, as it seems to me, is a very clear one. I see no reason for supposing our ancestors used the term 'Christian' as the synonyme of 'white.' The gentleman has given us his opinion only. But if this were a question to be settled by authority, I could not pretend to produce a weight of authority which the House would pronounce to be quite equal to that even of the member from Bridgewater; and there are few gentlemen here, for whose authority I should estimate higher than that gentleman's. But I should abuse the indulgence of the House, were I to pursue this discussion. I will only repeat, what I stated the other night, that Judge Dane says expressly, that the provincial legislature followed, in this matter, the Levitical law; which, we all know, was founded in religious considerations, and intended to prevent those of the Jewish faith from intermarrying with the Heathen.

The House refused, by a very large vote, to lay the report from the table. It received in its place, the report in inquiry, it was therefore, being it should die an ignominious death.

COMMUNICATIONS.

TO J. G. BIRNEY AND H. B. STANTON

Dear Brethren:

I understood you to say at the recent convention in Boston, that the Society you represent, would not *only* become members of the American A. S. Society, unless you believed it a religious or moral society, and that if you were members of our society, you would come to the conclusion that you must sustain the grossest possible sanction of the Gospel. Your choice, you should deem it your duty to leave the Society. From your remarks at that time, I understood Mr. Stanton's remarks at the anniversary in Hartford, to have dwelt on this point, that the Society, in your view, was not a religious society, and that, if I understood you aright, you intimated that all who have the right, must vote, if they would consistently continue in that Society; and that, in a different view, this kind of political action, far from, on that voting at the polls, was not essential part of the abolition of the A. A. S. Society, of course no *other persons* and no *local societies* can, in connexion with it unless they embrace this principle.

If I have misunderstood any of what you advanced, you will plain that what I said in reply, tended to make a wrong impression as to your course in relation to the duty of voting; and to put you in a position where you could, for yourselves assume. I meant to say, at least, that I had so understood you. Do you deny that, if you meant to be understood. Out of you says, (Birney) in the very commencement of your letter, which you complain of my construction— 'if one who has conscientious scruples led him wholly to repudiate the use of the elective franchise, were to organize an association for the purpose of abolitionizing the society—*I should be bound tell him that he had not the qualifications* for the institution and *therefore ought not to subscribe*.' Is not this but saying, that voting at the polls is an essential part of Abolitionism, as defined by the American Society? That no man can consistently join that society who repudiates the use of the elective franchise? That no society can consistently become its auxiliary? That it urges, as an essential part of Abolition, the duty of voting at the polls?

I never understood the Constitution. I never heard this explanation given to it till since the formation of the N. E. Non-Resistance Society. I have learned till since that time, that Samuel J. Key, Isaac Winslow, Wm. Bassett, Wm. Adams, the Reform Presbyterians, the Mennonists, and Wm. Lloyd Garrison could not consistently belong to the American A. S. Society, because of their conscientious scruples against *sustaining* our blood-cemented civil fabric by voting at the polls. For myself, ever since I have been long acquainted with its penal code, its military institutions, its support of its slave trade, foreign and domestic, its treatment of the slaves and Indians, its utter and total contempt of God and humanity, I have certainly that the government of the United States is hopeless as *now organized and administered*, than it ever, consequently, was, since its commencement, in PIRACY and MURDER, and in my view, it will, as consistent with the holy religion of Jesus Christ, as Christian's only rule of action, and with true allegiance to the King of Kings, to vote for a system of independency and neutrality, as to serve as a basis for a government of the United States. Its foundation was laid in blood. Its walls were built up with the hearts and skeletons, and cemented together with the blood of the slaves, and the blood of the Indian nations. But whether this is a *Divine Institution*, or whether it is our religious duty to sustain it at the polls, I do not mean now to discuss.

Dear Brethren, for what you have done for our suffering brothers in bonds, I thank you from my heart. The intention is to do more than you ever have done, I hope not. We may all mistake as to the best means of carrying out from the world the *principle* of slavery. I have understood the sole object of our organization is to destroy a *principle* and a system. We are to fight against *sin*, but against a principle and a system. We do battle not *for* men, but for a principle and a system. Men are nothing here, principles every thing. Individuals, though ourselves or dearest friends, are in the way of the principles of immutable right and eternal justice, crush us unless we get out of the way. Though the Mass. A. S. Society, the Am. A. S. Society and every other Society—though every Church in the land, though our state and national governments be found in the way of those heavenly principles, they that are embodied in the Anti-Slavery organization, them all be dashed to pieces and scattered to the winds.

I know that I am liable to err in explaining this very document. I know that I may, in the Declaration of Sentiments contained the sentiments of the American A. S. Society. But the Society voted otherwise. I know honestly believed that it was my part to adopt language that the skives, (and of course none else) had in moral right to obtain freedom. I know it was my duty, that the American A. S. Society has refused to sanction any such doctrine, and has, virtually, if not directly, sanctioned the doctrine that they have the right, if they had the power. I have not voted for its power. I voted the Anti-Slavery Society, never dreaming but it would do as our society, though I do not vote at the polls.

I knew not that any one ever dreamed of making it a test of membership—i. e. *sustaining this principle by voting at the polls*—till within a few months. Never did I surmise that any one would make principles subordinate to the fundamental principles of Abolition. Contrariwise, I suppose that they struck a death blow at all oppression, injustice, robbery, cruelty, cruelty and murder, the world over.

But no matter what I dreamed, supposed or surmised. Let the truth be brought out, and let it shine out in its way. You take the ground, as I understand you, that *voting at the polls* is an essential part of Abolitionism as defined by the Constitution of the American A. S. Society. I have never heard the subject formally discussed. I have heard the duty of voting was so demanded in the Anti-Slavery Society. I have heard it as I am told, when the Society was formed. I have unwise to urge *voting* as a duty and a part of Abolitionism till it has been discussed. Will you make this influence to have it discussed at the next anniversary? Then, if it can be shown that the Constitution does not make this an essential part of Abolition, and that it is a *wrong* principle, let us alter the Constitution; if it can be shown that *voting ought to be an essential part* of Abolition, let it stand, let us alter the constitution.

Yours for truth and humanity,

H. C. WRIGHT.

BOSTON FEMALE A. S. SOCIETY.

At the Quarterly Meeting of the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society, held on Wednesday, April 9th, the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, That we pledge to the American Anti-Slavery Society, (for the coming year,) $1,000, to the Sunday School Society, $100, and to the Massachusetts Asylum for Indigent Colored Children, $50.

The meeting was unusually large, and the above resolution, after eliciting much discussion, was passed by a large majority.

A vote was likewise passed, that this society appoint four Delegates to attend the Convention of American Women, to be held at Philadelphia in May.

It is hoped that all other Anti-Slavery Societies in this State will be prompt in sending Delegates to represent them at that meeting.

L. L. DOLLIVER,
Recording Secretary.

SECTARIAN LIBERALITY—THE NEW DOCTRINE IN PRACTICE.

Hanover, April 10th, 1839.

Bro. Garrison:

I have lately witnessed one of the most precious specimens of bigotry, superstition, and sectarian intolerance, which has ever fallen under my personal observation. I went to East Bridgewater on the 6th inst. with the intention of making arrangements to lecture in the Orthodox meeting-house in that place. I called on the Rev. Mr. Sanford, the pastor, at the suggestion of a member of his church, stated to him that I was an agent of the Mass. Anti-Slavery Society, and that I wished to lecture on the subject of slavery in his church. He wanted to know if I had any credentials. I told him I had none except my certificate of agency, as I had not conceived that any other would be necessary. 'Why, the truth is,' said he, 'there are men about lecturing on this subject, whom I should not wish to admit into my pulpit.' No man who entertains Mr. Garrison's views of the Sabbath, shall ever go into my pulpit with my consent.' He said he considered Mr. Garrison to be a practical infidel, and believed that he was more opposed to the Christian religion than he was to slavery. I remarked, that I believed Mr. Garrison's views of the Sabbath were the same as those held by the Quakers, and asked him if he would class them with infidels. This evidently threw him into a sad dilemma, for which he did not appear to be by any means prepared. He could not, or would not, answer this question in the affirmative, but endeavored to show that there was a radical distinction between them, inasmuch as the Quakers went to meeting on the Sabbath, while, as he averred, Mr. Garrison did not! How much validity there is in this distinction, allowing it to be true, I leave for others to decide.

I told him that whatever might be my own or Mr. Garrison's peculiar views upon religion, I could not perceive any necessary connection between them and a lecture upon slavery, as I did not attempt to support them at such a time. We had, heretofore, I remarked, claimed to be a body composed of every sect and party in religion and politics, united together for the redemption of the slave; and that in our associated capacity, all sectarian or party differences of opinion were to be so far laid aside, as to enable us to labor together in harmony and love.

I asked him if he would admit a Unitarian into his pulpit, to lecture on the subject of slavery or temperance? He said he could not consistently. The meeting-house had been dedicated to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and it would not, as he expressed it, be consistent to allow a person to go into the pulpit who did not believe in the Trinity.

He said it was a pity such men as Garrison and some others were in the anti-slavery ranks—they were a great injury to the cause of the slave. It was very much to be regretted that such a noble cause should be injured by the agency of such men! He gave me to understand, that he had no particular objection to my lecturing in his pulpit, provided I entertained the right religious sentiments, and would obtain the consent of the parish Committee; though he said the people had already had the whole subject spread out before them, and he did not suppose there could be any thing new advanced. (I wonder if there is no such thing as stirring up men's minds by way of remembrance.) I told him if religious belief was to be made a *sine qua non* of the matter, I did not wish to lecture in his pulpit by any means.

If Mr. Sanford was an avowed opponent of the anti-slavery cause, I should not be so much surprised at the ground he has taken; but he is not only a professed abolitionist, but, if I have been correctly informed, he is President of the East Bridgewater Anti-Slavery Society. This it is, which makes his course doubly mean and despicable, and which should call forth still stronger condemnation from every real friend of the slave. I trust, that not only the abolitionists of East Bridgewater, but his church and society also, will protest against this bigoted and exclusive course, as not only a palpable violation of the true spirit of freedom, but directly at variance with the plainest principles of the gospel. I should have called on some of the abolitionists in that place, and stated the circumstances of the case, had opportunity offered. But it was nearly night when I was there, and I was obliged to go to Abington. So I concluded to write you an account of the matter, not only to give you still further evidence of the spirit which is abroad in our midst, but in the hope that it might fall under the notice of the East Bridgewater abolitionists, and induce them to take some action upon it—either to condemn strongly and unequivocally the course of their President, or let the public know that they entertain the same views.

But, after all, this is but carrying out the doctrine of Messrs. Birney, Stanton, Phelps, &c. 'that every man is bound to go to the polls, or leave the anti-slavery society.' It seems clear to me, that if it is right as abolitionists to declare, that every man is morally bound to go to the polls, it is equally so to pronounce it his duty to avow a particular religious belief. Orange Scott says 'he is morally bound to use *all* means sanctioned by *law*, religion, and humanity for the destruction of slavery; and if *he* is morally bound every body else is.' Mr. Sanford takes up the sentiment, and declares that he is morally bound to believe in the Orthodox creed; and the same obligation is resting upon every one; ergo, no man can be a true abolitionist, who does not entertain my sentiments upon religion and politics! Here is the whole question in a nutshell. I leave those who avow this doctrine to digest it at their leisure.

Yours for the truth,
NATHANIEL H. WHITING.

W. E. CHANNING—LYNCH LAW.

The following article was written for the Non-Resistant, by one of its editing Committee; but not having been prepared in time for the next number of that paper, we have obtained the writer's permission to insert it in the Liberator. The quotation from Dr. Channing embodies the cardinal principle of Lynch law, in terms as explicit as those used by Amos Kendall and Judge Lawless! J.

—

A Letter on the Slavery Question has recently appeared, from the pen of Wm. Ellery Channing. It contains, among much excellent matter, and some of a more questionable nature, very just and severe strictures upon that wanton act of popular tyranny, the destruction of Pennsylvania Hall. While we would most cordially concur in most of the opinions and feelings expressed by the author on that topic, we cannot refrain from giving utterance to the grief and astonishment with which we read the following most extraordinary propositions.

'*Undoubtedly** there may be crimes, so unnatural, so terrible to a community, that a people may be forgiven, if, *deeming the usual forms of justice too slow*, they assume the perilous office *of inflicting speedy punishment*.' p. 75.

'There is, indeed, as I have intimated, one case where *popular commotion does, comparatively, little harm*, I mean that which is excited by some daring crime, which the laws sternly forbid, and which sends an electric thrill of horror through a virtuous community. In such a case, *the public without law, do the work of law*, and *enforce those natural, eternal principles of right*, on which all legislation should rest.' p. 80.

The doctrine thus authoritatively laid down as unquestionable, we conceive not merely to involve the principle of Lynch law, but to be the very Lynch law itself. We apprehend that the necessity and propriety of an appeal to such an ultimate law, has never been affirmed in stronger terms by any of its advocates or apologists at the North or at the South. The principles here advanced are broad enough to cover every act of popular violence which has disgraced our country and our kind from the burning of Hutchinson's house, in 1765, and the destruction of the Tea in Boston harbor, in 1773, down to the hanging of the Vicksburg gamblers, and the burning of the Charlestown Convent and of the Pennsylvania Hall. Let us apply them to this last outrage. 'What crimes,' say the mob, 'so unnatural, so terrible to a community,' so deserving of speedy punishment, as attacks upon the integrity of our glorious Union, attempts to subvert the Constitution of our country, and plots to deluge the Southern country with the blood of our brethren. If, where processes of justice are provided for the punishment of crimes, it is still justifiable for us to assume the perilous office of determining the guilt of offenders, and inflicting speedy punishment upon them, whenever we deem the forms of justice too slow—of course we are deserving of praise when we visit vengeance upon crimes which are not to be reached by any process of law.' 'But, I deny,' replies our author, 'that the cause that moved you to this act, was any crime at all, or had any tendency to produce any of these effects.' 'Perhaps so,' the mob would well respond; 'but of that you are not the judge. You lay down the general law, and we apply it to the particular cases. We, the people, who are the sole executioners, are, also, the only judges of the emergencies which call for these summary acts of justice.' And thus might every outbreak of popular fury be justified by principles sanctioned by a celebrated name. We hope that Dr. Channing will either recall these disorganizing propositions, or so explain them as to counteract their mischievous tendency. As they now stand, we maintain that the construction we have put upon them is the one they legitimately bear.

We admire the genius of William E. Channing, we love his far-reaching humanity, we honor his catholic spirit and his love of all truth; but we cannot conceal from ourselves, that in his attempts to reconcile the laws of the Kingdom of God, with the maxims and practices of the kingdom of this world, he is often betrayed into lamentable inconsistencies. This is nowhere more plainly the case than in the passage relating to the Pennsylvania Hall, from which the above quoted paragraphs are taken. We could enlarge at much greater length upon this topic, but are compelled to dismiss it with a single remark.

We know that our respected friend, of whose opinions we have briefly spoken with all freedom, but in all love, is not one of those who are afraid of truth, and that he never forbodes fatal results from its free discussion; but we can assure all those who see in the spread of the doctrines of non-resistance nothing but anarchy, licentiousness and bloodshed, that the men who assume and act upon the principles we have just reprobated, will bring down these fatal consequences on the heads of mankind much more speedily and certainly, than they who deem that there is *no* 'crime so unnatural, so terrible,' that it may not be left for punishment to the forms, whether slow or speedy, of the Divine Justice; who believe that there is but One Being in the Universe who has the right 'of doing the work of law and of enforcing the natural, eternal principles of right, in the punishment of offenders; and who hold that there is no crime, however 'daring,' though it may 'send an electric thrill through a virtuous community,' which should be met by a community of sinners in any spirit but that of perfect forgiveness and love, or repaid or chastised, except by benefits and blessings bestowed upon the erring brother.

E. Q.

* The Italics are our own.

MANSFIELD AND FOXBORO' JUVENILE SOCIETY.

Dear Sir:

In behalf of the Mansfield and Foxboro' Juvenile Society, which meets at my house to labor for the cause of the oppressed, I would inform you of our last meeting, and our encouragement to persevere. A large number of us have agreed, by signing our names, to meet once in three months, and labor half a day for the cause of the oppressed. The members are at liberty to invite as many as they please. We are happy to meet any, but we press none. We have no officers, no laws, no fines for the absent. They confide in me that I will dispose of their labor to the best of my ability. We do not wish to be ostentatious or proud of what we have done; but, considering the age of these children, some praise is due; and could the slaveholders take a peep into our little room and see these children all actively engaged, (some of but five years of age,) they would have reason to fear that ere long these young Davids and Jaels will sever the heart of the monster Slavery. Our last meeting was March 12. Our number was sixteen, nine girls and seven boys; none are fourteen—the largest number between ten and five. Some of the members were absent, engaged in school. They braided one hundred and five yards of straw. A lady eighty years of age, much engaged in the cause, took the braid home and prepared it for sewing into bonnets. It has amounted, free from all expense, to two dollars and thirty-seven cents. And now we would invite all those wealthy aristocrats that love slavery and who prepare an impious feast for their Clays and their Websters, to step into our humble dwelling and see these industrious children seated at their simple repast of their own providing, and learn a lesson and help us to undo these heavy burdens that are grievous to be borne. Already has the cry of the oppressed reached up to heaven. 'The hire of the laborer that has reaped down your fields, crieth, that is by you kept back by fraud, and their cries have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth.'

Thus far we have gone in peace and harmony, and no root of bitterness has as yet sprung up to trouble us; and what is still more pleasant, we have the approving smile of the parents. We love to see our children happy. We are always interested in their concerns. They anticipate their meetings with great joy, and will, no doubt, in after years, when fond memory lingers on the scenes of childhood, esteem those days as some of the happiest of their lives, when they met their young friends to braid 'colored straw,' for the benefit of the slave.

Yours for the slave,
EXPERIENCE BILLINGS.

Foxboro', March 28, 1839.

NEWTON UPPER FALLS.

Br. Garrison:

On Fast-day evening, br. Thompson of Lynn gave a powerful and efficient Lecture in favor of 'immediate and unconditional emancipation,' at Newton Upper Falls. He took occasion, after speaking of the 'inalienable rights of men,' (whatever may be their complexion,) to answer the popular objections which are raised against giving liberty to the captive, by every pro-slavery and grog-shop politician in the country. His arguments were clear, rational and convincing. He showed that their objections to anti-slavery measures, were either founded in ignorance and prejudice, or in a base recklessness to the principles of eternal truth and justice.

His illustrations were remarkably happy; his appeals to the friends of the slave, relative to our duty, as citizens of a boasted free government, as men, feeling for the wrongs and sufferings of our race,—and as Christians recognizing the common parentage and common brotherhood of man, were forcible and heart-stirring.

The lecture has given a new impetus to the cause in this place. It has aroused the slumbering, confirmed the doubting, and has renewed those of us, who have been long established, in the spirit of our minds. A new 'Female Society' was formed, and a Circulating Library obtained. Aided by this, the friends of emancipation will be able to do much the present year, to make the subject understood more thoroughly among themselves; and I hope, much to make the opposing party not only willing to have slavery abolished, but also disposed to throw the weight of their influence, and the force of their example into the scale of universal liberty.

Earnestly praying that by the omnipotent power of truth and justice, we may speedily see all systems of oppression overthrown, sin finished, and an everlasting righteousness brought in, I subscribe myself,

Yours for the slave and gospel peace,
JOHN ALLEN.

Watertown, April 1, 1839.

Barbarous Law. By a law now in force in a portion of the District of Columbia, a slave convicted of setting fire to a building, is liable to have his hand cut off, his body divided into quarters, and the parts set up in the most public places! Such a law would disgrace a horde of savages, but it is in perfect keeping with the principles of the American slave code. Members of Congress, being *white*, can carry dirks and Bowie knives, and commit all sorts of crimes with impunity; but the poor unlettered slave, who fires a building, no matter what may be the provocation, is butchered alive! So much for the beauties of legislation in this free government. J.

BOSTON.

FRIDAY, APRIL 19, 1839.

☞ Mr. Garrison will lecture on slavery at Worcester, on Sunday evening next, at Townsend on Monday evening, at Acton on Wednesday evening, at Salem on Friday evening, and at Haverhill on the following Sunday evening.

'WHO IS AN ABOLITIONIST?'

Our readers will recollect, that in the Liberator of the 28th ult., an article was published under this head, from the pen of H. C. Wright, containing certain inquiries relating to the Executive Committee of the American A. S. Society, and suggested by the extraordinary course of Messrs. Birney and Stanton at the late quarterly meeting of the State Society. That article has called forth from the editor of the Emancipator the following reply, which, perhaps, in justice to the Executive Committee, we cannot do otherwise than publish. Were it not for a single sentence, which we regard as of 'doubtful interpretation,' we should infer from the general scope and spirit of the article, that the despotic ground assumed by certain individuals in this quarter in relation to political action, whereby they seem determined to brand as recreant abolitionists all those who, from conscientious scruples, refrain from voting at the polls—thus turning the anti-slavery organization into an engine of tyranny, and lording it over the consciences of their brethren—*if it is* not entirely abandoned, will at least find no favor with the Executive Committee of the Parent Society. We hope the sentence to which we allude was intended to bear a construction not inconsistent with this inference; and if so, we have only to say, that while we could wish that the Emancipator had spoken at an earlier period, and while the issue of the struggle in Massachusetts was less doubtful than it now is, we are nevertheless glad that it has spoken. It is some consolation to have the club of Hercules placed at our disposal, even after the shock of the first onset has revealed the potency of other weapons and the weakness of the foe. We append a few notes to the article. J.

We have copied the above letter, the signature denoting the Rev. Henry C. Wright as its author, not to complain that unauthorized and groundless allegations, with regard to the views of the Executive Committee, are put forth on mere surmise or rumor;(1) nor to ask what advantage is expected to the anti-slavery cause by thus publicly impeaching the integrity and good faith of those whom the Am. A. S. Society has put forth to the slaveholders of the land as its representatives for the time being.(2) The writer of these remarks is a member of that committee, and *that* consideration belongs more properly to others. We merely wish to rectify a few errors with regard to the state of the case and the prerogatives and responsibilities of the committee.

The right of membership in the American Anti-Slavery Society is settled by the Constitution of the same, and no person who comes within the terms laid down by that instrument can be liable to have his membership justly called in question, however he may differ from the officers or committee, or from any portion or even a majority of the members of the society, on points not settled by the constitution. Hence I opposed, at the last annual meeting, the adoption of a vote virtually censuring the martyred Lovejoy for arming himself in defence of his rights; because as the constitution has not precluded the members of the society from self-defence, he had done nothing inconsistent with his constitutional obligations as a member, and therefore had a right to be uncensured by the society for taking up arms as he did.

The 'Executive Committee at New York,' have never 'taken the position' here ascribed to them—'that no person can consistently become a member of the American Society, unless he considers it a religious duty to vote at the polls; nor have they sought or wished to 'exclude from that society, and from the ranks of abolitionists, all' or any 'persons who have conscientious scruples about going to the polls.' Nor does that Committee intend to exscind all its auxiliaries which will not, as societies, adopt the principle that voting at the polls is a religious duty.' We speak confidently on this point, and beg our brethren to set their hearts at rest; for, although the subject has not been discussed by the committee at all, yet we know their general and fixed determination to abide by the constitution of the society, and the constitution has not invested them with any judicial, censorial or disciplinary power, to determine who may or may not be members, or to exclude or exscind those members or auxiliaries whose conscientious views of duty may not square precisely with their own. Those, therefore, who either wish or fear that the committee will assume any such prerogative, will be disappointed.

In determining the right of membership, the constitution declares that 'ANY PERSON *who consents to the principles* of this Constitution, *who contributes to the funds* of this Society, and is *not a slaveholder*, may be a member, and shall be entitled to vote at the meetings.' Now if any body can find such a 'principle' in the constitution, as that 'it is a religious duty to vote at the polls,' then no person who does not 'consent' to that can be constitutionally a member. On that question, each individual must judge of himself, and will have just as much authority to determine the rights or duties of others, as the Executive Committee. The writer of this is free to declare, that after diligent and repeated examination, he is unable to find any such principle laid down in the constitution, as that 'it is the religious duty of every person to whom the State grants the privilege, to vote at the polls,' or any thing equivalent to it. 'I speak only for myself, of course;' but it is proper to state, that Messrs. Birney and Stanton deny having taken the position alleged by Mr. Wright.

The constitution, however, plainly recognises 'our national existence,' our republican form of government, and our obligation 'to do all that is *lawfully* in our power to bring about the extinction of slavery,' and binds the Society to 'endeavor, in a constitutional way, to influence Congress to put an end to the domestic slave trade, and to abolish slavery in all those portions of our country which come under its control, especially in the District of Columbia, and likewise to prevent the extension of it to any state that may be hereafter admitted to the Union.' These are among the 'principles of the Constitution' to which every person is required to 'consent' in order to be constitutionally a member of the society. The right(3) of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and to suppress the domestic slave trade by its arm of power, is as much incorporated with the fundamentals of our organization as the duty of immediate emancipation, and no person denying either can rightfully exercise the functions of membership.

With regard to the *measures* which the society is to employ for the accomplishment of its object, the abolition of slavery, the provisions of the constitution are necessarily quite general, and leave much to be determined, from time to time, according to circumstances, by the discretion of its members, officers and agents. The preamble to the constitution recognizes the obligation of its members, to 'do all that is *lawfully* in our power to bring about the extinction of slavery.' In Art. 2, the society is pledged to 'endeavor, in a *constitutional* way, to influence Congress,' &c. In Art. 6, the Executive Committee are enjoined to 'adopt the *most energetic measures in their power* to advance the objects of the Society.' And the Declaration of Sentiments, put forth by the framers of the constitution, which, though not binding as a part of that instrument, is yet of great weight as a contemporaneous exposition of the views with which the society was formed, declares, 'that there are, at the present time, the highest obligations resting upon the people of the Free States, to remove slavery by *moral and political* action, as prescribed by the Constitution of the United States.' It could not, of course, have been intended, that there is an obligation to use all possible means at once, that are lawful and constitutional, or all sorts of moral and political action at all times and under all circumstances alike and continually; but only that the employment of both these species of power, as well as of all other lawful and constitutional means, from time to time, as wisdom might determine, and circumstances might render expedient, was within the scope of the society's plans. Those, therefore, who put forth 'political action,' seasonably and wisely, as abolitionists, have not only a right by the constitution to be uncensured for it, but have a claim to be commended for it as carrying out the principles of the constitution in the very way that was originally contemplated.(4)

The terms 'lawful' and 'constitutional' and 'moral and political,' are to be understood in what was at that time their generally received sense. And it would seem to be a dictate of natural justice, that when a majority or other considerable portion of the members are intent upon a particular course of 'action' either 'moral' or 'political,' which was then generally understood to be 'lawful' and 'constitutional,' others should not, as abolitionists, weaken their hands by inveighing against the measures honestly pursued by their brethren. And conduct of this kind might be deemed inconsistent with the obligations of membership, in the same sense in which withholding of money or other effects is inconsistent; i. e. it is not doing 'ALL that is lawfully in our power,' to abolish slavery. H. C. W. asks, 'Can those who *believe it a sin* to sustain our blood-cemented federal government by engaging in the strife of politics, in political caucuses, and at the ballot-box, consistently be members of the American Anti-Slavery Society?' Plainly, no person can answer this question, authoritatively. The Ex. Com. have no such prerogative. The opinion of one is as good as that of another. 'Mine opinion'; is, that this is a point to be settled by the conscience of the individual, for himself.

It is a well known fact, that there have been, from the beginning, many members of the Society, who have conscientiously abstained from voting at the polls, some for one reason and some for another. The Covenanters, or Reformed Presbyterians, as a sect, wholly abstain from taking a part in elections or holding office, under our National Constitution, because it contains no recognition of the government of God. Many members of the Society of Friends keep aloof from the polls, because the Constitution countenances slavery. Others have different reasons. Many conscientious individuals have kept away through disgust at the ordinary methods of electioneering. Yet these persons voluntarily consented to the 'principles of the Constitution,' and became members of the Society, and no man could constitutionally challenge their right to membership. If there was any difficulty it lay in their minds, and if they saw it not, it was the same as if it did not exist. Contemporaneous and uniform usage has therefore settled the question, that those who conscientiously abstain from voting may be constitutionally members.

As a measure of present expediency, under the constitutional pledge to do 'all that is lawfully in our power to bring about the extinction of slavery,' it is a fair subject of inquiry, at any time and by any person. In what way can I *best* promote 'the extinction of slavery?' And if any one decides, that for himself, or for this time, he can best promote the object by not voting at all, or by voting in a particular way, he may decide wrong, and so may be neglecting to do that which it is his duty to do, and those who think so have a right to say so; but he cannot thereby forfeit his membership under the Constitution, because the duty of voting is a point which the Constitution has left undecided.

It should be always borne in mind, that there are other modes of 'political' action, besides voting, as there are other modes of 'moral action' besides church discipline. Petitioning Congress or the State Legislature, is political action. Abstaining from voting, for the purpose of thereby influencing the measures of government, is political action. Questioning candidates is also political action. So, refusing to unite with a church, because that church is supposed to countenance slavery, is moral action. A thousand questions may arise in the detail, concerning which it is competent for the Society to decide, so far as its organized action is concerned, but on which it has no power to bind the conscience or coerce the will of members acting in their individual capacity, and no right to preclude from membership those who refuse to go with the majority. In regard to all these matters, a just discrimination, a kind and confiding spirit, and a paramount devotion to the ONE OBJECT which unites us, will doubtless prevent all severe collisions. But any appearance of a desire for domination, an intolerant spirit, or a design to thrust in other objects, and make them ride on the anti-slavery car, will infallibly create resistance, jealousy and discord. (5)

—

NOTES.

(1) It was not 'on mere surmise or rumor,' but on the *acts* of the agents and representatives of the Committee in this State, that the 'allegations' alluded to were 'put forth.'

(2) Is it 'impeaching the integrity and good faith of the committee' to inquire before the public what they intend to do in a case of great importance—especially when such an inquiry is suggested to the minds of hundreds of *their constituents* by the conduct of their own agents? It is because the abolitionists of Massachusetts have assisted in placing that committee as the representatives of the National Society before 'the slaveholders of the land,' that they feel at perfect liberty to interrogate them in regard to their course in this trying emergency.

(3) We are not sure that we understand what is meant by the term '*right*' in this connection. If it refers only to the *constitutional* right, or power of Congress, very well; but if it is intended to include the *moral* right under the law of God, then we deny the position. The Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society neither affirms nor denies any thing on this subject, but leaves the opinions of its members, whatever they may be, undisturbed.

(4) True. There has been no attempt, either in Massachusetts or elsewhere, to 'censure' those who carry abolitionism to the polls. The difficulty here has resulted from the opposite source—the attempt to 'censure' and to brand as recreant to the anti-slavery cause, those who cannot, as individuals, participate in a particular kind of political action.

(5) Good! We trust that those who have been so 'intolerant' as to attempt to crowd non-resistants off the anti-slavery platform, and to make the cause subservient to their designs in respect to other 'objects,' will take the hint intended for them.

DELEGATES TO THE AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY.

The following persons have been delegated from the Mass. Anti-Slavery Society, to attend the 6th Anniversary of the American A. S. Society on the 7th of May next.

Boston.—William Lloyd Garrison, Amos A. Phelps, Ellis Gray Loring, Samuel E. Sewall, Joseph Southwick, Henry Chapman, Henry G. Chapman, Simon G. Shipley, Wendell Phillips, John T. Hilton, Thankful Southwick, Joseph H. Eayres, David H. Ela, Edmund Quincy, Maria W. Chapman, Charles Follen, Oliver Johnson, Joshua V. Himes, Amasa Walker, Mary Ann W. Johnson, Edmund Jackson.
New Bedford.—Andrew Robeson, Joseph Congdon.
Fall River.—Nathaniel B. Borden, Gilbert H. Durfee.
Worcester.—Cyrus P. Grosvenor, John M. Earle, Anna Colton.
Leicester.—William B. Earle.
Shrewsbury.—George Allen.
Uxbridge.—E. L. Capron.
Millbury.—Abby Kelly.
Mendon.—Adin Ballou.
Dorchester.—Oren P. Bacon.
Medway.—Sewall Harding.
Brookline.—Samuel Philbrick.
Newton.—William Jackson.
Watertown.—Stillman Lothrop.
Lowell.—Orange Scott.
Groton.—Amos Farnsworth.
Ashburnham.—George Goodyear.
Cambridge.—Dexter Fairbanks.
Springfield.—Samuel Osgood.
Deerfield.—Wm. Richards.
Greenfield.—John Parkman, George T. Davis.
Northampton.—David Lee Child, Lydia M. Child.
Lenox.—James W. Robbins.
Pittsfield.—James H. Dunham.
Curtisville.—Joseph Hurlbut.
Weymouth.—Appleton Howe.
South Scituate.—Samuel J. May.
Duxbury.—Seth Sprague.
Hingham.—Jairus Lincoln.
Abington.—Samuel Reed.
Taunton.—Elijah Bird.
Middleboro'.—Nathaniel Eddy.
Kingston.—George Russell.
Sandwich.—Charles Nye.
Falmouth.—Dr. Belcher.
Lynn.—Wm. Bassett, John W. Browne, Aroline A. Chase, Deborah S. Henshaw, Hannah Buffum.
Haverhill.—Ezekiel Hale, jr.
Amesbury.—Sylvanus Brown.
Salem.—Josiah Hayward, L. L. Dodge, Lydia Dodge.
Andover.—John A. Collins.
Saugus.—Benjamin F. Newhall.
Methuen.—Stephen Barker.
Newburyport.—William Ashley.
Belville.—Joseph Jackman.
Ipswich.—Josiah Caldwell.
Lynnfield.—John Danforth, jr.
Gloucester.—Ingalls Kittridge.
Georgetown.—John Burden.
Danvers.—Abner Sanger.
Bradford.—Gardner B. Perry.
Nantucket.—George Bradburn.

PUBLIC NON-RESISTANCE MEETING.

The Executive Committee of the N. E. Non-Resistance Society propose holding a public meeting on some day during the week of the New-England A. S. Convention. The particulars will be made known hereafter. We give this early notice that all the friends of the cause in all parts of the country may have time to make their arrangements for attending it. We can assure our friends that it will be well worth a journey from Pennsylvania and Ohio, if we may judge of it from the little extemporaneous meeting which we held during the session of the annual meeting of the Massachusetts A. S. Society, in January last. We are sure that it will be a day of refreshing to our souls, and that it will give a new impulse to our holy cause.

MARIA W. CHAPMAN, *Rec. Sec.*

Boston, April 15, 1839.

Bristol Co. A. S. Society. We learn verbally that this Society, at its quarterly meeting, held in New Bedford on Tuesday last, voted to sustain the State Board, and condemned the hasty and ill-advised resolutions of its own Executive Committee, published sometime since in the Liberator. We shall doubtless be furnished with the official proceedings next week.

☞ The communication of George Allen of Shrewsbury was not received in season for this paper. It shall appear next week. J.

SKETCH OF THE TWO LAST MEETINGS OF THE BOSTON FEMALE A. S. SOCIETY.

At the quarterly meeting in January, a resolution was introduced by Anne W. Weston, and seconded by Eliza Philbrick, M. W. Chapman, and others, that, wishing to extend the principles of abolition through the community, we will subscribe for 50 copies of the Liberator. It was opposed by Miss Gould, on the ground that the Liberator was not an anti-slavery paper, having been filled up during the last year with peace, and she saw not how any anti-slavery society could constitutionally support it. Miss Mary S. Parker and Miss Lucy Ball said that our funds were insufficient—that they did hope the Society would consider, before making this appropriation, how disagreeable it was to the officers of the society to be dunned. As a vote had been previously passed to raise $1200 by our annual Fair, this idea seemed incongruous, and the resolution to take the Liberator was adopted with only five dissenting voices.

The resolution respecting the Fair passed unanimously, as there was no idea entertained at the time but that the proceeds of it would be devoted principally to the advancement of the cause in Massachusetts; especially, as symptoms were then discernible, that the Mass. Society would, even more than ever, require to be sustained by those who have made the slave's cause their own. Had those in that meeting who have done so, imagined for a moment that there existed in the minds of any, an intention to divert the funds from their customary channel, they would not have joined in that vote.

The recent meeting was very large. One of the members present, whom we have seen at every meeting we ever attended, said, 'Ladies, I do not even know your faces, but trust that your hearts are true to this cause; if so, there is moral power enough here to stir the State and the nation.' A resolution was offered by Miss Ball, in behalf of the American Society. Maria W. Chapman moved the substitution of the Mass. Society. To both these resolutions was joined an appropriation of $100 to the Samaritan Asylum and $100 to the Infant School, so that whichever resolution should pass, the Infant School and the Asylum might be secured.

The resolution in favor of the American Society passed by the constitutional majority.

It has been evident ever since the attempt to break up the Massachusetts Society in 1837, known by the name of the 'Clerical Appeal,' that a very wide difference in opinion and feeling exists in the Boston Female A. S. Society, as to the merits and manner of conducting the Anti-Slavery cause. It is for the women of Massachusetts to decide, whether at this critical juncture, they will aid the Massachusetts Society, now struggling not only for the cause of Freedom, but for *existence*, or the American Society, now struggling not only for the cause of Freedom, but for its antagonist idea, domination.

A Member of the Boston F. A. S. Society.

Receipts into the Treasury of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Soc. from the 2d, to the 13th of April.

Francis Jackson, quar. sub.	$50 00
From ladies in Dorchester to constitute George Bradburn of Nantucket life member,	15 00
Shrewsbury A. S. Soc. by H. B. Stanton,	100 00
Collections in Franklin, by N. Southard, and to constitute T. D. Southworth of Franklin, life member,	47 52
Collections in West Medway by N. Southard,	74 38
Collections in Taunton by Wendell Phillips and J. A. Collins.—Caleb Bryant, 2 50; Abner Pitts, 50 cts.; James Woodward, 1 00; Henry Washburn, 1 00; Henry Sprout, 5 00; Wm. A. Read, 1 00; L. L. Hodges, 1 00; John Slade, 2 00; John Read, 1 00; Emery Forest, 1 00; E. Wilcox, 25 cts.; Jonathan Hodges, 3 00; R. Bullard, 2 00; J. R. Hixon, 2 00; R. W. Deane, 50 cts.; Seth Burt, 1 00; O. Allen, 2 00; Lucinda Wilmarth, 1 00; Daniel Brewer, of Taunton, life member, 15 00; Elijah Bird, 1 00; Jerusha Bird, 1 00; L. M. Perkins, 75 cts.; S. Woodward, 3 00; A. Townsend, 1 00; Chs. Babbit, 1 00; S. M. Titcomb, 1 00; Miss Read, 1 00.	42 80
Boylston A. S. Soc. by Waldo Winter, Tr.	11 85
Barnstable A. S. Soc. by Warren Hallet, Tr.	32 00
Franklin County A. S. Soc. by G. T. Davis, viz. Rev. John Parkman, of Greenfield,	5 00
Rev. Dr. Packard, by T. Packard, Jr.	1 00
Ladies of Shelburne, by do.	7 00
Joseph Stevens, Esq. of Warwick,	1 00
Rev. Dr. Willard, of Deerfield,	3 00
Quar. sub. in Leicester, by Wm. B. Earle,	13 00
William Ashby, of Salem, towards State pledge,	5 00
Sandwich A. S. Soc. by Thos. P. Ryder,	10 00
Ashburnham Female A. S. Soc. M. Caldwell, Tr.	9 11
A widow's mite,	2 00
Collections in Weymouth, after lecture of Wendell Phillips, by John Jones.—E. Tirrill, 50 cts.; 3 friends, 65 cts.; A friend, 25 cts.; N. Ford, 25 cts.; J. Humphrey, 2d, 1 00; Wm. Lovell, 35 cts.; James Holbrook, 25 cts.; E. W. Dean, 50 cts.; A friend, 25 cts.; J. C. Lewis, 25 cts.; A friend, 25 cts.; Nathan Bates, 2 00; Abram Bates, 25 cts.; Josiah Pratt, 12 cts.; Sophia W. Pratt, 25 cts.; Edson Raymond, 25 cts.; Nabby Tirrill, 50 cts.; Saml. Torrey, 25 cts.; John Dyer, Jr. 1 00; S. Burrill, 50 cts.; S. V. White, 25 cts.; Minot Harrington, 1 00; Another member of the family, 38 cts.; D. Dyer, 25 cts.; Stephen French, 1 00; Chas. Bates, 25 cts.; Jas. Whittemore, 2 00; Saml. Curtis, 1 00; Bela Pratt, 50 cts.; Orrin Holbrook, 50 cts.; Saml. French, 1 00; Elizabeth Dyer, 1 00; Asa Dyer, 50 cts.; Stranger, 50 cts.; E. Kibbey, 1 00; Mrs. H. Whitton, 50 cts.; Abigail Washburn, 12 cts.; Mary Bates, 25 cts.; Francis H. Cowing, 1 00; Elijah Peirce, 50 cts.; Sarah Salisbury, 25 cts.; Jotham Salisbury, 25 cts.; Wm. Rice, 50 cts.; Joseph Bates, 27 cts.; Mrs. Bicknell, 25 cts. Total from Weymouth,	24 89
Collections in Roxbury, by John Jones.—J. G. Tilton, 50 cts.; Chs. Grant, 5 00; Isaac D. White, for life member 15 00; Dea. Kendall Brooks, 3 00; Roxbury Ladies qr. sub. 18 00. Total from Roxbury,	41 50
Collections in Dorchester by J. Jones.—Wm. Tolman, 1 00; Dea. Joseph Clapp, being money confided to his care by Collectors of quar. subs. 15 00; Abigail Pecco, 75 cts.; Elizabeth Bird, 75 cts.; Caleb Pillsbury, 1 50 cts.; Asa Robinson, 50 cts. Total,	19 50
Collections in Braintree, by John Jones.—B. V. French, 5 00; Capt. Isaac Dyer, 2 00; J. Hollis, 3d, 1 00; Edward Potter, 1 00; Simeon Thayer, 50 cts.; Dea. N. Thayer, 50 cts.; Joseph Hollis, 25 cts.; Alvin Morrison, 1 00; Lysander Richards, 2 00; Truman Richardson, 50 cts.; Dea. Jonathan Newcomb, for life membership, 15 00; Thomas Reed, Jr. 50 cts.; Joseph Richards, 2 00. Total from Braintree,	31 25
Collections in Randolph, by J. Jones.—Rev. J. Lord, 1 00; Thaddeus French, 1 00; Jedediah French, 50 cts.; Varenus Wales, 50 cts.; Wm. W. Linfield, 1 00; Allen Merrit, 1 00; Capt. Jonathan White, 1 00; Orramel White, 50 cts.; Wm. Thayer, 1 00; Moses French, 50 cts.; Dea. Elisha Holbrook, 1 00; Rev. Dennis Powers, 1 00; Sim. Faxon, 50 cts.; F. D. Holbrook, 50 cts.; Lewis Alden, 25 cts.; Luther French, 50 cts.; David White, 50 cts.; C. White, 50 cts.; Saml. Whitcomb, 50 cts.; Saml. Baker, 25 cts.; Asa Porter, 50 cts.; Jeremiah Belcher, 50 cts.; Seth Belcher, 50 cts.; Joseph Whitcomb, 25 cts. Total,	15 25
Collections in Weymouth, by J. Jones.—Gen. Appleton Howe, 1 00; Jacob Loud, 1 50; Eliza T. Loud, 50 cts.; Lucy Pratt 50 cts.; Rebecca Ripley, 25 cts.; Reed Blanchard, 1 50; Israel Fearing, 75 cts.; John Vinson, 1 50; Thos. Blanchard, 75 cts.; Mrs. Sarah Bates, 50 cts.; Josiah Torrey, 25 cts.; Mrs. Dorothy Holbrook, 62 cts.; Cyrus Holbrook, 50 cts.; John Dyer, 50 cts.; Ezra Pratt, 50 cts.; J. C. Lewis, 50 cts.; Susan C. Lewis, 25 cts.; Hannah Pratt, 50 cts.; Lydia Pratt, 50 cts.; Oran Holbrook, 25 cts.; Gilman Burrill, 1 00; Joseph Dunbar, 50 cts.; Ezra Vining, 50 cts.; Eben. Tirrill, 25 cts.; Eben. Humphrey, 1 00; Bela Pratt, 15 44; Isaiah Thayer, 25 cts.; Rufus R. Trott, 25 cts.; Gilman Thompson, 25 cts. Total,	32 16
	$603 91

HENRY G. CHAPMAN,
Treasurer Mass. A. S. Society.

☞ We have been under the necessity of omitting many articles intended for this paper in order to make room for the very interesting debate in the Legislature on the subject of the Dorchester petition. Correspondents must 'let patience have her perfect work.' J.

☞ We shall publish next week the reply of the editor of the Herald of Freedom to the communication of Orange Scott, which we have copied from that paper, and which will be found on the last page. J.

NOTICES.

ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

☞ *To sustain the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.* ☜

It is proposed by women of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society to hold a FAIR in aid of the treasury, some time in the month of October next, in the city of Boston. One specific object they have in view, is, to sustain the Rev. John A. Collins as General Agent of the Massachusetts Society. Doubtless, however, a much larger amount will be raised than is requisite for this purpose, and the remainder will be devoted towards the other operations of the Society. The undersigned offer the results of several years experience in this mode of raising funds, to such individuals and Societies throughout the State as may have the disposition to co-operate with them, in taking advantage of the city market for the benefit of the slave. We affectionately invite all such, to co-operate with us personally, by taking tables at our Fair, in behalf of their respective towns, the proceeds to be theirs, for the Mass. Society—credit being thus given where credit is due. It will be our joy to offer a heartfelt hospitality to those who feel inclined to pass the week of the Fair in Boston.

Letters and parcels from individuals who cannot attend personally, may be directed to Maria W. Chapman, 25 Cornhill, Boston.

Maria W. Chapman,	Mary G. Chapman,
Mary A. W. Johnson,	Eliza Lee Follen,
Thankful Southwick,	Henrietta Sargent,
Louisa Loring,	Susan Paul,
Eliza F. Merriam,	Eliza Philbrick,
Ann T. G. Phillips,	Anne W. Weston,
Mary Young,	Helen E. Garrison.
Caroline Weston,	

FAIR.

At the quarterly meeting of the BOSTON FEMALE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, held January 10th, it was unanimously 'Voted, that a Fair be held by the SOCIETY toward the close of the present year.' Also, 'Voted, that the Society pledge to raise the sum of twelve hundred dollars for the cause.' A resolution was also passed that the Society subscribe for fifty copies of the Liberator. The objects for which this money will be expended are the following. To the American Anti-Slavery Society, one thousand dollars. To the Infant School for colored children, one hundred dollars. To the Samaritan Asylum for Indigent Colored children, one hundred dollars. To fifty copies of the Liberator, one hundred dollars.

The Fair will be holden by the Society in DECEMBER next. We would invite all societies and individuals, who are favorable to the cause of the SLAVE and the ELEVATION OF THE COLORED POPULATION to assist us, as heretofore, by donations of articles, the amount of which will be duly acknowledged *to them by the Society*.

We trust it is unnecessary to remind our co-workers of the sufferings of thousands of our sisters, who by the oppression of man are denied those blessings with which we are favored; and while we contemplate their sorrows, let us ask ourselves how we would wish them to labor were they in our soul's stead, and act accordingly. If this be done, our *present* duty will be accomplished, light will go forth to chase away the darkness that envelopes the mind of the task-master, the Northern apologist will be silenced, and the day of redemption be hastened to millions of earth's captive sons and daughters. In behalf of the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society,

MARY S. PARKER,
M. V. BALL,
CLARISSA LOTHROP,
LYDIA GOULD, } *Committee.*

MIDDLESEX CO. A. S. SOCIETY.

The Quarterly Meeting of the Middlesex County Anti-Slavery Society will be held, with Divine permission, in the Rev. Mr. Phelps' Church in Groton, on Tuesday and Wednesday, the 23d and 24th days of April. The meeting will be organized Tuesday morning, at 11 o'clock, precisely. It is hoped that every Anti-Slavery Society, in every town in the County, will be fully represented. The peculiarly interesting state of the Anti-Slavery enterprise imperiously demands it. And the friends of the slave, who live in towns where no Society has been organized, are most respectfully urged to rally with us in the defence of truth and justice, and to advocate and advance the 'sacred cause of virtue, liberty, and independence.'

JOSEPH WARREN CROSS, *Secretary.*

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

The Board of Managers of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society, respectfully announces to the Female Anti-Slavery Societies of the United States, that, having ascertained that the time appointed for the Anti-Slavery Convention of American women, was unfortunately chosen, as it occurs during the week of the anniversaries of the American Anti-Slavery and other national Societies, they have changed the time for the opening of the Convention, from Wednesday the 8th, to *Wednesday the 1st day of May*. At that time we shall hope to welcome to Philadelphia, large delegations from all our sister associations.

In behalf of the Board of Managers of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society.

Sarah Pugh, *President.*
Mary Grew, *Cor. Sec.*

Philadelphia, March 5, 1839.

THE YOUTH'S CABINET,

Devoted to Liberty, Peace, Temperance, and Religious, Moral, Intellectual and Physical Education,

Will be resumed April 25, 1839, by its original editor, Nathaniel Southard, in compliance with numerous and urgent calls from its friends. It will be issued every Thursday, from New York and Boston. It will consist of its usual variety of instructive reading for the young, including an interesting article on slavery each week. Since the Slave's Friend has been discontinued, something of this kind is much called for. A little active effort by its friends, may give it a wide circulation, and thus greatly benefit the young and help the cause of the slave.

Terms.—One dollar per annum in advance. Ten copies to one address for eight dollars.

Letters may be addressed to N. Southard, 25, Cornhill, Boston, or 143, Nassau st. New York.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN ANTI SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The sixth anniversary will be held, with Divine permission, in the city of New York, on Tuesday, the 7th day of May next. The public exercises will be in Broadway Tabernacle, and commence at ten o'clock, A. M. An abstract of the Annual Report will be read, and several addresses delivered by brethren from different parts of the Union. A meeting for business will be held in the Lecture Room of the Tabernacle, in the afternoon, after the public meeting, and be continued, probably, for one or two subsequent days.

All the auxiliaries are requested to send delegates, and members of Anti Slavery Societies, throughout the country, are invited to attend the anniversary.

Joshua Leavitt,
Lewis Tappan,
La Roy Sunderland, } *Committee of Arrangements.*

NORFOLK COUNTY A. S. SOCIETY.

The quarterly meeting of the Norfolk County A. S. Society will be held at the Village Church in Dorchester, on TUESDAY, the 23d inst., at 10 o'clock, A. M. A full and punctual attendance is requested.

O. P. BACON, *Rec. Sec.*

Dorchester, April 15, 1839.

MARRIED—In Paxton, on the 9th inst., by Rev. Mr. Farnsworth, Mr. Daniel W. Kent of Leicester, to Miss Harriet N. Grosvenor of P.

COMBS, FANCY GOODS AND PERFUMERY.

A. S. JORDAN, wholesale and retail Store, sign of the original Golden Comb, No. 2 Milk street, two doors from Washington street, would invite attention to more than two hundred different patterns of wrought and plain Combs, of the latest and most fashionable sizes, among which are the Victoria Comb of 40 different patterns, including the new star or lace pattern, that cannot be imitated in horn, highly rich and ornamental—Crescent Combs, of original and beautiful patterns—wrought and plain back Combs—do do cap or twist Combs—do do puff or tuck Combs—do do side and neck Combs—do do round Combs—Shell, Ivory, Horn and Wood dressing and pocket Combs—Tortoise Shell Hair Bands—Pearl do do do—constantly on hand, Horn and Metallic Combs of every description—fine Ivory Combs.

Also, a large assortment of Fancy Goods and Perfumery—Toilet Soaps and Brushes. Purchasers will find it for their interest to call before purchasing elsewhere.

☞ Combs made to order and repaired. Highest price paid for Shell.

April 19. 2m.

LITERARY.

From the Sentinel and Free Press.

AMERICAN HYPOCRISY.

'Tis true, they tell us of the stars and stripes,
That proudly wave upon our nation's flag—
Which o'er the world floats with triumphal air,
And mocks the power of tyrants and of kings.
Again, they tell us of our country's glory—
The bravery of her valiant sons that fought
And bled to save her from oppression's yoke,
That sire and son might here in peace enjoy
Those rights which God and Nature gave to man.
They speak of favors given, of wrongs redressed,
Of rights secured, and blessings dearly bought;
And bid us wake and join in Freedom's lay.
'Tis thus exultingly we sing, and boast
The name of Liberty, and loud proclaim
To Poland's sons, and all insulted Greeks,
That here's a home for all, where all are free.
Alas! how many Russian slaves have sighed
To hail the land where Freedom's star arose—
To breathe her air, to tread her fertile soil,
Nor fear the rage of haughty tyrants more.
How sweet to chant the song of Liberty!
To know that we are free, and no proud lord
Shall dare disturb, and hurry us away,
To toil in hopeless bonds, where no kind voice
Is heard to cheer life's toils, and sooth our care;
Nor wife nor loving children more are seen
To light with smiles the dreary path of life.
E'en now, methinks, I prize sweet Liberty!
And fain would give this precious boon to all
In Turkish lands, and Russia's wide domain.
But why conceal? why talk of stripes and stars,
And yet in silence pass the wrongs of those
Who never knew the sweets of Liberty?
Those brilliant stars upon our 'standard sheet'
Have long been shamed by stripes of crimson hue;
(Would that red and purple stripes alone were seen
On canvass sail and colors flying high:)
Long has that flag in boasted triumph waved
Above our Capitol, while just beneath,
Our brother bound in chains, must hear the lash,
And feel the smart of bondage more accursed
That Greek has felt, or Turk has e'er imposed.
Who shall describe such scenes of woe and wail?
Ah! who shall count the stripes and tell the groans
Of man, inflicted by his brother man,
When high in power, and in his country's name,
The herald loudly boasts of Freedom's cause?
Oh! let it ne'er be told the world around,
Lest there be joy where rank oppression reigns,
And every exile's harp be tuned to woe.
Oh, let the breeze that moves Atlantic's wave,
Ne'er bear the cry to Greece or Poland's sons,
Lest all their hopes are blown away like dust,
And gloom and dark despair shall close the scene.
O Liberty! how art thou rudely mocked!
How is thy name abused, while yet adored!
Say, didst thou teach the strong the weak t'oppress?
And man his brother man to chain and task?
And no reward be given to him who plants,
And reaps thy fields of golden harvest?
To charge thee with such baseness * were unjust;
To say that thou art right, and yet of fraud,
And robbery and outrage, still approve.
Nor heaven, nor guardian liberty, can sanction
Such base injustice, such insulting wrong.
And can it be that statesmen † great and learned,
And sages, such as Greece and Rome could boast,
Should still have erred, and 'still the wrong maintain'?
'Tis possible, for interest still will blind,
And justice cry, and mercy plead in vain,
When country, honor, and humanity,
Are quite forgot, to calm oppression's rage,
And truth is buried near ambition's altar.
How impotent is man with all his powers,
When interest, pride, ambition, all oppose
The truth, and ask that justice still delay.
How many grope and stumble in the dark;
Because if truth is known, self is condemned.
They, like the ancient scribes, see all reversed;
'Light stands for darkness, darkness stands for light'—
'Good stands for evil, evil stands for good.'
But though the tallest champions go forth,
To war with justice and humanity—
With sophistry to mystify the truth—
Justice still lives, and truth is mighty still.
Nor shall there be a want of advocates
To plead the cause of injured innocence.
And so maintain th' acknowledged *rights of man.*

D. H.

Fort Ann, March 9, 1839.

* See Calhoun's Speech.
† Clay and others.

The following wild and beautiful lines by Mary Howitt, the English Quaker Poetess, have a touch of Coleridge's manner.

From the New York Star.

THE SEA GULL.

BY MARY HOWITT.

Oh, the white sea-gull, the white sea-gull,
A joyful bird is he,
As he lies like a cradled thing at rest
In the arms of the sunny sea!
The little waves rock to and fro,
And the white gull lies asleep,
As the fisher's bark with breeze and tide,
Goes merrily over the deep.
The ship with her fair sails set, goes by,
And her people stand to note,
How the sea-gull sits on the rocking waves,
As still as an anchored boat.
The sea is fresh, the sea is fair,
And the sky calm overhead,
And the sea-gull lies on the deep, deep sea,
Like a king in his royal bed!

Oh, the white sea-gull, the bold sea-gull,
A joyful bird is he,
Sitting like a king in calm repose
On the breast of the heaving sea!
The waves leap up, the wild wind blows,
And the gulls together crowd,
And wheel about, and madly scream
To the sea that is roaring loud;
And let the sea roar ever so loud,
And the winds pipe ever so high,
With a wilder joy the bold sea-gull
Sendeth forth a wilder cry—
For the sea-gull he is a daring bird,
And he loves with the storm to sail;
To ride in the strength of the billowy sea,
And to breast the driving gale!
The little boat she is tossed about,
Like a sea-weed, to and fro;
The tall ship reels like a drunken man,
As the gusty tempests blow.
But the sea-gull laughs at the pride of man,
And sails in a wild delight
On the torn up breast of the night-black sea,
Like a foam-cloud, calm and white,
The waves may rage, the winds may roar,
But he fears not wreck nor need;
For he rides the sea in its stormy strength,
As a strong man rides his steed!

Oh the white sea-gull, the bold sea-gull!
He makes on the shore his nest,
And he tries what the inland fields may be;
But he loveth the sea the best!
And away from land, a thousand leagues
He goes 'mid surging foam;
What matter to him is land or shore,
For the sea is his truest home!
And away to the north, 'mong ice-rocks stern,
And among the frozen snow,
To a sea that is lone and desolate,
Will the wanton sea-gull go,
For he careth not for the winter wild,
Nor those desert regions chill;
In the midst of the cold, as on calm, blue seas,
The sea-gull hath his will!
And the dead whales lie on the northern shores,
And the seal and the sea horse grim,
And the death of the great sea creature makes
A full merry feast for him!

Oh, the wild sea-gull, the bold sea-gull!
As he screams in his wheeling flight;
As he sits on the waves in storm or calm,
All cometh to him aright!
All cometh to him as he liketh best;
Nor any his will gainsay;
And he rides on the waves like a bold young king,
That was crowned but yesterday.

NON-RESISTANCE.

SHALL WE HAVE A WAR?

For some weeks past, the public mind has been much excited with the Northeastern Boundary question, and not a few have fondly or fearfully anticipated a general war with Great Britain. The friends of God and humanity have been greatly distressed as they have seen the war spirit, the bloodiest fury of the pit, stealing into the public mind,—the torch of war burning over our eastern frontier, Maine hot in the pursuit—and Congress placing in the hands of the President, fifty thousand volunteers and ten millions of money, 'the purse and the sword,' to commence and push forward the work of human butchery. Under these circumstances, when nothing but the interposition of God or the clemency of Great Britain, the most powerful and warlike nation in the world, can save us from a bloody conflict, many are inquiring, 'Shall we have a war?' On this question, I have a few thoughts to offer. I offer them as a Christian, a follower of the Prince of Peace, and not as a CIVILIAN or a POLITICIAN. I am no politician: never found my way to the ballot-box. I care nothing about and take no interest in the party politics of the day. It matters not to me, whether Cæsar or Pompey are on the throne. Having bowed the humble knee to the King of kings, and sworn allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ, I have no interest in any political question any farther than such a question involves moral and religious considerations. But to the question: Shall we have a war?

Answer. No—unless we are a nation of MAD MEN. For why should we engage in the work of human butchery? Has every pacific measure been adopted in vain? Has our government sought negotiation with much long-suffering and patience in vain? Has a mutual arbitration been sought and refused us? In a word, have we done all that can be done to settle the question of the boundary line amicably and without the shedding of blood? No.—Again, will a war settle the question? decide the controversy? poise the scale of justice? run a line and make all right? No—never. A ten years hot and bloody war,—a hundred millions of treasure spent, a hundred thousand of our brethren slain and hurried away to judgment in their sins, red with blood and burning with anger,—half a million widows and orphans manufactured on a thousand battle fields, will do NOTHING, absolutely nothing towards adjusting the matters in dispute. It would not decide who is in the right or who is in the wrong. It would not, could not run the line. To settle such a question by war, the war must be a war of EXTERMINATION. Every thing short of such an encounter, of the nature of war, will only tend to embarrass the question, immerse it in blood and fill the counsels of both countries with mutual hatred and secret heart-burnings. Let our rulers play the dreadful game of war, and after our treasury has been emptied, a tremendous national debt has been entailed upon us, and thousands of precious lives lost, the noise of cannon ceased and the smoke of the battle field has blown away, then the question recurs—'Where is the boundary line? Where?' It is not settled.

SHALL WE HAVE A WAR? No. Not if we have the fear of God before our eyes. Paul, in his description of human depravity, caps the climax by saying: 'Their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways; the ways of peace have they not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes.' A correct description of fighting men. God commands us to love our neighbors as we love ourselves; requires us to love our enemies even; overcome evil with good; tells us that wars and fightings come of our lusts, and threatens the implacable with his hot displeasure, saying, 'if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Heavenly Father forgive your trespasses.'

BUT, SHALL WE HAVE WAR? No. Not unless our religion is all a farce and our professions all hypocrisy. We profess to be a christian nation. Ours is a land of churches, Bibles, revivals and moral and religious enterprises. The church holds the balance of power. The ministry bears a mighty sway in forming the character of the public mind, and in giving the tone to the public conscience. Nothing can be done by the way of war without the consent and concurrence of the church and ministry. Who is the head of the church? The Lord Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace, whose 'servants cannot fight;' he who is holy, harmless, and who in the hands of murderous enemies, was as an unresisting, uncomplaining Lamb. This King in Zion, to whom we owe our first allegiance, requires us to love our enemies, bless them who curse us; do good to them who hate us; overcome evil with good; resist not evil; avenge not ourselves; if our enemies hunger to feed them; if they thirst to give them drink; and if they sue us at law and take away our coat, to let them have our cloak also. All this the Prince of Peace did himself. All this he requires of all his followers. Now if we follow the Lord Jesus Christ, if we obey his precepts, we can have no war; if we do not mean to follow Christ and cherish his spirit and obey his precepts, our religion is a farce and all our professions solemn mockery. If we are involved in a war, it will be because the church is corrupt, 'drunk with the blood of saints,' and a time-serving ministry have preached another gospel,—a rum-drinking, slave-holding, man-killing gospel. Such a gospel the devil loves.

SHALL WE HAVE A WAR? No: unless we are willing to involve our country in the direst of all calamities. A general national war will greatly impoverish the country, reduce thousands of families to beggary and pauperism, roll a tide of death over the land, hurrying hundreds of thousands into a premature and impenitent grave, sweep our commerce and fisheries from every sea, turn drunkenness and debauchery loose to march over our land, desecrate the Sabbath, cripple and almost annihilate the moral and religious enterprises of the day, destroy revivals of religion, and accelerate the progress of INFIDELITY. The camp is the hot-bed of drunkenness, idleness, sabbath-breaking, debauchery and infidelity. Besides, in a war with Great Britain, the odds would be against us. She is a mighty, warlike nation, the mistress of the ocean. Besides, she would find hundreds of thousands of allies, 'the bone and muscle' of our Southern and Western country. Let England land an army, a hundred thousand strong, in Florida, wave her striped banner over three millions of slaves, panting for freedom, and proclaim liberty to the captives; the Seminoles and the hundreds of thousands of different Indian tribes on our Western frontier, burning for revenge, would fly to the rescue, and what power could arrest the progress of such a host? Where would the conflict cease, and what would be the end thereof? The following from Senator Benton may afford some practical hints as to the sequel of such an unequal contest.

'Troops have been tried, and have failed in accomplishing the object. Every species of troops have been tried—regulars, militia, and volunteers, horse and foot. They have made campaigns and fought battles for three years, and have done all that men could do under such circumstances; and they have suffered more than men ought to be required to suffer in such a war; and all without accomplishing the object. Three years have been consumed in military operations; and at what cost and what results? At the cost, in money, of nearly twenty millions of dollars; in lives, of nearly forty officers, killed, or died of wounds, or of the climate; of many wounded; of nearly four hundred soldiers of the regular army; besides heavy losses among the militia and volunteers. This is the cost! and what are the results? The results are, four counties of Florida depopulated—the Indians ravaging the country from Cape Sable to the Okefenokee swamp—the frontiers of Georgia attacked—depredations carried to the suburbs of St. Augustine and Tallahassee—the lighthouse at Florida Point burnt and destroyed—ship-wrecked mariners on the coast of Florida massacred—and all cultivation suspended over a large district of country, part of which was settled and cultivated under the dominion of Spain, when Florida was a province of that kingdom. These are the results, after three years of military operations—after this great cost in money and in lives.'

SHALL WE HAVE A WAR? No. not if we do our duty to God and our country as Christians. Let Christians resolve to follow the Prince of Peace; be holy and harmless,—resolve not to fight with carnal weapons come life or death; bear their testimony freely, fully, boldly against the spirit and practice of war; let all the followers of the sons of God surround the mercy-seat, at this solemn crisis and fill all heaven with the holy incense of fervent prayer on the subject, and God will turn the hearts of infuriated rulers as the rivers of water are turned, and we shall have no war.

P. R. R.

WHEATLY, L. I., 3d Month, 25th, 1839.

RESPECTED FRIEND:

Although a stranger to thy outward visage, I feel and know thee in the everlasting covenant of life. By the perusal of thy valuable paper, I have discovered that there is a shaking in the abolition ranks on account of the non-resistance principles of some of the friends of the cause. But this is not to be wondered at. The road is too narrow for flesh and blood to walk in. It strikes at the root, and would do away war, slavery, and every other oppression. But alas for those who denounce thee for maintaining those testimonies delivered by the lip of truth! Are thy opponents afraid of the truth? or are they like Baalam seeking for the reward of divination? I have long been of an opinion that many of the ministry would not advance the reformation farther than is useful for their worldly interest. They like to take the lead, and will go a little out of their way to accommodate their people in order to keep them in tow, but touch their interest, and the mask is off. Yet I think there is no ground for discouragement, but the contrary.

I have felt much pleased with the principles of non-resistance. They are a beacon-light, breaking out in a dark place, that may dispel the gloom of surrounding darkness. This is one reason why I subscribed for the Liberator. My heart is with you, and the fervent desire of my soul is, that the Lord will prosper your way in every good work and word.

I thought, perhaps, thou would be willing to know how thy publications are received here. I have as much as possible kept the Liberator in circulation since I received it, and the Non-Resistant also; and I have heard no one condemn them. Yet few have faith to remove the mountain of opposition and tradition that lies in their way. Thou gives it as thy opinion, that there are few among the Society of Friends who live up to those principles in full which thou and Jesse Hersy have adopted. In this thou art correct. We have slumbered on our posts; we have been compassing a mountain for some years, without any assurance of advance. Although many of us have been favored like Moses, (having been permitted to ascend Pisgah where we have beheld the Holy land and exclaimed, 'O that I might go over and see that goodly mountain and Lebanon,') others have gone further; like the true spies, they have searched out the good land, in length and breadth, and brought forth the fruit thereof in life, and conduct, and encouraged us to go in and possess the land. But we have listened too much to the evil spies, who have told us that there are giants in the land, to whom we appear as grasshoppers; that it is a land that eateth up its inhabitants; and many of us have been ready to cry out, 'would that we had continued slaves in Egypt, where we sat by the fleshpots and eat to the full.' I hope that your faithfulness will incite us to more watchfulness and care, for those that love the Lord most he will honor most. It is true that those that live godly must suffer persecution by a wicked world; it has been the lot of the righteous in all ages. I have been a sufferer most of my days on account of military requisitions; but I count this loss gain to me. It had the effect to wean me from the world and its glittering glories, and tought me not to trust in man, but the living God that made the heavens and the earth, who has said, 'to this man will I look, that is poor in his own heart and trembles at my word.'

I have not written this unto thee for publication, but as a legacy of love and fellow-feeling. I am an old man, nearly three-score and thirteen. My natural eyes grow dim, and my memory fails. I have never been to an election but twice that I remember. I have never attended court but twice as a juryman—never equipped myself for war;—and it is now a comfort in old age, that I have been thus preserved. It is the Lord's doing; to him be all the praise. He visited my soul when young, and led me out from those things. When I had no outward instructer, and belonged to no society, even in my juvenile years, my soul abhorred slavery. It happened to fall to my lot to work with slaves, as I was a day laborer, and had good wages as a carpenter, and being often weary, it caused me to reflect that those poor creatures got little or nothing for their labor. Thus my mind was brought to abhor slavery as one of the greatest evils in the world. I sometimes reflect that I have not done all the good I might have done, having but common talents and being unlearned. Yet I feel a hope that my heavenly Father will accept the will for the deed.

I am thy friend and fellow-servant in the faith, the patience and the testimony of Jesus. May his work continue to advance, until the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of the Lord and his Christ.

TIMOTHY TITUS.

From the Herald of Freedom.

THE 'NO HUMAN GOVERNMENT THEORY.

Friend Rogers—The Liberator and its *editor*, are, I perceive, assailed on the one hand and defended on the other, through the columns of the Herald of Freedom. To assail or defend either, *indiscriminately*, is, in my opinion, an error. The *abolitionism* of the Liberator, as to its *moral bearings*, is of the right stamp—high-toned and thorough, and should be defended by all the friends of truth and righteousness. But farther than this our obligations, *as abolitionists*, do not extend. Error is error, whether embraced by a friend or an enemy; and no considerations of personal friendship should induce us to *connive* at error.

Mr. Garrison's views of the Sabbath, I care little about: he has as good a right to his opinions as the *Quakers*. And though I differ from him in this, yet I have no fear that his Sabbath notions will injure the cause of abolition.

I believe he is also opposed to such an *order* as that of the Christian Ministry; but this too is comparatively a small matter. I have nothing to hope nor fear from his opposition to that *order*; neither has the slave. Whether the Christian ministry stands or falls, affects not the question of the emancipation of the slaves. And as it respects his exposure of those 'dumb dogs' in the ministry that 'cannot bark,' or that bark only to defend slavery and oppose abolition, so far from going too far, I believe he has rather fallen short of his duty. I hope he will continue to 'speak' in relation to the crimes of these men, 'as the tempest does, sterner and stronger.' I have seen enough of this time-serving policy in the church of which I am a member; and I have no reason to believe that other denominations are much better.

But the no-government theory stands on different ground. *It strikes at the very foundation of the anti-slavery enterprise (! !)* And how you could pass off the matter, in the last Herald of Freedom by tamely saying, Mr. Garrison's '*non-resistance* notions are a *little stronger* than we have *been educated* to,' I cannot conceive! This appears altogether too *tame* for the conductor of a public journal; especially one of *your stamp*. Can it be that the fear, that you would not come off even so well as 'second best,' makes you so careful? Speak out, dear brother, and let us know *which side* of this question you take. If you are *with* friend Garrison, let us know it; and if you are opposed to him, speak out like N. P. ROGERS. To say that to 'repudiate all human politics,' [alias the 'science of government'] to 'acknowledge allegiance to *no human government*'—to go against 'every legislative and judicial body'—and against '*all existing, civil, political, legal*, and *ecclesiastical institutions*,' is a *little* stronger than you have been *educated* to,' is a strange sound from the HERALD OF FREEDOM! Dignify such principles with the name of *peace*,' or '*non-resistance*,' if you please; they are abhorrent to my soul. I can almost say in the language of the Psalmist, 'I hate them with a perfect hatred.' But mark well; whoever shall say that I hate *peace* and *non-resistance* in the common acceptation of those terms, will state that which is *false (!!)* I say no such thing. But whoever will make the *quotations* from the no-human government documents that I have made, and then say that I hate *such sentiments*, shall be welcome to publish it to the ends of the earth—the wider the better. It is to these objectionable things that I wish to call the attention of your readers, and which for the want of a better name, I call the *no human government theory*. If this be not the true character of these sentiments, then I confess myself incapable of understanding the meaning of the English language. What effect are such sentiments likely to produce upon abolitionists, so far as the elective franchise is concerned? Where would the hopes of the slave be if all abolitionists were of this stamp? And certainly we all have as good a right to abandon the polls as Mr. Garrison has. Indeed, if he believes it *wrong* to go to the polls, he ought to use his influence to bring abolitionists and every body else to what he considers right, which thing he also does, as the Liberator for the last six months abundantly shows. On the other hand, if we believe he is wrong, we ought to oppose him, not *indirectly*, in *whispers*, but in thunder tones; provided we think the evil merits so much notice. At any rate, we ought to see that the anti-slavery cause does not suffer through his influence. The more disconnected it is from these *notions* the better.

I love and respect brother Garrison for what he has done. All the feelings of his soul are still opposed to slavery: he wields a gigantic pen against it. For this too, I love and respect him. But that dear brother may err—and it is believed he has most sadly erred. That he has departed, in part, from the principles of primitive abolitionism, cannot, and should not be disguised (!.!) When I reflect of what he has done and suffered in this holy enterprise, it pains me exceedingly to make this charge, which by the way, I made in his presence at the annual meeting of the State Society in January last. God knows there is not a man on earth I should be more unwilling to touch with a heavy hand.—But the cause—the precious cause of the slave, has claims upon us superior to all considerations of personal friendship. Indeed, those very considerations should induce us to deal plainly and faithfully with each other.

* * * * * * *

Our brother may be *honest*, but is he a safe *leader?* What guarantee have we that the man who will now go against 'all existing *civil, political, legal*, and *ecclesiastical institutions*' will not to-morrow go against all *anti-slavery* organizations? He may hereafter think *individual influence* a better course. To be *consistent with himself*, he ought to adopt that plan *now*. Indeed what assurance have we that he will not hereafter abandon *moral* influence? He who will yield a portion of the anti-slavery ground to-day, may, for aught we know yield another portion to-morrow, and substitute something, which in his opinion, may be more in accordance with the *universal government of God*. He has found that all human governments are wrong,—a sin in themselves; and therefore in the latitude of perfectionism, he may still have other revelations which may change the entire character of the anti-slavery enterprise.

It is painful to reflect, that just at a time when we began to hope that we could exert a salutary influence at the polls, this no human government theory should be broached, and broached too by one who had first sounded the alarm in relation to slavery—and who had been one of the first advocates of *political* action. But now, forsooth, it is a *sin* to go to the polls—but if you must sin in this way, *sin right*; alias vote right.

Now suppose all the abolitionists in the country were of the Garrison stamp? All political influence, in such an event, would be instantly abandoned, and the slave might remain in bondage till dooms-day, unless he could be made free without the lifting of a finger on the part of abolitionists to change a single wicked law by which he is now held in bondage. Well then might he pray, 'Lord, save me from my friends.' Yes, if all abolitionists were of this *no human government stamp*, they could not vote nor be voted for, because that would be a *sin!* And all the remonstrance we get from the editor of the Herald of Freedom is, '*it is a little stronger than we have been educated to'!!*

It is true friend Garrison has been *supported*, and perhaps *led on* by one H. C. Wright; but I have no disposition to notice *him*: his influence is next to nothing. He may go against all governments both human and Divine and the world will not be much the better or worse for it. But it is not so with Garrison; his word will eat as doth a canker. Even our noble hearted brother, GERRIT SMITH, can, from considerations of personal friendship or something else, give one hundred dollars to support this no human-government paper, called the 'Non-Resistant,' and spend his time in reading it, to get light, his political abolitionism to the contrary notwithstanding! This scheme of *consummate nonsense*, coming from the source it does, is the darkest spot in our anti-slavery enterprise. *Congressional gags bear no comparison with it.* But thank God, there are some abolitionists who can think for themselves; there is, therefore, yet hope for the slave.

In conclusion, I will only add, that whoever shall apply what I have said in this article against the no human government theory, to peace or non-resistance in the common acceptation of those terms, will make a palpably false representation. Let not a dust be raised to hide these deformities from the public eye, by a terrible outcry of, what hard things you say against '*peace* and '*non resistance*'! Here are *the things* to which I object, in a tangible form.—*Look at them again.*

Lowell, March 29, 1839. O SCOTT.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A COURT OF JUSTICE IN GEORGIA.

FROM THE AUGUSTA (GEORGIA) MIRROR.

A friend of mine has recently returned from an excursion into the —— circuit of this State. He tells me that, while in the county of ——, he strayed into the Court-house, and was present at the arraignment of a man by the name of Henry Day, who was charged with attempting to kill his wife. Day was a pale little man, and his wife who was present, was a perfect Behemoth. The indictment being read, the prisoner was asked to say whether he was 'guilty or not guily.' He answered, 'there's a mighty chance of lawyer's lies in the papers, but some part is true. I did strike the old lady, but she fit me powerfully first. She can swear equal to a little of anything, and her kicks are awful. I reckon what you say about the devil moving me is tolerable correct, seeing as how she moved me. I have told you all I know about the circumstance, Mister. I gin Squire Jones there a five dollar bill, and I allow he'll talk it out for me.'

Squire Jones thereupon rose, and said he had a law point to raise in this case, which he thought conclusive. It was an established rule of law that man and wife were but one; and he should like to know how a man could be punished for whipping himself; he should be glad to hear what the Solicitor General could say to that. The Solicitor General answered that he thought his brother Jones had carried the maxim a trifle too far: men had often been punished for beating their wives. If a man should kill his wife, it would not be suicide. Here Squire Jones interposed, and defied the Solicitor General to produce an authority to that effect. The Solicitor General looked over Green and Lumpkin's Georgia Justice for some minutes, and then observed that he could not find an authority just then, but he was sure he had seen the principle somewhere, and he called on the Judge to sustain him. In the enthusiasm of the counsel on this point, they forgot to offer any evidence as to the guilt or innocence of Day in the premises.

The Judge being likewise oblivious of this fact, proceeded to charge the jury. He told them that man and wife were one, and were two. If the wife ran in debt or abused a neighbor, or knocked down or dragged out a fellow-citizen, then man and wife were two. He remarked that, in either event, the man was legally bound to suffer, and, therefore, come it as they would, Day was undoubtedly guilty. He said he would not decide the question whether, if a man kill his wife, it was murder or suicide. He was not prepared to express an opinion upon that point. It was a very delicate one, and he had no idea of committing himself. (Some one in the room here observed he was mighty fond of committing others.) He then called up the bailiff, a tremendous looking cracker, wearing a broad brim white hat with crape, (I never saw a man south of latitude 33 that did not wear a white hat with crape,) and proceeded to admonish him that the jury were very much in the habit of coming in drunk with their verdicts, and that, if it happened in this case, he would discharge the prisoner and put his punishment upon him the bailiff. The bailiff, giving a significant glance at the Judge, replied that other people besides the jury came into court drunk; that some people thought other people drunk, when some people were drunk themselves. The jury then retired, and so did my friend.

The next day he returned and found matters *in statu quo*, except that Day and his wife had made up, and were discussing together the merits of a cold foul, a quart of beer, and now and then exchanging kisses, despite of the frowns and becks of the officers. The Judge, clerk, and sheriff had been up all night, and looked wolfish, and the bailiff was seated on his white hat at the door of the jury room, and his countenance expressed that he had swallowed the concentrated venom of a thousand wild cats. The most awful curses, oaths, and sounds proceeded from the jury room—some were roaring like lions—some crying like children—mewing like cats—neighing like horses, &c. At last, a consultation was held at the door of the jury room between the foreman and the bailiff, whereupon the latter, putting his white hat one-sided on his head, came into the court room and addressed the Judge thus: 'Mr. Tom Jakes says the jury can't agree about this here man, and if you keep him (i. e. Tom Jakes) without grog any more he'll lick you on sight.' The Judge appealed to the Bar if this was not a contempt of court, and 'Green and Lumpkin's Georgia Justice' having been consulted, it was finally decided that, as it was a threat addressed to the Judge as a private individual, and was to whip him 'on sight' and not on the bench, it was not (under the free, enlightened, and democratic principles of Georgia legislation) a contempt of court. This being settled, the Judge directed the bailiff to say to Tom Jakes, the foreman, that the jury should agree if they stayed there through eternity. The bailiff retired, and so did my friend; but he gives it as his opinion, from the frame of mind in which he left all parties, that the jurors and bailiff are still there.

R. M. C.

AN AMERICAN CITIZEN MURDERED.—A letter from Mexico, dated Febuary 14, states that Mr. A. DUBELLE, of New York, was barbarously murdered on the 29th ult. by a gang of robbers who attacked the mail coach on its way to Publa, half a mile from the garita (gate) of this city. He was shot dead, and several other persons in the coach were wounded. These human demons are daily committing spoliations and murdering travellers in some quarter. The moral and political condition of this country is constantly retrograding.

☞ The following arguments against rail roads are an excellent counterpart to the objections which a certain class of people urge against a *too rapid* movement of the great car of moral reform! They don't believe in the 'topsy-turvy, harum-scarum, whirligig' measures of those fanatics who would have all sin put a stop to at once! Not they! Give them 'the old solemn, straight-forward, regular Dutch Canal—three miles an hour for expresses, and two yoke of oxen for a heavy load!' J.

RAILWAY. The following humorous arguments were advanced by a canal stockholder, for the purpose of putting down railroads: 'He saw what would be the effect of it—that it would set all the world a-gadding. Twenty miles an hour, sir!—Why, you will not be able to keep an apprentice boy at work; every Saturday evening he must take a trip to Ohio to spend the Sabbath with his sweetheart. Grave, plodding citizens will be flying about like comets. All local attachments must be made at an end. It will encourage flightiness of intellect. Veracious people will turn to the most incurable liars; all their conceptions will be exaggerated by their magnificent notions of distance. 'Only a hundred miles off! Tut, nonsense, I'll step across, madam, and bring the fan.' 'Pray, sir, will you dine with me to-day, at my little box on the Alleghany?' 'Why, indeed, I don't know; I shall be in town until 12; well, I'll be there, but you must let me off in time for the theatre.' And then, sir, there will be barrels of pork, and even cargoes of flour and chaldrons of coal, and lead, and whiskey, and like sober things, that have always been used to sober travelling, whisking away like a set of sky rockets. It will upset all the gravity of the nation. If a couple of gentlemen have an affair of honor, it is only a steal off to the Rocky Mountains, and there no jurisdiction can touch them. And then, sir, think of flying from debt! A set of bailiffs mounted on bombshells would not overtake an absconded debtor, only give a fair start. Upon the whole, sir, it is a pestilential, topsy-turvy, harum-scarum whirligig. Give me the old solemn, straight-forward, regular Dutch canal—three miles an hour for expresses, and two yoke of oxen for a heavy load! I go for beasts of burden; it is primitive and scriptural, and suits a moral and religious people better. None of your hop-skip-and-jump whimsies for me.'

JUMPING LAND CLAIMS IN ILLINOIS.—He who first squats on a lot of wild land by putting up a log house, is considered by the regular squatters as owning the claim. Nevertheless, another often comes, and in a night gets up another log house and claims the lot as his. This second operation they call jumping the claim. The following account of these pioneer efforts to sustain law and order, we take from the letter of an Illinois settler, published in the Bangor, Me. Whig.

'In returning from R. I. found an old man, named Merryfield, of my acquaintance, after men to rout a party of fifteen scoundrels who had jumped his claim the night before. The party M. had raised had proceeded towards his house, (three miles) and he had turned out for more. I jumped on to a horse and followed as fast as possible. I found the party just ready to proceed to the premises. On seeing me and learning that I had gained my case, a very important one just then, they cheered me lustily. We started, twenty three of us, not one armed, for our object was *peace, not war*. We found the ruffians ready to receive us, making use of the house, built of large oak logs, as a fort. Each of them having a rifle, and pistols, and bowie knives. We parleyed with them a while, when they told us they should kill the first man who touched the house. We were now armed with hickory clubs, and we proceeded to business by hitching two yoke of oxen to one corner of the house. The jumpers seeing this, stationed themselves outside at the two corners facing the one at which we made the attack, their guns and pistols cocked and aimed at us, as they said, to fire when we should give the word to the oxen. Without hesitating, we gave the word, and down came one end of the house. This settled the question. The jumpers did not fire, and we giving them three hearty cheers—drew the logs off to Mr. M's house. The day but one after, they came on again in large numbers, whereupon seventy five of us went down and gave some of them a severe flogging, burnt up their hay and made them agree to leave the claim.'

LYNCH LAW AND ITS EFFECTS.—We received a private letter from Natchitoches, a day or two since, in which the writer relates an instance of Lynching in the following words. 'Some time within the last month, a man living on the Texas road, about twelve miles from Natchitoches, within the state, (who had three orphan children under his care, whom he frequently maltreated,) was pretty harshly dealt with by the adherents of Lynch law, as the following circumstances will show. The citizens of Natchitoches, on hearing of his maltreatment of the children, disguised themselves, and repaired to his house at night, for the purpose of inflicting summary punishment upon him. Having found him, they carried him to the woods, tied him to a tree, tarred and feathered him, and then whipped him severely. Shortly afterwards he came to town, armed with a loaded pistol, and meeting a strange man, accused him of having assisted in the Lynching affair. Instantly upon making the accusation, he discharged the pistol into the breast of the innocent man, wounding him severely. The fellow was then taken up, and committed to prison. He subsequently gave bail for his appearance at court, and was liberated. On the evening after his release, he went to his home, and killed himself! So ends the affair.'—*New Orleans paper.*

RIOTS.—The Legislature of Massachusetts has passed an Act, which contains the following provisions:

Sec. 2. Whenever any property of the value of fifty dollars or more shall be destroyed, or be injured to that amount by any persons to the number of 12 or more, riotously, routously, or tumultuously assembled, the city or town within which said property was situated, shall be liable to indemnify the owner thereof to the amount of three-fourths of the value of the property so destroyed, or the amount of injury thereto, to be recovered in an action of the case in any Court proper to try the same, *provided* the owner of such property shall use all reasonable diligence to prevent its destruction or injury, by such unlawful assembly, and to procure the conviction of the offenders.

Sec. 3d. Any City or Town which shall pay any sum under the provisions of the preceding section, may recover the same against any or all persons, who shall have destroyed or injured such property.

COAL IN MASSACHUSETTS.—Probably not one half, hardly one third, of the vegetable, geological or mineral treasures, which lie deep below the surface of Massachusetts, have yet been discovered. Professor Hichcock's Survey has done much to develope these treasures, but much more remains for future generations which inhabit the state, to bring to light. The beds of coal discovered in the eastern part of Massachusetts just begin to enlist attention. By the report of a Committee on this subject in the legislature, we learn that nearly 400 square miles in Bristol, Norfolk and Plymouth are one entire coal bed. The quality is Anthracite of the best kind, equal to the Pennsylvania, some specimens having been taken nearly 70 feet below the surface, but the explorations are so expensive, that Legislative aid has been solicited. Some attempts have already been successfully made in Mansfield, by sinking a shaft 64 feet and then striking off 150 feet, following the coal strata. About 1500 tons have already been obtained and it sells readily at $6,00 the ton at the Mines. The quantity is inexhaustible and furnishes a new item of wealth to Massachusetts, which now imports annually nearly two million dollars worth of coal from the other States and Great Britian.

The following remarks on the horrors of WAR are copied from the New England Farmer, being the concluding sentences of an article on the Eastern border troubles:

'War is no child's play. A battalion of troops drawn up in their clean-washed regimentals, in front of the State House on Boston Common, with their sparkling armor and their gilded epaulets, and all the charms of the soul-stirring bugle and deep-toned drum filling the air in the month of June, is a very pretty affair. But a battalion of men calling themselves Christians, with the ferocity of tigers, dealing death from a thousand blazing cannon among men like themselves; strewing the fields broadcast with the mutilated, the dying, and the dead, and then raising their arms, crimsoned with human gore, in the fiend-like exultation of conquest, makes one shudder with horror, and distrust one's own identity as a human being, and ask, in the tone of the Angle in Franklin's fable, 'who coming down to the earth in the time and on the very spot of a battle between two fleets in the West Indies, when he saw the decks of the ships bespattered with blood and brains, and saw the headless trunks rolling about, and the scattered and smoking limbs, and heard the roar of cannon, and saw the piercing of the bayonets in boarding, whether this can be earth, or whether indeed it is not h—ll?'

Public Meeting at Memphis, Tenn.—There was a large meeting of the citizens of Memphis, Tenn., on the 17th ult., in consequence of some developments which led to a belief that a plot had been laid by negroes of the neighborhood against the lives of some of the citizens. A committee, consisting of seven slaveholders, was appointed to investigate the affair, which they did, in a faithful and impartial manner. The report made by the committee shows that no conspiracy had been entered into by the blacks, except by a few, who had for their object the poisoning the family of a Mr. Dabney. The report of the committee says, emphatically, 'the fears which were entertained of a general plot being on foot among the slaves and free negroes, are entirely groundless.'—*Boston Post.*

PRICE OF SLAVES IN THE SOUTH. The Montgomery Alabama Advertiser says: The proceeds arising from the sale of [illegible] last week at Montgomery, belonging to the estate of McIver, deceased, exceeded the expectations of every one. On the first day's sale they were sold [illegible] for cash—

188 for $61,478, averaging $327 [illegible]

On the second day, on a credit of one [illegible] years—

30 brought $67,950, averaging [illegible]

On the third and last day, on a credit of [illegible] two years—

31 brought $68,016, averaging [illegible]

The negroes, taken as a whole, were a very ordinary lot—a large portion of them [illegible] and some very young. Whether the [illegible] thorise the prices given, we leave to those [illegible] noticed the rise and fall of cotton during the [illegible] years.

NEW WORK ON SLAVERY.—The American Anti-Slavery Society, have now in press and will shortly publish, a new and interesting work on Slavery, setting forth the physical condition of the slaves in this country. It will embody a mass of facts, with regard to habitation and a name,' showing the horrible atrocities perpetrated upon the defenceless victims of slavery, which, for their atrocity, were, perhaps, never surpassed in any part of the world. It will have an [illegible] and extensive circulation than has been given to any previous work of the kind.—*Zion's Watchman.*

We announce with sincere regret the death of Hezekiah Niles, late of this city, who departed this life yesterday morning at 2 o'clock at Wilmington, where he resided for some time past in the hope of recovery of health. As the editor and proprietor of Niles' Register, the deceased entitled himself to the gratitude of his countrymen in furnishing the best register of passing events of national or local importance.

DEATH OF COL. FISHER.—The Baltimore Sun mentions that a few days since at Matagorda, Texas, a rencontre took place between Col. S. Rhodes Fisher, late Secretary of the Texan Navy, and a young man named Fuller, when the former was shot dead upon the spot. Judge Fisher, we understand, was formerly of [illegible] and of a highly respectable family. His relatives reside in this city and its vicinity. The intelligence of his death we believe was brought by the [illegible] New Orleans from Galveston.—*Phila. Ledger.*

ROYAL PRESENTS.—The American Temperance Union have, by request of Mr. Delavan, prepared a present for the King of the French and the Duke of Orleans. They consist each of a copy of the 'Temperance Journal' and 'Permanent Temperance Documents,' both very superbly bound and gilt at the Tract Rooms. The books are for the present at the office of the Society, Clinton Hall.

He who maintains the right, though contemned by the few, and opposes the wrong, though applauded by the many, must forego all expectations of popularity till there shall be less to censure than applaud in human conduct. And when this is the case the millennium will have dawned.

A church in Dunbarton, N. H. has passed five resolutions upon the subject of slavery, one of which excludes all slaveholding ministers from their pulpit, and all slave-holding church-members from their communion. Another church in Cambridge, Mass. has passed a series of resolutions upon the same subject, one of which prohibits any remarks, in their social meetings, calculated to call forth conflicting opinions, the object of which was, to prevent any allusion, by prayer, or otherwise, to Southern Slavery.

There were received, on Monday night last, at this post office, upwards of 500 copies of 'Human Rights Extra,' an abolition paper published in New York, put up in single copy, and directed to most of the postmasters in the state of (Georgia) and other [illegible]. Our post master on ascertaining the title and contents of the paper, DID NOT HESITATE ONE MOMENT (*Grandiloquence!*) as to the course he should pursue: all the copies that could be found were withdrawn and *destroyed*.—*Augusta (Geo.) Paper.*

TEXAS. General Hamilton and Governor Butler of South Carolina, and Col. White of Florida, have lately been welcomed on their arrival in Texas, by the giving of common public dinners, &c. Men of such eminent talents cannot but prove an acquisition to Texas, should they decide on settling there.

W. H. Wharton died on the 14th of March, at his Retreat, in Texas. His death was in consequence of a wound in the abdomen, received by the accidental discharge of a pistol.

A MOTHER'S AFFECTION. A colored woman now living in Charlestown, Mass. once herself a slave, learning that her daughter, a slave, was advertised among the effects of a bankrupt, about to be sold in Baltimore. She scraped together her earnings and savings, sent her all to Baltimore, arrived in season to purchase her daughter, and has returned with her. She is now poor and sick; a deserving object of charity.

THE OLD DOMINION. There is a sort of hereditary talk—even at the North—about old Virginia, her great men, and her high principles—which will not, we shrewdly suspect, bear the test of examination. Revolutionary Virginia, and while the race of that day survived and ruled, was a great, a glorious State—given, indeed, to metaphysical subtleties, but with a vast and reliable fund of wisdom and virtue. But Virginia of the present generation is really but a feeble type of the past.—*N. Y. American.*

VERY PIOUS. A Clergyman of Louisiana lately made the following announcement from the pulpit—'I am requested to state, that immediately after service this evening there will be a race just back of the Church, two mile heats for a purse of $300—two negro wenches and some hopes of another. *I trust you will all be there.*'—*Le Roy Gazette.*

No marvel that such ministers can make merchandize of the souls and bodies of their brethren. Alas for the Church when such men are their leaders!

GENTLEMEN'S REFECTORY AND SOCIAL RESORT.

No 5, Wilson's Lane, near State Street.

The undersigned informs the public, that he has taken the above establishment, formerly kept by BOSWELL GOSS, and that he keeps on hand a constant supply of

REFRESHMENTS

Of all kinds. Also, FRUITS and DELICACIES of all sorts during their season. Every thing furnished in his establishment is the product of rare [illegible]. He keeps no kind of intoxicating liquor. A share of the public patronage is solicited.

tf WM. A. BURLEY.

LOST.

Some time since, the undersigned borrowed a manuscript address of the Rev. S. J. May, on the subject of Peace. Subsequently it was done up in a small parcel, directed to 'Rev. S. J. May, South Scituate,' and, as was supposed, sent to him. By some mistake, it has never been received. Any person having knowledge of such parcel, will confer a favor and be suitably rewarded on forwarding it to the author at South Scituate, or to A. A. PHELPS, 32 Washington st. Boston.

WANTED,

In a family in Concord, Mass., an intelligent and trusty colored girl, 14 or 15 years old, to do house work. Any one who can come well recommended, the person in want is disposed to bring up and give every reasonable advantage. For further information, apply at the office of the Liberator.

March 21st. 3w.

MALCOM'S TRAVELS.

GOULD, KENDALL & LINCOLN, have in press, and will publish about the first of March, Malcom's Travels in Burmah, Hindostan, Malaya, Siam and China, in 1 vol. 8 vo. and 2 vols. 12 mo.—with a superb original map of South-eastern Asia—five steel plate engravings and about 100 wood cuts.

FREE LABOR MOLASSES.

FREE LABOR MOLASSES from the Sandwich Islands, of superior quality, for sale by BISHOP & WITHINGTON, Corner of Salem & Hanover Streets.

March 15. 4tis.

CHARLES WISE'S FREE LABOR DRY GOODS STORE, No. 50 North Fifth st. one door above Arch st. Philadelphia.

Orders from a distance punctually attended to.

Sept. 28. eop 6mos.

MAHAN ON CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection; with other kindred subjects, illustrated and confirmed in a series of Discourses designed to throw light on the way of holiness. By Rev. Asa Mahan, President of the Oberlin Collegiate Institute. Price 62 1-2 cents. For sale at 25 Cornhill.

REPORT OF THE HOLDEN SLAVE CASE.

Trial at the January term of the court of Common Pleas, for the County of Worcester, A. D. 1839. Published by the Board of Directors of the Holden Anti-Slavery Society. An interesting pamphlet of 32 pages. For sale at 25, Cornhill. Price 12 1-2 cents.

VICTORIA COMBS.

TWENTY-FIVE new pattern Shell Victoria Combs, with and without ornaments, for sale at wholesale or retail, at JORDAN'S Comb Store, No. 2 Mill Street, 2 doors from Washington street. Feb. 1.