

From the Anti-Slavery Standard.

ADDRESS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, TO ABOLITIONISTS.

DEAR FRIENDS: The Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society feel concerned to lay before you their brethren the real position which they occupy, and their plan of operations for the succeeding year.

The debt of the Society has been reduced \$472 since the annual meeting—its present amount is \$1515. We hold, that you, brethren, are the debtors. You are pledged, not only to discharge the debt, but to provide the means necessary to sustain the continued operations of the Society. The requisitions for this purpose are now reduced to the lowest possible scale, that comports with efficiency, and true economy. The stated liabilities of the Society are, for office and printing office rent, \$550; office expenses, \$600; salaries, total, \$2400; estimated cost of printing the Standard, (making no allowance for the receipt of subscriptions,) \$3120—total, 6070. We are unable to perceive how the necessary operations of the Society can be sustained on any other efficiency, on a more reduced scale. It is obvious that they might be more enlarged; but the Committee are resolved to confine themselves strictly to this limited scale, until the means are afforded for more extended operations. In the meantime, while they devote themselves cheerfully to the trust which you have confided to them, they desire your prompt co-operation in making it useful to the cause of freedom. It is indispensable that they be placed above the embarrassments which have weighed upon them for the last twelve months. On no other conditions can your expectations be realized, or our labors be rewarded with the success which we earnestly desire.

We appeal to you, brethren, to furnish without delay, the means of sustaining the American Anti-Slavery Society, in a state of healthy life and activity—to free it from the damps of embarrassment—to enable it to pay its just debts, and to stand before the country, commanding respect for the principles which it represents, and public confidence, by the integrity of its obligations. To do this, we are powerless. We warn you, this promptly, that we cannot, as your Executive Committee, continue to assume obligations, unless we be furnished with means for their discharge. We are resolved to transact our business on the cash system only, believing this to be the only true system, by which we shall avoid the embarrassments that have hitherto shackled the operations of anti-slavery societies throughout the country. We will receive your failure to sustain us on this plan, as an indication that our position is not needed to the cause, and that it ought to be abandoned! Let every man, woman, and child, who has a heart for the sufferings of our common humanity, enter with promptitude and energy on this good work. Let each do what each can, and the cause of human freedom will progress with accelerated speed. Remember, brethren, that you are the debtors of the laboring priester—that it is your duty, while you are pledged to discharge, to pay him for his work as soon as it is done. We point you, once more, to our debt—we remind you that we have current expenses, amounting to one hundred and fifty dollars per week. Will you enable us to be just, or will you allow us to fail? We await your answer.

You will be made acquainted, through the Standard, of our receipts and expenditures. The Committee have adopted the plan of acknowledging, immediately, all money received, whether the amount be great or small.

We call your attention to the One Dollar subscription list. This measure alone, if carried out, as it may be, by the friends of the slave, will meet all the wants of our Treasury, without imposing oppressive burdens on any. Let it not fail, through negligence, we entreat you.

We call on subscribers to the Standard to forward their subscription for the 2d volume, without delay. Agents, be active in procuring new subscribers. Agents to our Treasury. If you fail, we fall through the negligence and delay of our friends, and not through their want of ability.

Signed on behalf of the Executive Committee, JAMES S. GIBBONS, Chairman. LUDIA MARIA CHILD, Secy.

From the National Intelligencer. A Card to my Constituents.

Impelled by a deep conviction of constitutional obligation to separate from my Southern friends on account of a deprecated allusion to that subject in this extraordinary session of Congress, convened for the purpose of relieving the Government and the country of the constitutional responsibilities, and because I was unwilling to avail myself of a privilege I was not disposed to extend to others, I feel that I may be due to those who feel an interest in my legislative action here briefly to assign the reasons that prompted me to vote in the affirmative.

In the first place, I hold the right of petition to be absolute, unlimited, and uncontrollable, (for, if a line is to be drawn, you will hardly find any two that would draw the same line,) a right guaranteed to the humblest citizen in the community, and that it necessarily carries with it the obligation to consider; and upon its consideration two questions arise: 1st, Have you the power to grant the prayer? And 2dly, If you have the power, have you the disposition? And my answer to these particular petitions would be, that I have not the power, and if I had, I have not the disposition. My friends deny the right to receive the petitions, because they say, we have no constitutional right to grant a prayer. If this doctrine be correct, upon what principle of propriety can those who deny the constitutional power of Congress to establish a bank or a protective tariff consent to receive petitions on either of those subjects? The unavoidable interruption that would ensue to the harmony of the Union from the assertion of such a principle in government need not be exposed.

But, apart from the constitutional question, the most profound reflection that I am capable of giving to this question has not only strengthened but riveted my former impressions upon my mind, that the course of wisdom and true policy to the South is to disconnect the question of the right of petition from that of abolition, and to dissipate the delusion that prevails at each extremity of the country, by ascertaining the exact strength of the abolitionists in Congress, and thereby settling the question at once and forever. Moreover, I am not disposed to indulge in timidity and apprehension at the body of a dead man, that can only be reanimated by an injudicious course of policy by its own enemies. If left to themselves, the abolitionists are irrevocably dead. ()

I was satisfied before I came to Congress, that we occupied a false position on this question, which was rendered more untenable at the last session by the adoption of the 21st rule; and, while I was willing to surrender a great deal to the judgment of those whose interests are identified with my own, I could not consent to yield the deep, deliberate, and conscientious convictions of my own judgment, with a full view of the mischief that I thought would necessarily result from incorporating that with the other rules of the House.

Next winter, if it is thought desirable, I shall be prepared to go forth into the field, with those who will suffer with me, but at this time I was neither disposed to embark in the discussion myself nor indulge it in others.

Most respectfully, JNO. M. BOTTS. June 8, 1841.

To the Editors. Messrs. GALE & SEATON:

As I felt constrained by an impious sense of duty to give my vote to-day in favor of Mr. ADAMS'S amendment to Mr. WISE'S resolution in regard to the adoption of the 21st rule; and, while I was willing to surrender a great deal to the judgment of those whose interests are identified with my own, I could not consent to yield the deep, deliberate, and conscientious convictions of my own judgment, with a full view of the mischief that I thought would necessarily result from incorporating that with the other rules of the House.

I have long entertained the opinion, that the abolitionists constitute but an insignificant portion of the citizens of the Northern States; and I believe, moreover, that they have thereby been enabled to obtain the same, regardless of the exert about social equality, with which their enemies have endeavored to retard their reasonable exertions.

in this sentiment by the public declaration of Mr. ADAMS that, in his opinion, if a proposition were brought forward for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, there are not five members on the floor of Congress who would vote for it; and that the almost universal sentiment in the North is, that Congress has no power to interfere with the subject of slavery in the States. But, whilst this is the fact, a large number of the Representatives from the Northern States, believing conscientiously that the sacred right of petition is vested by the refusal of Congress to consider the memorial as a force to assume a position which is apparently adverse to Southern interests, when in truth they are as much opposed to abolition as I am. Without pretending to go into a discussion of the extent of the right of petition, I am willing to rest my vote on the ground of expediency. I am unwilling that the abolitionists should continue to enjoy the support which they now receive from the parent co-operation of the wise and virtuous men of the North in regard to the right of petition. I wish to withdraw from them all intrinsic support, and to expose to the world their insignificance in regard to numbers and character. This can only be done by receiving their petitions, referring them, having a report and a direct vote on the question of abolition or no abolition, unmingled with the right of petition or any other collateral question. If this course had been taken years ago, I believe that the abolition fanaticism would have shared the fate of the Sunday-mail excitement. But, be that as it may, for one I do not wish to dodge this question. It must be met at some time or other; and I am for meeting it promptly. If I am right in my conjecture that the abolitionists are so inconsiderable in numbers, the benefit will be made manifest, and there will be an end of agitation. If, on the other hand, there is a determination on the part of our Northern brethren to disregard the guarantees of the Constitution, and to trample on the rights and interests of the South, the sooner we know it the better; for if the Constitution and the laws afford us no security for our institutions, we must rely on our extra-constitutional means to maintain and protect them.

There is one other view of the subject which I would respectfully present. It is this: Suppose Mr. ADAMS'S amendment had been defeated by such a vote as was given upon the adoption of the 21st rule originally; what would have been the effect upon the public mind? Would it not have appeared that the House was almost equally divided on the subject of abolition? And what, I ask, would have been the moral effect throughout the Union of such an apparent state of things? Would it not have unsettled the very foundations of our Southern institutions? But, on the other hand, if we obtain a direct vote on the single question of abolition, upon which we shall have a vote of 50 or 100 in favor of the rights of the South, and which will effectually suppress agitation, and restore confidence to the South, and harmony and fraternal feeling to the Union?

Respectfully, your obedient servant, ALEX. H. H. STUART, Representative 17th District of Virginia. From the Colored American.

Great Anti-Colonization Meeting in New-York.

Agreeably to public notice, a very large and respectable meeting of colored citizens assembled in the Asbury Church, to consider the following resolution, adopted by a late Colonization Convention held in Maryland:—

"That while it is most earnestly hoped that the free colored people of Maryland may see that their best and most permanent interests will result from their remaining in this State; and while this Convention would deprecate any departure from the principle which makes colonization dependent upon the voluntary action of the free colored people themselves,—yet, if regardless of what has been done to provide them with an asylum, they continue to persist in their demand for equality of social and political rights—THEY OUGHT TO BE SOLEMNLY WARNED, that, in the opinion of this Convention, a day may arrive, when circumstances that cannot be controlled, will force upon them the necessity of leaving their present abode, and leaving them no alternative but removal."

The meeting was called to order by Rev. T. S. Wright, and prayer offered by Rev. Jacob Matthews. The absence of Rev. R. V. Christopher, Rush, of the Meth. E. Wesleyan church, Rev. Edmund Crosby S. Barbary, Thomas Downing, Wm. A. Tyson, Rev. T. S. Wright, Newport Henry, P. H. Reason, James Fields, Rev. S. E. Cornish, Henry Stoughton, Rev. C. B. Ray, Alex. Elston, P. A. Bell, John Peterson and Robert Hamilton, were appointed Secretaries.

On motion of Rev. Theodore S. Wright, seconded by Mr. Junius C. Morel, of Pennsylvania, the following preamble and resolution was unanimously adopted:—

Whereas, we the colored inhabitants of the city of New-York, having with our brethren throughout the country, from the earliest period of the American Colonization Society, with entire unanimity, expressed our opposition and abhorrence of the doctrines, measures, and influence of the scheme of expatriation, viewing it as the main prop of American caste, and the prolific source of violence flow most of the various proscriptions and oppressions under which we groan and suffer—we therefore, in solemn meeting assembled, with increased conviction of the accuracy of our views on this subject, deliberately and unanimously reiterate our protest against the wicked scheme; therefore

Resolved, That notwithstanding present, anticipated, or threatened adverse influences, as regard to our own permanent interests, and the rights of our brethren; fidelity to our unswayed countrymen, love to the great principles of the American revolution, secured by the blood of our patriotic fathers, and a just appreciation of our holy religion, clearly indicate our religious duty as a people to live, labor, and die upon the soil of our birth, confidently committing our cause and its final issue to the God of the oppressed, who maketh the wrath of man to praise him, and restraineth the remainder of wrath.

On motion of Rev. S. E. Cornish, of New-York, seconded by Mr. Peter Gallego, of Toronto, U. C. Resolved, That the resolution of the Maryland Colonization Convention, intimating a forcible removal, from their native State, of 60,000 colored citizens of Maryland, is the legitimate consequence of Colonization principles, and the legitimate policy of the American Colonization Society.

Resolved, That we therefore, respectfully, earnestly and solemnly entreat Christian ministers to abstain from preaching, and Christians to abstain from contributing for the Colonization Society, on the 4th day of July, or any other time.

On motion of John J. Zulle, seconded by P. H. Reason, Resolved, That the statement of the late Maryland Convention, that colonization is "dependent upon the voluntary action of the free colored people themselves," whereby that meeting would make it appear, that the colored people have given their consent to this project, is false and deceptive; subversive of the claimed honesty of those who made it, and a base imposition upon the community.

On motion of Dr. J. McCune Smith, seconded by P. A. Bell, Resolved, That the threat, that a force is maturing, equivalent to remove the free colored population from the State of Maryland, is a base and insidious artifice. Let those of Maryland, with their empty treasury, has not the means to transport them to Liberia. 2d. That therefore, if force be used, Maryland will adopt the alternative of throwing a free colored population of 60,000 into some one of the free States, or of sending to Canada 60,000 persons, who would become a most dangerous neighbor in the time of peace, and an implacable enemy in time of war, thus either infringing on the rights of the States, or periling the peace of the country.

Addresses were delivered by Rev. T. S. Wright, Junius C. Morel, of Pa., Rev. S. E. Cornish, P. Gallego, of Toronto, U. C., J. J. Zulle, P. H. Reason, Dr. J. McCune Smith, P. A. Bell, and C. L. Reason. The resolutions were adopted with entire unanimity, the utmost enthusiasm prevailing during the evening; when at a very late hour, the benediction being pronounced by the Rev. T. S. Wright, the meeting adjourned.

EMANUEL CROSSBART, President. Z. S. Barbary, Thomas Downing, Wm. A. Tyson, Rev. T. S. Wright, Rev. S. E. Cornish, H. Stoutenburgh, P. H. Reason, Newport Henry, James Fields, P. A. Bell, Alex. Elston, Rev. C. B. Ray, Vice Presidents. John Peterson, Robert Hamilton, Secretaries.

Case of Mr. Jennings. The editor of that well-conducted journal, the Lynn Record, (who seldom omits to improve every suitable opportunity to vindicate the cause of our colored population, both bond and free,) notices the recent outrage committed upon the person of our respected fellow-citizen Thomas Jennings, in his exclusion from the cars on the Eastern rail-road, on account of his complexion, in the following manner:—

The above is undoubtedly a gross and palpable outrage on equal rights, and individual rights. "Corporations have no souls," and the agents and individuals who act under them sometimes act as if they had none or worse than none. Railroad companies are incorporated for the public good. They have special powers, privileges and favors conferred on them for the purpose of being serviceable to the public, like turnpike companies and others, and they have no right to make arbitrary distinctions between individuals, and deny to any one or more persons, rights which belong to all equally. They have no more right in selling their tickets and furnishing cars to regard the color of the skin than they have the color of the clothes of individuals. The law is no more in their favor than it is in the favor of the colored man, and public sentiment does not allow it. In no other case than *Exeter county v. the Eastern Railroad* is it so manifestly practised. Even in the slave States, colored people ride in the same cars with white people, and no one thinks of making any objection. So throughout the States and counties south of us, no distinction is made. But on the Eastern Railroad, if a colored man, however well educated and well behaved, after paying for his ticket, ticketed and paid for, and perhaps kicked after he is out. No law and no justice will tolerate such conduct. The subject is important, and may receive further attention hereafter.

Congress. MONDAY, JUNE 21.

Abolition Petitions. Mr. Adams came into the House with a band-box full of abolition petitions, which he presented one by one, briefly reciting the contents. Some he presented asking the House to rescind the 21st rule, and he added—I hope they will rescind it,—others which he offered prayed to be released from military duty in case of the insurrection of the slaves, or a servile war. None of these petitions, under the rule, was referred to Mr. Adams. The House was called for resolutions. Many were adopted for different subjects.

Conrad Trist.

A resolution calling for any further information in possession of the Government in relation to the seizure and search of American vessels by British cruisers on the high seas was taken up, and Mr. Adams offered an amendment, calling for the reason for the delay of the action of the Government in the case of Mr. Trist, consul at Havana.

Mr. Adams said, he understood that Mr. Alexander Everett, the agent who was sent to Havana to inquire into the allegations, had been bottom upwards during his day's presentation. On Saturday we forgot to mention that he presented a petition from the inhabitants of Baltimore praying for his own expulsion, and laughed heartily over the decision of the Speaker, which laid the question of reception upon the table under the rule.

Mr. Adams presented the petition of two thousand women of thirty-eight towns of the State of Maine, praying the House to rescind the 21st rule. The petition was not commenced where he left off, and his bundle, like the widow's cruse of oil, seemed to increase with every drop upon it.

When Mr. Adams finished, he returned thanks to the House for their patience in hearing him through, and sat down like Hercules of old, after having performed his last and most difficult labor.—Globe.

Debates in Congress on the Gag Law.

House—Monday, June 14. After the Journal had been read, the Speaker stated that the first business was the motion of last week, to reconsider the vote by which the select committee had been appointed to revise the rules, except the 21st.

Mr. Wise resumed his remarks, and gave a detailed account of the several attitudes in which the abolition of slavery presented itself to the House. He argued that the institution of slavery in the District of Columbia, was a domestic relation, and not a federal one—therefore, as it had not been created by the Federal Government, the Government has no right to abolish it, or to interfere with it in any way whatever.

He then read copious extracts from Northern papers, with a view of showing that the sheltering of runaway negroes was applauded by the people of the North, and that the laws of the Southern States were publicly and avowedly violated.

He alluded more particularly to a case which recently occurred at Boston, where a white man was held to bail, for taking back a runaway slave to his master in North Carolina.

Mr. Parmenter explained, that in the case referred to, the Grand Jury returned a bill. Mr. Wise said he was glad to hear it. But he would ask, how the case would have stood, had that Grand Jury been composed of abolitionists. [A jury of honest men would have reported a bill—it was not needful that they should have been technically abolitionists.] Mr. Wise then referred to the laws enacted by the State of Ohio, as a further instance where the provisions of the Constitution were set aside by State laws. He referred to the case of certain gentlemen of the House, who pretended that they were not abolitionists. He stated that the House had once had a slaveholding Speaker, as it had now, who gave the South security by having a majority of slaveholders on the Committee of the District of Columbia. But it would avail nothing. He then referred to the constitution of the Committee on Claims, where Mr. Giddings of Ohio, (an abolitionist,) is chairman. What had the South to expect from that quarter? Suppose he (Mr. W.) had had his slaves killed in the Florida war, would the gentleman (Mr. Giddings) be in favor of recompensing him? No, he was sure the gentleman would not.

Mr. W. then proceeded to refer to three histories of Massachusetts to show that the people of that State had in former times been guilty of selling Indians and exporting them. It is a fact, said Mr. W., that the people of Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, should do something in these latter days to wipe out their sins before God.

He then gave a history of the origin of the Pinkney Resolution, the Abolition Resolution, and of the 21st Rule, with the votes by which they were severally adopted. He also related one instance, and the only instance, where Mr. Adams, the Nonpartisan of Abolition, had bowed to the latter Rule. He then appealed to the friends of the South on the imperative necessity of resisting to the utmost any attempt at innovation on their rights. He referred to the career of Wilberforce on the Slave Trade, and also, to the Car-leic Emancipation Act, to show the danger of a majority remaining inactive, and affording only a dead inertia, while a minority, however small, were constantly exerting themselves, and keeping up agitation, year after year, before the public mind. In such a case, he said, the majority were sure to get weaker, not as certainly as the result would wear away by the constant running of the stream.

He concluded after having spoken six hours. A scene of great excitement then arose in an attempt to get the floor.

Mr. Botts demanded the previous question, and stoutly resisted every appeal to withdraw it. Mr. Stanley moved a call on the House, and on the motion the yeas and nays were ordered, were—yeas 104, nays 104. Mr. Adams wished to ask the Speaker if there were any rules now in existence. The Speaker said there were, viz: those adopted on Saturday, and which had been reported by the select committee.

Mr. Adams.—Yes, but the vote by which that committee was appointed is now reconsidered. A scene of great confusion here arose, pending which the House adjourned.

June 15.—The question came up on the original resolution. Mr. Rayner then took the floor and addressed the House at some length against the course pursued by the abolitionists.

He contended that if the people of the North had a right to petition for the redress of imaginary grievances of people other than their own, why could they say where it would end? Their petitions might extend to grievances, real or supposed, which might exist across the Atlantic. They would then have the right of petitioning Congress to go to war with the English for oppressing the Irish, or with Russia for oppressing the Poles. Were this right to petition for other than their own grievances to be admitted, it would lead to the greatest absurdities.

Suppose, said Mr. R., turning to Mr. Adams, that petitions day after day, were pouring in, praying that the manufactures of the North were a nuisance, would the gentleman receive the petitions? Mr. Adams—Yes, I would.

Well, then, said Mr. Rayner, suppose petitions were presented from the Catholics, asking Congress to prohibit the use of meat, or from the Jews, asking them to abolish the Christian Religion, or from Fanny Wright and her followers, asking Congress to abolish the institution of marriage; would the gentleman receive such petitions?

Mr. Adams, with great animation, exclaimed, "Why, the most damning feature of slavery is, that it DOES abolish the institution of marriage. How then could I have any more objection to receive such petitions, than I have to the perpetuation of slavery, which destroys that sacred institution of Marriage?" (cries of "order," sit down.)

Mr. Adams. Yes, it does abolish the institution of marriage; and I have seen the effects of it; yes I have seen it. Here a general call for order commenced, and Mr. Adams resumed his seat, saying that if the gentleman was afraid to receive answers, he should take care to ask no questions.

Mr. Rayner then resumed his remarks. He said that the people of the South would stop the progress of the abolitionists over their border, with their dead bodies, if they could effect it no other way.

Mr. Morgan followed. He reminded the House that it had now been two weeks in session, and was just where it was first. He desired to know if they were not now quite time for them to proceed to business.

Mr. Cushing said he came here hoping to do much, but resolved to speak little. Words were but the sons of earth, but rumors were the daughters of heaven.

Mr. Adams said he had not the heart to reply to Mr. Cushing's remarks, but he had the heart to reply to Mr. Morgan's remarks. He said that the House would give him an opportunity to reply.

Mr. Charles Brown made a long and violent speech against the call for the previous question. Mr. Briggs said the gentleman had expressed great horror at the operation of the previous question. But the gentleman was now feeling the rod under which the Whigs heretofore had smarted. Mr. B. in a very pointed manner referred to the many instances when the late administration party in the House, had set the example of shutting up all debate by the previous question, and asked the gentleman and his friends how they could now refuse to take their own medicine.

disposition to exercise that freedom to the annoyance of any body. Mr. S. expressed his surprise that those who deprecated a continuance of the abolition excitement should insist on the adoption of the 21st rule. He could give no assurance that a refusal to adopt the rule would stop excitement on the subject of slavery; but he would say that its re-adoption would very greatly increase it. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Johnson) had contended that the adoption of the rule had had the effect of allaying the abolition excitement, both here and elsewhere, and that it should, therefore, be continued. Mr. S. said he had determined to avoid, at this time, going into a discussion of the merits of the rule; but he must take the occasion to say that the gentleman from Maryland was greatly mistaken in his estimate of the effect of it. It was true it had, to some extent, allayed the excitement of this Hall; but it had not allayed the depth and strength of the feeling which prevailed at the North on this subject. While the gentleman was dreaming that abolition was dead, it was, in fact, gathering strength from his own efforts to suppress it.

There was, said Mr. S., a great mistake prevailing in regard to the effect of gag resolutions and gag rules. It was taking a narrow view of the subject to look only at the immediate result of the measure here. These men know very little of the nature of the abolition excitement who think to stop or retard it by denying the right of petition, and forbidding discussion in this Hall. They ought to know that, if obstructed in one channel, it will find another. The stream will roll on, obstruct it will. Who would think of stopping the Potomac by a dam? Raise it mountain high, and the sea will sweep it with it, and either sweep it high, or force a passage around it, and roll on to the ocean. It was just so with abolition. It mocks at gag resolutions and gag rules.

And let gentlemen beware of the direction which their own ill-advised measures might give to the abolition excitement. There was already a "third party" in existence, with candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency in the field. That party had been forced into being by the gag resolutions and rules which had been adopted here, and by kindred measures in other States. The re-adoption of the gag rule at this time would give a tremendous impulse to the movements of that party. Let gentlemen beware of the consequences of the act they were about to perform.

The great question of slavery, Mr. S. said, would have to be met in some form, sooner or later, and that not merely as a question of philanthropy and of human rights, but as one intimately connected with the finances of the country, affected as they are, free and slave labor. The institution of slavery is practically interwoven with the whole subject of political economy in this and in every country where it exists, and it must be discussed. But he would not now go into the subject. He would only repeat the expression of his anxious desire that the present session should not be consumed in the discussion of this question. He believed that the way to free action was, to drop the rule, upon which it could operate, or, if they should, that it might be laid upon the table, not under a rule odiously applicable to this subject alone, but under a resolution which should exclude from consideration at this session all subjects not embraced in the President's message. It seemed to him that that whole House, North, South, East, and West, might come together on this ground, and that the act might go forth to the country, not as a triumph of abolition or anti-abolition, but as a measure dictated by a sense of the urgent necessity of occupying all the time of the House in the great business for which it had been called together.

For the Liberator. Essex County Anti-Slavery Society. The annual meeting of the Essex County Anti-Slavery Society was held at Lynn, June 22d and 23d. Wm. Bassett, President, in the chair. A strong delegation was present from various parts of the county, showing that the cause has no diminution in the zeal and fidelity of the friends of emancipation in old Essex. The discussions were of an order among the members, and were continued for two days with unabated interest.

The meeting was opened with prayer by bro. Allen, of Rockport. The Secretary read the minutes of the last meeting, which were approved. The business committee offered the following resolution, which, after discussion, was adopted:—

Resolved, That the right to liberty, like that to life, is inalienable; and, consequently, the assertion that the slaves would not take their liberty, were it offered to them, is no justification of slavery; but on the other hand, shows the abomination and iniquity of that system, which can reduce immortal and accountable beings to the level of brute beasts, and to make them the willing chattels of another.

The Treasurer, J. N. Buffum, read his report, showing a deficit of about \$33.

Resolved, That a committee of three be chosen to nominate officers for the ensuing year.

Resolved, That the nomination of this committee, and all other nominations, be referred to the business committee, and after an animated debate, in which Messrs. Garrison, Pillsbury, Buffum, Davis, Boyce, Allen, Torrey, Cole, Jenkins, Harriman, Bishop, Whiting, and others participated, adopted:—

Resolved, That a committee of three be chosen to draft a petition. Chose W. L. Garrison, Geo. C. Leach, and Nathan Webster.

Resolved, That this Society recommend to the several town societies in the county, to cause dresses on slavery to be delivered in their respective churches, on the 4th day of July, and to wear said dresses on that day.

Resolved, That the anti-slavery cause is especially the cause of the "common people," and in order to promote its triumph, volunteer agents and lecturers, like the carpenter's son and the laborer of Galilee, are demanded to carry its principles to every school district and hamlet of our country.

Resolved, That the conduct of the Eastern Railroad Company, in their exclusion of Wm. Thomas Jennings, Jr., and others of color, from the following cities, on the 2d of July, is a flagrant violation of the laws which prescribe their duty as "common carriers," and is equally contrary to their charter, and to the spirit and the letter of the Bill of Rights of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That should they persist in this unjustifiable course, it should work a forfeiture of their charter, and bring upon the Directors, Supervisors, and all concerned, the weight of a public indignation, and a just reprobation.

Resolved, That these resolutions, signed by the President and Secretaries, be sent to the Superintendant of the Eastern Railroad.

mittees in all those towns which have hitherto interposed with the South. Resolved, That this Society has listened, with high satisfaction, to the reading of a letter from the Fishburne Glasgow Argus of the 24th ultimo, in which he declares that, in his opinion, "founded upon a full and accurate knowledge of the Society's operations from the commencement of its existence, and an intimate and endeared acquaintance with many of its most distinguished and devoted members, the American Anti-Slavery Society has maintained inviolate, both in the letter and in the spirit, the admirable Constitution which it originally adopted; that it has been steady true to the high principles put forth in its noble declarations, promulgated at the same time; that he considers it still essential to the sincere sympathy, the unabated confidence, and the earnest co-operation of the friends of the slave in Great Britain; and that he shall feel it to be, as he has ever done, an honor to be regarded as one of its humble supporters, and to share in its progress with which it may be assisted."

Adjourned to meet at half-past 7. Met according to adjournment. Resolved, That if the taskmasters of the South are determined to uphold and guard their impious system at all costs, they disregard all warnings, and put forth their insolent and selfish obduracy, it behooves them to know, that in case of a rebellion for liberty on the part of the oppressed people of the North, who are resolved never to accept any governmental requisition, (come what may, a penalty for disobedience,) to aid in restoring the supremacy of tyranny, and in subduing to chains and servitude those who may be struggling to be free.

Adjourned to meet at 9 o'clock, Wednesday morning. WEDNESDAY MORNING. Met according to adjournment. The annual report of the Board of Managers was read by the Corresponding Secretary. Voted that the report be accepted.

The report of the nominating committee was read, and after some discussion, was amended by the following:—Resolved, That the nominating committee be, as follows:—Messrs. William Ashley, Jr., Daniel C. Eaton, and Elizabeth C. Leach, of Rockport, be added to the list of Vice Presidents upon motion, it was voted that this report be accepted; also Voted, that the report be amended, and the persons therein named be chosen for the various offices for which they are nominated, as follows:—

President—WILLIAM BASSETT, Lynn. Vice Presidents—Ezekiel Hale, Jr. Haverhill; Wm. Jenkins, Andover; Stephen Barber, Methuen; A. G. Conings, Salem; John Smith, Andover; Christopher Robinson, Lynn; Thomas Hilditch, Gloucester; Jos. L. Noyes, Georgetown; Thos. Woodbridge, Marblehead; Charles Butler, Newburyport; Daniel C. Eaton, Rockport; Wm. Ashley, Jr., Salem; Richard Hood, Danvers; Elizabeth C. Leach, Gloucester.

Executive Committee—Abner Sargent, Danvers; Josiah Hayward, Salem; Mary P. Putnam, Danvers; Lydia Dean, Salem; Jesse P. Harriman, Danvers. Rec. Sec.—James D. Black, Danvers. Cor. Sec.—James B. Boyce, Lynn. Treas.—James N. Buffum, Lynn. Auditors—Jonathan Buffum, Lynn; Wm. B. Scott, Danvers; Sylvester P. Phelps, Salem.

Adjourned till 2 o'clock, P. M. Afternoon Session. Met according to adjournment. Voted, That the next quarterly meeting of this city be held in Newburyport. The discussion of the resolutions was resumed. Resolved, That the 4th of July cannot be properly observed by those who profess to be Christians, patriots, and republicans, and who are in the achievements of their revolutionary faith, as by considering it to anti-slavery purposes; it ought to be so consecrated, until the foot of a slave can no longer be seen on the American soil; that abolitionists should endeavor, as far as possible, to rally round the anti-slavery standard on that day; and that, while it is a matter of sincere regret to behold the triumphant progress of the tyrannical and other kindred reforms, the colored people of these, on "Independence Day," should be allowed to exclude the British flag, and to wear the awful emblem of three millions of American slaves. Resolved, That in the renewal of the GAG LAW by the present session of Congress, by which the right of petition has been again closed down to the people of the United States are denied all rights, except on those points which SLAVERY is the person of John (Tyler, a slaveholder), has been given to exclude the British flag, and to wear the awful emblem of three millions of American slaves.

Resolved, That a committee of three be chosen to draft a petition. Chose W. L. Garrison, Geo. C. Leach, and Nathan Webster.

Resolved, That this Society recommend to the several town societies in the county, to cause dresses on slavery to be delivered in their respective churches, on the 4th day of July, and to wear said dresses on that day.

Resolved, That the anti-slavery cause is especially the cause of the "common people," and in order to promote its triumph, volunteer agents and lecturers, like the carpenter's son and the laborer of Galilee, are demanded to carry its principles to every school district and hamlet of our country.

Resolved, That the conduct of the Eastern Railroad Company, in their exclusion of Wm. Thomas Jennings, Jr., and others of color, from the following cities, on the 2d of July, is a flagrant violation of the laws which prescribe their duty as "common carriers," and is equally contrary to their charter, and to the spirit and the letter of the Bill of Rights of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That should they persist in this unjustifiable course, it should work a forfeiture of their charter, and bring upon the Directors, Supervisors, and all concerned, the weight of a public indignation, and a just reprobation.

Resolved, That these resolutions, signed by the President and Secretaries, be sent to the Superintendant of the Eastern Railroad.

The Treasurer's report was accepted. Voted to adjourn till quarter before 8 P. M.

Evening. Met according to adjournment. The following resolution, having been duly adopted by Messrs. Whiting and Pillsbury, was read:—

Resolved, That, while a man-stealer fills the highest office in the gift of the American people, and while all the power to which he owes his position has been solemnly pledged to sustain and defend a man-stealer and robber in our country; and while the Massachusetts Grand Jury will exercise its authority to send a human being back to the stocks of a Southern prison-house, and while a man-stealer is welcomed to our pulpits, and loudly applauded by a large New-England audience, while heaven-defying arrogance he justified robbery, man-stealing, and murder; and while abolitionists are excommunicated for no crime but for

THE LIBERATOR.

BOSTON:

FRIDAY MORNING, JULY 2, 1841.

Fourth of July.

By appointment of the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, an address on the subject of slavery will be delivered on Sabbath evening next, July 4th, at the Marlboro' Chapel, by Mrs. L. G. LORRAN. Services to commence at 7 o'clock. The conclusion of which will be taken up in aid of the cause. The audience is invited to attend.

Grounds for Secession.

In the last annual report of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, all the charges which had been brought against it by those who had seceded from it, were fully and accurately grouped together, and were shown to be well founded, by an appeal to the official proceedings and documents of the Society. No recitation was ever more triumphant—no exposure more complete than that of the mischiefs which were ever more terrible to the plotters of mischief.

In the second annual report of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, (to which reference was made in the Liberator,) an elaborate but not a full attempt is made to impair the force of this evidence. Twelve columns of the *Free American* are occupied in raising the grounds for the secession, and in stating of which has, in fact, any thing to do with the question at issue. It is nearly all of it devoted to an exposition, not of the mischiefs which are devoted to the State Anti-Slavery Society, but of the individual heresies.

The impudence, the folly, the malice, the degradation of mind exhibited in the Report, demonstrate alike the guilt and the fatuity of new organization, and prove that it is indeed a wicked and a base course, to find any plausible excuse for its secession. It has been already stated that the Report was drawn up by Amos A. Phelps and Charles T. Torrey, who were the leading and most active seceders in the Commonwealth, and whose names will long constitute a black feature in anti-slavery history. They have done their best—i. e. their worst—of course; and the Abolition Society, whose work is their own, has signified that having made their plea in its own defence, or holding more can be urged in its own defence, or holding more can be urged in its own defence.

For myself, I most respectfully declare that, in my judgment, this Report merely establishes the innocence of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and the criminality of the new, than any paper which has yet appeared on either side of the question—not excepting the triumphant vindication of the former, to which allusion has already been made.

When I proceed to examine the document under consideration, there are two or three points which I wish to impress upon the memory of the reader. 1. Every society or organization is to be measured by its own standard, and held responsible for its own proceedings, but it is not for the opinions or conduct of any individual member.

2. If evidence in favor of or against an association, references must be had to its official organ, papers or proceedings; or, in other words, to what it actually approves or rejects, as an association; and if no evidence can be valid which is drawn from any other source. If, for example, there were individual members of the Colonization Society, who changed and avowed dangerous opinions on the subject of slavery, or on any other subject, the Society would not justly be held responsible for the opinions, unless it sanctioned them as a body.

3. If the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society has departed from the broad, catholic ground which it formerly occupied—if it has become a mere automation in the hands of a few designing individuals—it must and can be shown from its official acts. If no matter may be proved against one or more individuals connected with it. The only pertinent question is—What has the Society done?

4. On the anti-slavery platform, all sectarian and party views are professedly forgotten; and the friends of bleeding humanity meet for the promotion of a common object. But though, by the very nature of their organization, they are restricted, while standing on that platform, from attempting to proselytize on their peculiar religious or political views to other subjects, they may nevertheless, as individuals, or as their responsibility, be as zealous as they please in inculcating their sentiments as Methodists, Baptists, Universalists, Infidels, Whigs, Democrats, &c. &c. They do not consent to have their right to speak or act in the spirit of freedom, on all questions that may challenge the attention of the human mind, because they are willing to band together as abolitionists; and whoever denies to them this right, or refuses to walk with them in anti-slavery fellowship because of its exercise, is a bigot in principle, or an oppressor in grain.

5. I have never been, and have never aspired to be, the accredited mouth-piece of the abolitionists of the Commonwealth, or of the Republic. From the commencement of my labors, I have acted for myself, on my own responsibility, as a common soldier, and without asking any man, or any association, to endorse my conduct as an abolitionist. I am connected with the old anti-slavery organization on the same terms and under the same restrictions as hold myself responsible only so far as I give them my aid; and never have I wished or attempted to modify its action contrary to its original structure and design.

6. The Liberator is not and has never been the official organ of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, or of any other association. It is, and it has ever been, a strictly independent journal, under my exclusive control, for the management of which no other person in the wide universe is responsible but myself. Whatever may be its merits or its faults, therefore, the praise or the blame belongs to me alone.

7. These points have been repeatedly stated in the course of the controversy which has grown out of the secession from the anti-slavery platform; but it is essential to the formation of a correct judgment on the part of the candid inquirer, in relation to the merits of this controversy, that he bear them continually in mind.

8. Having thus frankly stated the position which I occupy as an abolitionist, and defined the limits and responsibilities of the anti-slavery association, I now proceed to show that the grounds set forth for the secession in the Report of the Massachusetts Abolition Society are untenable, that a false issue is made in that document, and, consequently, that all the charges which have been brought against the old organization are well founded.

9. First, it must be premised, that if the original constitution of the State Anti-Slavery Society was unobjectionable to the seceders, then, in order to justify their secession, they are bound to show that they no longer regard it as a sound instrument, or that it has been so altered as to be fundamentally wrong in principle. It will not suffice to show that, in two or three instances, a wrong interpretation has been put upon the language of the constitution by the majority of the society; for the minority cannot be bound by any such interpretation, and it is for them, under such circumstances, not to secede, but to endeavor to convince the majority of the error into which they may have fallen. Now, it is not pretended by the seceders, that any change has been made in the constitution of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society; or that they cannot any longer assent to its principles; or that they have any objection to its original structure and design.

10. The Report under consideration professes to give the anti-slavery history of the origin and progress of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and to justify its secession from the old organization. It is a full and complete history of the origin and progress of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and to justify its secession from the old organization.

11. In 1836, it is alleged that I expressed an opinion adverse to the sending of female delegates to the annual meeting of the American Society, on the ground that it was never contemplated, and would make trouble. Another good reason for the secession from the Massachusetts Society in 1839? Crime No. 10.

The items of which this important history is composed in the Report will certainly amuse, if they fail to convince 'posteriorly' of the genuineness of the new organization—that is, if such an abortion shall ever meet the eyes of posterity.

It will be remembered, that the charges which have been brought against the old pioneer society are that (in the language of the present Report) it has been made, by a deliberate and well-natured design, 'on the part of one or two individuals,' a substitute to the promotion of their personal and sectarian views on the subjects of Women's Rights, so called, Civil Government, the Church, the Ministry, and the Sabbath!!! Orange Scott has styled it a "rotten-hearted, no human good, women's rights institution."

Let us now see in what manner these accusations are sustained in the Report; for, as they are weighty, all will admit that the evidence adduced to show their accuracy should be ample and explicit.

It is denied in the Report, that any of those who have been prominent in the secession, have been actuated by personal feelings towards myself! "It is believed that, to this hour, they are all on terms of perfect personal friendship and good will (!) to Mr. Garrison, and that when they meet him, as they occasionally do, they meet as friends, (&) with no personal animosities whatever toward each other." If such men are my friends, then I have never had any enemies. They have spared no pains to make me appear hideous in the eyes of individuals and of the public. They have represented me as a cunning, crafty, unprincipled man, a heretic in religion, a Jacobin in politics, seeking nothing but the gratification of my own selfish ambition, and basely intent upon subverting the integrity of the anti-slavery enterprise. They have assailed me with an apparent ferocity of spirit, and a malignity of purpose, surpassing any thing that I have experienced at the hands of the open and avowed enemies of the abolition movement. And yet they have the cool effrontery to disclaim any personal ill-will, and to assume to be 'on terms of perfect personal friendship' with me! I can forgive them even this additional outrage; but I tell them it is impossible for me to regard them as entitled to my confidence or friendship. If they are my friends, then I have only to adopt the exclamation of another—'Save me from my friends, and I will take care of my enemies!'

The Report mainly consists of a series of personal attacks upon sundry individuals, of which any association, having a just sense of decency, magnanimity or honor, would be justly ashamed.

But, to the point—to wit, the 'facts' demonstrating that the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society had so far become changed in its character and object as to justify secession from it.

All its own members, and all regular delegates or members of auxiliary societies, were allowed to participate in its proceedings; just as in the case of the American Society and other kindred bodies. This had been its uniform practice from its commencement. Some towns being nearer Boston, and more thoroughly abolitionized, than others, were naturally more fully represented at the annual meeting of the Society, than those which were remote, or which had less zeal and spirit in the cause. For refusing to make any geographical distinctions or artificial arrangements in its meetings, so as to cripple the free action of a large portion of those who were among its most valuable supporters, this stands in the category of new organization—as Crime No. 1!

2. Mr. Fowler, the phrenologist, in giving 'Mr. Garrison's phrenological development,' says—'He has more forethought than he manifests, is full of new schemes and projects, seldom or never commits himself, generally keeps his plans and feelings to himself, &c. Hence one reason for the secession!'

3. In 1837, [Mr. Garrison] used frequently to remark, that nothing thorough and effectual could be effected for temperance and abolition, until we had some more radical and genuine reform.' Nay, he said 'he was led to fear that all efforts to avert the pending calamity of the annexation of Texas to the Union would prove abortive, and that our national destruction was sealed.' Hence another reason for the secession from the Massachusetts Society! Crime No. 3!

4. In a letter addressed to Orson S. Murray, of Vermont, dated August 11, 1837, I said—'In giving my attention to the degradation and misery of two millions of American bondmen, I do not forget mankind. How monstrous! My mind is busy in the investigation of many subjects, &c. How dangerous! 'The subject of peace is among them, and is peculiarly dear to me.' Worse and worse! 'I hope to be more deeply engaged in it by and by, than I am at present.' This is truthful! Hence a fourth reason for the secession! This is charged upon the State Society, by implication, as—Crime No. 4!

5. In Worcester, Oct. 2, 1837, 'at noon, [the precise moment is not specified in the Report!] at the house of Mr. Earle, Messrs. Stanton, Green and others being present, the conversation turned upon the merits of Thompsonianism. Mr. Garrison avowed himself a believer in the theory, [shocking!] and added, with much emphasis, 'Law, medicine and divinity are the three great impostures of the day.' Hence a fifth reason for seceding from the old society! Put this down against it as—Crime No. 5!

6. In the Liberator of Oct. 13th, 1836, a letter was published, and endorsed by Mr. Garrison, in which the writer said—'The present governments stand in the way of God's kingdom, just as Colonization once stood in the way of Abolition. They occupy the ground, without effecting the object, &c. And he further declared—'God, by his spirit, has moved me to nominate Jesus Christ for the Presidency, not only of the United States, but of the world.' Hence the sixth reason for the abandonment of the State Society! Crime No. 6.

7. Messrs. Phelps, Whitier, E. Wright, Jr., Father Ward, N. Crosby, Esq., and Rev. C. W. Denison, remonstrated with Mr. Garrison for allowing such sentiments to appear in the columns of the Liberator; but he turned a deaf ear to all their remonstrances—telling them that if they could refute those sentiments, he would give them a hearing. He persisted in doing just as he pleased with his own publication! Record it against the State Society as—Crime No. 7!

8. Mr. Garrison read a letter from James Boyle, of Ohio, relating to the spiritual and political condition of the country, in the presence of 'John E. Fuller' and others, and 'spoke of it in terms of the highest commendation—saying, in substance, that, however unpopular its doctrines, they were true, and would yet be received by the people.' And so secret was he about it, that he actually 'sifted it in' to the Liberator, that the whole country might read it! Another reason for the separation from the State Society! Crime No. 8!

9. The *Anti-Slavery and Anti-Slavery Convention* in 1838, invited 'all persons present, whether men or women, to become members, and participate in its proceedings.' Put this down against the State Society as—Crime No. 9!

10. In 1836, it is alleged that I expressed an opinion adverse to the sending of female delegates to the annual meeting of the American Society, on the ground that it was never contemplated, and would make trouble. Another good reason for the secession from the Massachusetts Society in 1839? Crime No. 10.

11. On the 25th of February, 1839, Oliver Johnson, addressed a letter to the church in Middlebury, Vt. with which he was connected, in which he gave his views of 'the nature of the church organizations of the present day!' What an outrage upon anti-slavery liberty! Nay, the 'Rev. Alanson St. Clair' affirms that Mr. Johnson once said to him, 'Any thing to give the clergy a job!' Hence, another reason for secession from the Mass. A. S. Society. Crime No. 11!

12. In his reply to the Clerical Appeal, 'Mr. Garrison declared that the great mass of the clergy were nothing better than hirelings, in the bad sense of that term, and that their overthrow is registered on the scroll of Destiny.' For this, the State Society must be held responsible. It is—Crime No. 12!

13. 'In Sept. 1833, the New-England Non-Resistance Convention came.' Oct. 5th of that year, Mrs. M. W. Chapman wrote an editorial article in the *Non-Resistant*, in which she defined the 'church originally,' and 'voluntary associations' now, to be substantially the same thing. Of course, the guilt of this daring act belonged to the old society! Crime No. 13!

14. In a letter from James Boyle, published in the Liberator, the writer said—'Lawyers, doctors and priests are the devil's trinity—and professions, as such, must perish.' Hence, another reason for new organization! Crime No. 14!

15. At the annual meeting of the American A. S. Society in May, 1840, a resolution was adopted, affirming that 'the American church has given its undisguised sanction and support to the system of American slavery, and therefore ought not to be regarded and treated as the church of Christ, but as the foe of freedom, humanity, and pure religion, so long as it occupies its present position.' This is gravely brought forward among the reasons to justify the secession, although that resolution (which is an anti-slavery truth) was adopted after the secession had taken place! This, too, is put down to the account of the Massachusetts A. S. Society, and is—Crime No. 15!

16. On the 3d of July, 1840, an article appeared in the National Standard, not as 'editorial,' nor 'prepared for the purpose of expressing the views of the new Executive Committee of the old society,' as the Report falsely declares, but written on the sole responsibility of a single individual, the initials of whose name were appended to it,—in which the opinion is advanced, that the anti-slavery reform in this country is necessarily of a far more radical character than 'the abolition of negro physical slavery,' and will 'unsettle popular theology [which is pro-slavery] from its throne, break down the barriers of sect, (which is pro-slavery,) and, in short, resolve society into its natural elements, [now thrown into a most unnatural state,] saving all the real progress it has made in the scale of improvement.' [a terrible loss truly!] It is, of course, perfectly fair to charge upon the Mass. A. S. Society the errors (?) of an anonymous writer in the Standard, and to make a newspaper article, written in 1840, a reason for seceding from the State Society in 1839! Put it down, therefore, in the account, as—Crime No. 16!

17. In November last, a 'Church, Ministry and Sabbath Convention' was held in Boston. [No doubt the sun rose and set, and stars were seen at night, and the weather was somewhat cold, and many other monstrous events happened, during that month; for all which, the Mass. A. S. Society must fairly be held accountable!] The result of that meeting, its denial of the Sabbath [a falsehood—it took no action whatever upon the subject] and the ministry [ditto!] and, above all, its rejection of the Bible as of supreme authority in matters of religious faith and duty, [ditto!] are well known.' Hence, another reason for the new organization in 1839! Here, then, is—Crime No. 17!

18. 'Mr. H. G. Chapman met Mr. Stanton in the anti-slavery office, 25 Cornhill,' and the Report says, expressed a very contemptuous opinion of the old executive committee at New-York, (in view of their unmanly and unjust treatment of the State Society,) couched in highly reprehensible language. The manner in which this language (if it be accurately given,) uttered (if it were uttered at all) in the heat of excitement, in private conversation, is dragged into this Report, during the absence of Mr. Chapman from the country, evinces a spirit not far from diabolical. But the Mass. A. S. Society, as such, must be made responsible for the private behaviour of its members! Crime No. 18!

19. Some time ago, two pictures, drawn in pencil, and intended as a humorous satire, were suspended a day or two in the office at 25, Cornhill, without leave, on the responsibility of an individual not connected with the Anti-Slavery or the Non-Resistance Society. The design of these was to place the furious opposition of Orange Scott, William Goodell and others, to the divine cause of non-resistance in a just though ludicrous point of view. For instance—'In one picture was drawn Bro. Scott alone, in the dress of a soldier, with high boots, long huge spurs, epaulets on the shoulders, Napoleon hat, high nodding plume, a long sword hanging by the left side, a brace of pistols in his belt, a huge bowie-knife in his left hand, and in the right, a lance or spear, one end resting on the ground, and from the other hanging a flowing streamer, labelled 'the staff of accomplishment.' From his mouth were proceeding the words: 'I hate non-resistance with a perfect hatred; the Prince of Peace is not the Prince of Orange.' Under his feet in large capitals, were the words, 'AN AMBASSADOR OF THE PRINCE OF PEACE IN FULL CANONICALS.'

This was intended to illustrate the true position in which those, who profess to be the 'ambassadors of the Prince of Peace,' are placed by availing themselves of carnal weapons against enemies. It is said that birds that have been hit are easily known by their fluttering, and that the coat is very apt to be put on by those whom it suits. Now, the clamor which has been made on account of those harmless sketches, by such peaceful belligerents as the *Reverend Messrs. Colver, Phelps, St. Clair, Wise, Torrey, Cummings, &c. &c.* is in the highest degree ludicrous, and speaks volumes as to the pertinency of their application. They who sanction the use of deadly weapons must not be offended if they are represented armed at all points to defend themselves in case of an assault! They who uphold a government, which keeps a standing army and a navy to execute its bloody purposes, must not foam at the mouth when they are portrayed in a military or naval dress! What they justify in others, they ought not to regard as an affront when alleged against themselves. What they say others may lawfully do, they concede may be lawfully done in their own persons. There have been very many caricatures of abolitionists by their opponents; but whoever saw an abolitionist angry on that account?

It is only when the portraits is 'drawn to the life,' and the individual thus sketched is conscious that he is justly placed in a ridiculous or a criminal attitude, that displeasure is excited, and the spirit writhes in agony. If Mr. Comstock's illustrations of the anti-non-resistance position of Messrs. Scott, Whitier and Goodell had been palpably absurd and monstrous, then, instead of making these individuals ridiculous, the necessary effect would have been to cover the artist with shame, and to injure the non-resistance enterprise. If they merely caricatured, (as they did without any approach to caricature,) the principles and doctrines maintained by the persons represented, then why so much heat and excitement on the part of the new organization opponents of non-resistance, unless they are conscious that the mirror has been held up to nature?

This course but playful effort of genius on the part of Mr. Comstock was immediately seized upon by the seceders, to excite odium against the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and to justify their own schismatical conduct, as 'drawing men catch at straws.' They have expatiated upon it in private and in public, in their journals and lectures, in se-

son and out of season, as though it were a very dreadful affair—more shocking to humanity than the battle at Waterloo, or the naval conflict at Trafalgar! They have even dignified it so far, and magnified it so largely, as actually to have held it up on the other side of the Atlantic as an intolerable grievance and a terrible affront!! This caps the climax of human weakness and folly. The fabric of the mountain in labor, that brought forth a mouse, or of the tempest in a teapot, is grave in comparison. It proves that some men, at least, are but children of a larger growth. Small children would be ashamed to make so much 'ado about nothing.' The attempt to make the State Society, or its Board of Managers, responsible for the pictures alluded to, because they happened to be pinned up at 25, Cornhill, by the individual who drew them, is alike impudent and absurd. Yet it is charged upon them in the Report as—Crime No. 20!

No marvel that the Executive Committee of the Abolition Society say that 'they are humbled and mortified' at the pitiful reasons which they present in their Report for the secession from the old society. They ought to be. The marvel is, that they should be so infatuated as to resort to low artifices, and coarse personalities, and the presentation of false issues, and suppose that in this manner they would be able to justify themselves in the eyes of an enlightened people.

There are various other equally grave and awful counts in the indictment against the Mass. A. S. Society—such as that 'Mrs. Chapman is known to have said to Mr. Garrison repeatedly, 'Your first business is to crush the clergy'—that 'George W. Benson and William Chace (?) are family connections of Mr. Garrison'—that the wife of Wendell Phillips 'is a relative, and when here an inmate of the senior Chapman family'—that (Alanson St. Clair being witness) Joshua V. Himes is 'a no-government and woman's rights man, and a cordial later of evangelical Christians'—&c. &c. Upon these I shall not pause to comment, but allude only to one other point—viz.

20. The Massachusetts A. S. Society is accused of refusing to adopt language on the subject of political action, which it formerly used, affirming it to be the duty of abolitionists to vote at the polls. The simple fact is, that such language was never adopted with invidious or proscriptive intent, but always in a popular sense, as applicable only to those who were in the habit of going to the polls; and at no time was it intended to mean any thing more than that abolition voters were bound, by their own standard, to be as zealous and faithful at the ballot-box in the cause of the slave, as they had once been in favor of party. Several of the signers of the Declaration of Sentiments at Philadelphia, in 1833, and of those who assisted in the formation of the National Society, have not voted from that day to this. Is it to be supposed that they would have appended their names to an instrument, binding them to the discharge of a certain act which they never meant to perform? Preposterous idea! As soon, however, as the Non-Resistance Society was organized, Messrs. Stanton, Phelps, Torrey, Scott, Colver, Birney, and others, began to make war upon it, in their anti-slavery character, and to interpret the language of the Philadelphia Declaration and the Constitution of the National Society in a sense never before contemplated; and avowedly on purpose to exclude from the organization, or to subject to censure, such members of the anti-slavery society as were conscientiously scrupulous against voting at the polls in any case whatever. Perceiving the object of this unjust procedure, the State Society refused to sanction it even in appearance; and hence the clamor that has been raised by the seceders on this point. But, in the teeth of all their charges, it still remains true, that—in the language of the last annual report of the Society—

'Not a sentence in favor of the peculiar doctrines of non-resistance can be found in any of its publications; nor has any resolution respecting that subject ever been discussed in any of its meetings. Our non-resistance brethren are as much opposed to its introduction on the anti-slavery platform as those who have seceded from our ranks; and in an instance, to our knowledge or belief, have they ever attempted to obtain the sanction either of this or any other anti-slavery society, to non-resistance principles or measures. On the contrary, while they are giving their zealous and efficient support to our enterprise, they have marked out their own distinct course as non-resistance.'

And again: 'On the subject of 'political action,' the Society constantly inculcates the doctrine, that anti-slavery should be the paramount question at the polls, to the sacrifice of all mere party considerations, by all those who wield the elective franchise;—and that it is highly inconsistent for abolitionists to vote for slaveholders or pro-slavery candidates; but it does not make it a part of the anti-slavery creed to mingle in the duty of every man to mingle or not to mingle in the political conflicts of the country—for that is an 'extraneous topic.' The Society could occupy no other ground without being 'sectarian,' and destroying its own platform.'

I have thus examined all the evidence which is adduced in the Abolition Report, intended to justify the secession; but, it will at a glance be seen, that of the twenty specifications, only two of them relate to the action of the Society—all the rest being personal attacks upon individual members, for whose conduct or opinions the Society is not any more responsible than the present national administration. To these two, the Society must plead guilty; for one is, that all its members are left free to participate in its proceedings; and the other is, that no religious or political test is made a condition of membership.

It is scarcely credible that such a scandalous Report should have been intelligently adopted by an association making some pretensions to decency and self-respect; but the official record declares that it obtained the sanction of the Massachusetts Abolition Society at its late annual meeting. 'O Shame! where is thy blush?'

State Meeting at Millbury. The semi-annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society was held at 25, Cornhill, on Monday forenoon last, without transacting any business, as few members were present. On motion, it was adjourned to the 17th of August, to be held at Millbury, at the special request of the friends of the Society in that part of the Commonwealth. In consequence of this arrangement, the meeting of the Worcester County (South Division) A. S. Society, and also the Anti-Slavery Fair, both of which were to have been held at Millbury on the 5th instant, will be postponed until the 17th of next month, at which time it is intended to rally a large gathering of the friends of emancipation.

In this connection we would add, that it is in contemplation to hold a county meeting at Nantucket, between the 1st and the 10th of August, of which due notice will be given hereafter.

JOSEPH STURGE. A 'public tea party' was given to Joseph Sturge, of England, and Charles Stewart Renshaw, of Jamaica, (formerly of this country,) in the hall beneath the Marlboro' Chapel, on Friday evening last. It was exclusively managed by the Executive Committee of the Massachusetts Abolition Society, although every body (even women not excepted!) was invited to be present, on the payment of \$1.00 for a ticket. A sumptuous entertainment, it is said, was provided by Mr. Rogers, of the Marlboro' Hotel, on a scale to accommodate some three or four hundred persons. About one hundred and twenty-five were present. As it was a new organization movement—as Mr. Sturge has identified himself with that movement, on both sides of the Atlantic—as he is a member of the London Convention, which combined with the London Convention to reject, by a purely despotic act, on account of their sex, a portion of the delegates sent by the American A. S. Society to the latter body—the friends of primitive abolitionism in Boston and vicinity, with scarcely an exception, took no lot or part in the matter. The veracious correspondent of Mr. Sturge, 'Reverend Nathaniel Colver,' acted as chairman on the occasion. Addresses were made by Messrs. Sturge, Renshaw, Colver, &c.

In the course of his remarks, we are told, Mr. Sturge said he was a peace man; 'but, though a friend of peace, he did not wish to be understood as sympathizing with those who were for weakening the arm of civil government'—i. e. in the abstract, he was against the use of carnal weapons; but, practically, he went with those who wield them destructively against their enemies! This 'extraneous' thrust at non-resistance was deemed very pertinent to the occasion, and received by the company with much satisfaction. According to the *Free American*, 'the divine blessing was invoked, in silence, after the manner of the Friends.' This sanctioning of *Quakerism* was not 'extraneous,' of course. How easily new organizations can stray at a gnat, and swallow a camel!

COUNTY MEETING AT LYNN. The anti-slavery of Old Essex is constantly improving in quality. The proceedings of the county meeting at Lynn, last week, (see preceding page,) furnish matter for the serious consideration of the pro-slavery north and the slaveholding south. The end is not yet. Blessed are all they who shall endure to the end, and, having done all, shall be able to stand. We call the special attention of abolitionists to the resolution adopted, respecting the observance of 'Independence Day'—and that of southern slaveholders to the resolution respecting a servile insurrection and a civil war, that may one day overwhelm them in destruction, by their refusal to consent to a speedy and peaceful abolition of their diabolical slave system. They are warned!

FROM AFRICA. The British brig Emily, Capt. Cooper, has arrived at New-York, from Sierra Leone, which she left May 11th. It was very sickly at that place, and Sir John Jeremie, the Governor-General, had died.

The Boston Vigilance Committee. Held a public meeting in Tremont Chapel, on Thursday evening last. Between four and five hundred were present, including many of the pro-slavery merchants of the city. The kidnapping case, and the general principles on which the committee was established, were explained by the Secretary; after which, addresses were made by Rev. Messrs. Colver, Cummings, and Snowdon. The remarks of Mr. Colver, in defence of the right and duty of aiding the fugitive, and the pithy and humorous address of Father Snowdon, were received with great applause. Much interest was evidently excited in the objects of the committee. A collection, amounting to nearly \$18, was taken up in aid of its funds.

I will take this occasion to remark, that the committee need a prompt and large addition to their funds, in order to prosecute several important measures, now in contemplation, for the security of the rights of the colored man, in our State. The Treasurer, or Secretary, will be happy to receive them. Donations will be acknowledged in the Liberator and *Free American*.

Two facts should here be noticed. JOSE TORREY, the poor kidnapped man, has been returned to his tyrant, in Newbern, N. C. The Newbern Spectator announces the fact, with prizes of the 'magnanimity' of the Captain, Higgins, for refusing to receive any part of the reward of \$300, offered for the apprehension of the poor fugitive! Magnanimity, indeed! Say rather, regard for southern trade!

Another case of kidnapping occurred in this city, the very day our committee was organized. Several days after, I heard a rumor of the arrival of a slave, went on board the brig Reporter, and the Captain denied having spoken any British ship out of Charleston. He little thought his knavery would come to light. The Woodstock, which was turned into a slave ship to carry the poor man back, was cleared June 6th, by BLAKE & BECK. The Reporter arrived the day before. 'The Savannah Georgian of June 18th says:—

'The brig Woodstock, Capt. Davis, arrived at that port on the 17th, from Boston, having on board a negro slave named Peter, the property of Jonathan Lucas of Charleston, S. C. who was found secured on board the British ship Wilson, from Charleston, bound to Liverpool; who, two days out, fell in with the brig Reporter, Capt. Hawthorn, from Havana, bound to Boston, and put the said fugitive slave on board, with a request that immediately on his arrival at that port, he would put him on board the first vessel bound to the South, which he did, by delivering him to Capt. Davis.'

The Charleston, S. C. Patriot mentions the facts, and adds that they occurred 'without any requisitions from Governors, or any other long-winded controversy. This, and the late case in Boston, where the GRAND JURY refused to find a bill against the Captain of a vessel for detaining and carrying back a negro who had concealed himself on board at Newbern, N. C. shows that all men at the North are not enemies to the rights of the South. Such conduct deserves OUR WARM APPROVAL AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.'

Surely, the measure of our disgrace is full! Has Boston, Massachusetts sunk so low, that there is no redemption for her? Shall slavery exult over our base surrender of our rights and our laws? Captain Higgins, and these other kidnappers stalk abroad on our streets unwelcome to justice, because the GRAND JURY choose to disregard their solemn, their sworn duty. How long shall such things be? Let free men, who are worthy to be free, answer, and that speedily.

CHARLES T. TORREY, Secretary of the B. V. Committee.

Triumph of Villany. The following account of the conduct and reception of Ben. Higgins, on his arrival home after his acquittal by the Grand Jury for Suffolk, is from the Yarmouth Register:—

A correspondent at Eastham writes as follows:—'Mr. Ben. Higgins, late mate of the schr. Wellington, arrived home on Friday last, and hoisted a white flag in presence of a number of his fellow-citizens, feeling assured that the Legislature of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued, but to proceed on the voyage to Boston? It is a matter of surprise to some of our officers that the *Legislator* of Massachusetts never intended to punish a man for honestly endeavoring to preserve peace between two sovereign States (!) He states that when the slave was discovered, the crew refused to return to any slave State. What other course, then, could be pursued,

