

TERMS.—Three dollars per annum, in advance. Four copies will be sent to one address for the regular price, if payment is made in advance.

Advertisements of a square and over inserted three times at five cents per line; less than a square, 75 cents for three insertions. Yearly and half yearly advertisements inserted on reasonable terms.

The Agents of the American, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Michigan Anti-Slavery Societies are authorized to receive subscriptions for THE LIBERATOR.

The following gentlemen constitute the Financial Committee, but are not responsible for any debts of the paper, viz:—WESLEY PHILLIPS, EDWARD QUINCY, ROBERT JACKSON, and WILLIAM L. GARRISON, JR.

W. LLOYD GARRISON, Editor.



Our Country is the World, our Countrymen are all Brethren.

Refuge of Oppression.

GEORGE THOMPSON IN AMERICA AGAIN.

When the rebellion broke out, and for a long time after, the British Abolitionists sympathized openly with the rebels. We were astonished at this, and thought it a wicked inconsistency in them to wish success to a rebellion made in behalf of slavery.

Mr. Thompson finds a different condition of things here. The Cause stands firmer than ever, though the Garrison Abolitionists are not yet reconciled to it, and the people of the North have shown their real feelings towards slavery by welcoming gladly the opportunity offered by the war to seek its utter destruction.

MOSSIEUR TONSON COME AGAIN.

George Thompson, of England, has come to our shores again, and is being glorified in Boston. When he was here before, he was followed and fawned upon by a certain uneducated and conceited class, and he has been in correspondence with them, more or less, ever since, and has been quite a big gun, in his paper way, of that foolish and functionless abolitionism which has been the practice of our British Abolitionists for the last twenty years.

GEORGE THOMPSON AT THE COOPER INSTITUTE.

That pioneer English abolitionist, George Thompson, has had his public reception at the Cooper Institute, and it seems to have been very good of it, in contrast with his rough treatment here on his first visit to this country, thirty years ago, and his second, thirty years later. But the contrast between the Thompson of 1834 and 1864, and the Thompson of 1864, will explain why, in our days of sectional peace and harmony, he was regarded as an unwelcome interloper; and why, in these days of our terrible civil war, he is received without any signs of a hostile public opinion.

ing broadcast over the land have sprung up into legions of armed men, engaged in the dreadful work of slaughtering each other. The labor of his hands as an abolition pioneer missionary having ripened into a plentiful harvest of blood, he returns to claim his reward. He comes to rejoice over our misfortunes and to glory in his work. He comes as a philanthropist, when at least his whole career has been that of a reckless fanatic. Having wasted his time, talents and money in the perditionous business of inflaming the two sections of this country to the arbitrament of fire and sword, and when we are taxing all our resources to the uttermost to save the life of the nation, he returns from England as a distressed philanthropist and a money beggar.

DISLOYAL UNIONISM.

George W. Thompson, the intermeddling British Abolitionist, who, several years ago, visited this country, and boldly advocated disunion, had a reception at Cooper Institute, New York, last night. General John C. Fremont was to preside, and, we presume, did so. The New York Tribune, speaking on the subject, says:—

"There are prejudices against Mr. Thompson among our people, growing out of the fact that he was among us thirty years ago, when 'Liberty and Union' were not one and inseparable, and he stood sternly for Liberty. 'The Union being a Shibboleth of oppression, he repudiated the giant wrong and all its hiding-places. But, from the hour when slavery sought the life of our country, he has been of equal service to the disunion faction of the South.—New York Herald.

LETTERS FROM ENGLAND. NO. V.

BIOGRAPHY OF GEO. THOMPSON, ESQ.

BY WILLIAM FARMER, ESQ.

Mr. Thompson's connection with the Anti-Corn Law League, which was in fact a society for the abolition of the slavery which the landocracy of this country had imposed upon its industry, commenced soon after his rejection of the tempting offer made to him by the Protectionists; and in 1841 he rendered that organization—and through it the country at large—a service, which, if not the proximate, was the remote cause of the abolition of the bread tax, and other imposts upon the necessities of life, shortly afterwards.

and consideration one towards another, deserving the highest admiration, and furnishing the demonstration that, where the good of our country is at stake, men can merge all differences which divide them out of doors, in a generous and combined effort for the rescue of their suffering brethren. (Loud applause.) Your conference has been distinguished by catholicity without compromise; by a stern maintenance of the cardinal principles of Christian morality, without the slightest abatement of your attachment to those peculiarities by which, as sects and religious parties, you are known. What language could more apply or do more justice to the noble enterprise of the men who joined in the last session of this liberal society than the subsequent censured Mr. Thompson for his philanthropic association with American Abolitionists, because some of them did not exactly pronounce their own theological shibboleth! The same anti-slavery application may also be made of the following passage:—Prompted by a feeling of humanity, inspired by the genius of the gospel, and touched with pity for the miseries of those around them, a noble army of seven hundred men, the soldiers of Christ, the preachers of rightness, have left their homes, and the altars at which they minister, and have come up to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty. (Hear, hear, and applause.) There have not been wanting those who, by anticipation, have poured contempt on the noble effort. Predictions of failure, charges of incompetence, the imputation of low and sordid motives, have been plentiful. But your numbers, your demeanor, the spirit you have displayed, the wisdom you have brought to the task, the absence of any petty and party feeling, by which all your doings have been clouded, and the hope of the wicked to the winds, and have given the friends of perishing humanity assurance that the ministers of religion in Great Britain, from Caithness to Cornwall, and from Cape Clear to Holyhead, are men who can, when necessary, bury in one grave their polemical animosities and their partisan predilections, and, as brethren, unite to assert the rights of the poor, and defend the cause of the oppressed. The first day's chairman, the Rev. Thomas Adkins, in opening the proceedings, asked for what the conference was convened; and then gave the following reply to the question:—Not to place ourselves in hostile array, sect against sect, and party against party, (applause,) within the narrow lines of sectarian denomination; not to hurl at each other the brutal fulmen of excommunication, placing the unhappy delinquent under the ban of exclusion in this world; and consigning him to final perdition in the next; but to harmonize the jarring elements of conflicting creeds, and to bring brethren together who can hardly enter into the minds of the most eminent Christians, but less than which cannot satisfy ours. (Loud applause.) We are met together, brethren and fathers, at the call of suffering humanity, (applause,) and that call reaches us, not across the briny ocean, but through the green valleys and populous streets of our own native land. We are, I admit, met at the very outset of our procedure by a query, 'What have Christian, and, more than all, Christian ministers, to do with tenets which are so denigrating to that kingdom which is the object of our labors, and which we are to forego the immunities, and forget the duties that relate to the present life. I have yet to learn how, when we begin to be Christians, we cease to be men.' Is it not a lamentable fact that many of these Orthodox ministers did subsequently most grievously apostatize from this truly catholic faith? that they hurried their brethren into excommunication against the American Abolitionists; that they placed them under the ban of the edictum, and that they refused to give any perfect agreement with their anti-slavery principles? Dr. Frye Smith said, 'We have come together in no capacity, assumed or implied, expressed or imagined, of authority. We are not a convective, nor a synod, nor a convocation. We disclaim any pretensions of a right to make laws or regulations, or any desire to bind the consciences of our fellow Christians, or to command their practice.' They were willing then to suspend for the time, for the sake of the common cause and the broadest possible platform, their own denominational peculiarities, and their own fundamental principles, and to regard themselves as brethren, for example, objected to vocal prayer, not for himself, but because there were Roman Catholic priests in the conference, to whom it would not be agreeable; surely, in an Evangelical Congregationalist, that was going a long way in concession for the sake of philanthropic union; much more than would be needed on the anti-slavery platform.

"Why should those who agreed with him arraign themselves any right to conduct the religious services? Was it because they constituted a majority? He treated the meeting would not be influenced by such reasons. They had to consider the wants of the poor; and he hoped the apple of religious discord would not be thrown in to mar their efforts at removing them." The Rev. Mr. Storey, of Cornwall, said, "We have agreed to sheathe the sword of theological controversy, and to unite in promoting an object worthy of our best energies, and dear to every Briton, especially to every British Christian, the welfare of our country, and the happiness of our fellow-men. Let the priest and the Levite, let us be good Samaritans, gather round the wounded, we-begone traveller, and pour in oil and wine, and thus illustrate and answer the inquiry, 'Who is my neighbor?' In many points of theology we may differ; but there is one doctrine we all believe, one principle we all support, one end we all pursue, and that is, the welfare of our fellow-men in the golden rule, which we all subscribe; it is that contained in the golden rule, which we all subscribe; it is that which should do unto you as you would have them do unto you. The grand and lament of starving millions is not the cry of a sect or party. Catholic and Protestant, Churchman, Dissenter, and Wesleyan, feel alike the iron band of the oppressive bread tax, which in the infliction of its tortures is at least no respecter of persons. The cry of the widow and fatherless is not the cry of a sect, unless it be of that sect which among the oppressors has always been spoken against, and which is entitled to be oppressed." The Rev. Mr. Storey, a Catholic

priest of Manchester, said, "It gave him infinite pleasure to see this assembly; but it was a pity that though they might differ about modes of faith, worship, the soul and essence of religion, was there." The Rev. Thomas Spencer, an Episcopalian, Rector of Hinton Charterhouse, said, "It was because of their great zeal for a great object, and not allow themselves to be disturbed or diverted from the great object for which they had assembled. (Loud applause.) I have such a bias in my mind in favor of liberty, that I prefer being wrong there is a variety of sentiments, to being with those who are all of one mind. I like this approximation and tendency to one common centre; it is the best sign for our day. (Applause.) And if this object for which we are met will not draw men together, and cause them to lose all party spirit, all bitter hatred and malice towards one another, I don't know what will." The Rev. S. J. Phillips, Catholic priest of Liverpool, expressed his gratification to see gentlemen of such various theological opinions, uniting so harmoniously in the cause of the poor. Would it not have been equally gratifying to see them uniting in the cause of the poor from 79? The Rev. P. A. Cox, D.D., who had shunned the American Abolitionists as dangerous lepers solely on account of a certain amount of alleged heterodoxy existing among them, said to this assembly of Episcopalians and Presbyterians, Papists and Protestants, Trinitarians and Unitarians, Baptists and Swedenborgians, Inghamsites, Calvinists and Armenians—"Gentlemen, why should we be here? I ask why we should not be here? (Loud cheers.) Is any principle sacrificed? (Cries of "No.") Is any duty neglected? (No.) Is any sacredness of life sacrificed? (No.) Our principle is to love God supremely, and our neighbor as ourselves. Our duty is to do good, by whatever means we can accomplish it. Why not then, professing to long for the freedom of the slave, unite with his best and truest friend, Mr. Garrison, for the accomplishment of that object? What kept the Doctor away from such a righteous association in America? Nothing, but those very theological differences which he trod under foot with indignant contempt in Manchester. Had he been contented to his new and catholic view after he returned home from America? Then he was, as a Christian and a man bound to have made the amende honorable to the American Abolitionists for his former fault. It was his duty to have left his gift upon the altar, and to have sought reconciliation with his injured brother, before he presented it. Quotations of catholic expressions, similar to the above, might be greatly multiplied from the speeches then delivered. I have cited them, somewhat at length, to show that these reverend gentlemen, and not the great fundamental principle of liberality, by which the conference of 1841 was united, and upon which alone it could have acted. If the imposition of a theological test, as a term of communion, was wrong on the subject of the bread tax, what makes it right on the question of slavery?

Those who know the history of the Anti-Slavery movement will understand the relevancy of these observations in a sketch of the public career of Mr. Thompson. I know, from reports of his own leading divines of the apostate churches, that he had to endure, solely on account of his faithfulness to the American Abolitionists, and his fearless rebukes of British churches for their unfaithfulness to the cause of the slave, have amounted to absolute persecutions. They are by no means the least of the great sacrifices which he has been called upon to make for the cause of emancipation. The reticence of the churches upon the subject, upon the subject of the bread tax, and the fundamental principle of liberality, by which the conference of 1841 was united, and upon which alone it could have acted. If the imposition of a theological test, as a term of communion, was wrong on the subject of the bread tax, what makes it right on the question of slavery?

When the times change, how quickly men change with them! And how sincerely the men of new opinions think they have never held any other! Out of our window, that frosty morning, in a weather which pointed due North-looking, like many others who were present, we saw a man, who was pointing that way. Of course, the altered and improved sentiment of the country is a cause for joy and thanksgiving; yet we could not help thinking, while sitting at that festival, that if the popular opinion had only changed at an earlier day—when it was appealed to solely on the ground of moral principle, instead of by the exigency of war—how many tears might have been saved, how many graves been kept unfiled, how many hearts rendered unbroken! The eloquent man who many years ago came to speak to a free people concerning the freedom of the slave, and whose single and constant speech was the same then as now—ought to have been heeded then, as it is applauded now. Had this been so, the orator, instead of having lately helped to save us from a war with England, would have earlier saved us from the war with ourselves. George Thompson, advocating in England in 1864 the cause of the Union, was not more our friend than while advocating in America in 1834 the cause of freedom.

We scorn the littleness of speech which still comes from a few pens and tongues, decrying an Englishman, who opens his mouth in this country, as an intermeddler with our affairs. The cause of liberty is as universal as Human Nature; and no man who serves among her knight-errantry, come from whatever land or clime he will, is a foreigner or an alien. If liberty in Italy may ask the sympathy of an American for Garibaldi in prison, so liberty in America may ask the eloquence of an Englishman man; but if he were to come to this country, would he not give him a hearing? But John Bright has publicly said that British Emancipation owes to George Thompson more than to any other man. American Emancipation owes him something as well. He is part of the salt that gives savor to the proclamation of Abraham Lincoln. To George Thompson, therefore, who comes for the third time to our shores, expecting now to spend the remainder of his days here, we give a hearty welcome, as an Englishman, not as an American—but as a brave and true man who, proudly claiming both countries, is proudly claimed of both.—N. Y. Independent.

GEORGE THOMPSON.

This most eloquent of modern Englishmen is again in this country. When he visited us last, in 1850, it was as an abolitionist. His eloquence, his logic could be answered only in one way, and that the method common at the South. He was mobbed in Faneuil Hall. He was burned in effigy at Springfield. All ignorant and brutal prejudice was stirred up against him. His philanthropy was made to appear officious interference; and his honest desire to see this country truly prosper by ridding itself of slavery was interpreted as a desire to meddle with our institutions and involve us in trouble. Time has shown who were our true and who our false friends. The men in England we regarded as our best friends in the days of our compromising degradation, were prompt to take sides with the rebels when our troubles came. Those who had sided with us in fair weather, wished us a speedy wreck when the storm came. But George Thompson was among the noble men who early and constantly exposed the cause of the North. He gave good for evil. Before the war, we knew him only as an abolitionist. Since the strife began, he has been an ardent and devoted friend of President Lincoln, the administration, and the Northern cause. Mr. Thompson was bred in a mercantile house in London, and it was not till 1830 that he became known to the public. At that time he read the great speech of Dr. Thompson of Edinburgh in favor of immediate emancipation, embraced its views, and was soon after employed by the Anti-Slavery Society of London to travel and lecture. His success was complete and astonishing. No antagonist could stand before him. The West India body, taking alarm, put forward Mr. Peter Borthwick to present the slaveholding view of the question, and, though he was a man worthy of Thompson's steel, yet the advocate of slavery could not stand

party, whose throats contracted so wonderfully in reference to the American Abolitionists. Again, in the Anti-Corn Law League, the Orthodox and the heterodox stood side by side on the same platform, and any questions asked about a man's religious faith would have been deemed simple impertinence. Finally, the question of Parliamentary reform was taken up by a large number of Evangelical pastors as a ministerial question. They, moreover, joined in a Conference held at Crosby Hall, at which they stood in association with William Johnson Fox, whom they regard as a Fanthorpe, George Dawson, a Unitarian and something more, and to crown all, one of the Honorary Secretaries was George Jacob Holyoke, a well-known and avowed preacher of Atheism, and editor of the infidel publication, The Reasoner. What then was the something else which made all the difference with the American Abolitionists? Simply the pro-slavery slanders of American divines in this country. These remarks may appear to have a posthumous birth; but for practical purposes they are, nevertheless, pertinent in a history of George Thompson.

THE WELCOME TO GEORGE THOMPSON.

A man who has laid his hands upon two nations, helping to break chains in each, deserves the reward of generous praise. So on Monday night at the Cooper Institute, we all clasped our hands into a heap, at the public reception of George Thompson. We have heard of "English cheers" and a "Scotch welcome," but, after all, what is heartier than an American greeting? The enthusiastic multitude on that occasion did equal honor to their guest and to themselves; for they gave him cause to forgive their old injuries done to a stranger; and showed how fitting it was that the city which once saw him on a weather-beaten and weary back, with exclamations, "Whom we injure, we hate," says the proverb; and having injured this man too greatly, we hated him too long. Coming to us as a prophet, we stoned him as a prophet; but, at last, the very stones once cast at him are now made into his monument. It is thus that foolish multitudes, from the beginning of Christianity, have always cheated themselves out of their victims—vilifying good men into better fame, and persecuting them into final coronation.

At the meeting on Monday night, one of the audience, an one who I should have known as a New York politician, who years ago, was a bound of the pack that howled Mr. Thompson out of the city, is there not hope for the world when a man who begins as a dog, and passes into a politician, may yet come out right at last? When the times change, how quickly men change with them! And how sincerely the men of new opinions think they have never held any other! Out of our window, that frosty morning, in a weather which pointed due North-looking, like many others who were present, we saw a man, who was pointing that way. Of course, the altered and improved sentiment of the country is a cause for joy and thanksgiving; yet we could not help thinking, while sitting at that festival, that if the popular opinion had only changed at an earlier day—when it was appealed to solely on the ground of moral principle, instead of by the exigency of war—how many tears might have been saved, how many graves been kept unfiled, how many hearts rendered unbroken! The eloquent man who many years ago came to speak to a free people concerning the freedom of the slave, and whose single and constant speech was the same then as now—ought to have been heeded then, as it is applauded now. Had this been so, the orator, instead of having lately helped to save us from a war with England, would have earlier saved us from the war with ourselves. George Thompson, advocating in England in 1864 the cause of the Union, was not more our friend than while advocating in America in 1834 the cause of freedom.

We scorn the littleness of speech which still comes from a few pens and tongues, decrying an Englishman, who opens his mouth in this country, as an intermeddler with our affairs. The cause of liberty is as universal as Human Nature; and no man who serves among her knight-errantry, come from whatever land or clime he will, is a foreigner or an alien. If liberty in Italy may ask the sympathy of an American for Garibaldi in prison, so liberty in America may ask the eloquence of an Englishman man; but if he were to come to this country, would he not give him a hearing? But John Bright has publicly said that British Emancipation owes to George Thompson more than to any other man. American Emancipation owes him something as well. He is part of the salt that gives savor to the proclamation of Abraham Lincoln. To George Thompson, therefore, who comes for the third time to our shores, expecting now to spend the remainder of his days here, we give a hearty welcome, as an Englishman, not as an American—but as a brave and true man who, proudly claiming both countries, is proudly claimed of both.—N. Y. Independent.

GEORGE THOMPSON.

This most eloquent of modern Englishmen is again in this country. When he visited us last, in 1850, it was as an abolitionist. His eloquence, his logic could be answered only in one way, and that the method common at the South. He was mobbed in Faneuil Hall. He was burned in effigy at Springfield. All ignorant and brutal prejudice was stirred up against him. His philanthropy was made to appear officious interference; and his honest desire to see this country truly prosper by ridding itself of slavery was interpreted as a desire to meddle with our institutions and involve us in trouble. Time has shown who were our true and who our false friends. The men in England we regarded as our best friends in the days of our compromising degradation, were prompt to take sides with the rebels when our troubles came. Those who had sided with us in fair weather, wished us a speedy wreck when the storm came. But George Thompson was among the noble men who early and constantly exposed the cause of the North. He gave good for evil. Before the war, we knew him only as an abolitionist. Since the strife began, he has been an ardent and devoted friend of President Lincoln, the administration, and the Northern cause. Mr. Thompson was bred in a mercantile house in London, and it was not till 1830 that he became known to the public. At that time he read the great speech of Dr. Thompson of Edinburgh in favor of immediate emancipation, embraced its views, and was soon after employed by the Anti-Slavery Society of London to travel and lecture. His success was complete and astonishing. No antagonist could stand before him. The West India body, taking alarm, put forward Mr. Peter Borthwick to present the slaveholding view of the question, and, though he was a man worthy of Thompson's steel, yet the advocate of slavery could not stand

before the champion of Freedom. The wit eloquence, sarcasm, logic, facts of the latter, always gained him the victory. After the passage of the West India abolition bill, Mr. Thompson came to this country, and was driven away. Returning, he turned his attention to the affairs of British India, advocating the rights of the natives against the rapacity and oppression of the East India Company. In 1842 he visited India, and was received like a conqueror; greeted with long processions of richly caparisoned elephants and camels, with cymbals and trumpets, and escorted with all the gorgeous pomp of the orient. He, however, banded himself with investigation, and on his return made his attack on the East India House, in defence of the dethroned Rajah. He made a great sensation, and a scene ensued that recalled the days of Lord Clive and Warren Hastings. It was an era in the history of the Court of Proprietors, and his eloquent pleas for justice and honor were not in vain.

In the Corn Law struggle, he fought side by side with Cobden and Bright, and swung the scales in the Free Trade scale, and secured its passage by a majority unprecedentedly large for the House of Commons. He was an advocate of universal suffrage, of the dissolution of the union of Church and State, and free education. Mr. Thompson's oratory we have never heard equalled. His compass is greater than that of any speaker we know. Others may excel him in certain things, but he is remarkable in everything. In lofty flights he is irresistible, full of passion and the fire of genius; his sarcasm is terrible, and yet his humor is so taking that, at times, you think he would have made the best comedian in the world; and, withal, he is the most graceful, polished and elegant of speakers. He recalled to us, when we heard him in 1850, what we had read of the greatest orators of the English parliament, when such men as Burke and Fox and Sheridan were his ornaments. Upon an occasion when Mr. Thompson had been speaking on the formation of the British India Society, Lord Brougham arose and said: "I have always been listening to Mr. Thompson, who is the most accomplished orator whom I know." There could not be higher praise; but those who hear him will be likely to endorse it.—Harford Press.

PORT ROYAL LANDS.

On the 9th day of March last, the United States Tax Commissioners for the District of South Carolina offered for public sale at Beaufort, in pursuance of a law of Congress, for the collection of taxes, 76,725 acres, and

Of this amount, 60,296 acres were purchased by the United States, and 16,429 acres, or about 46 plantations, including small islands, were sold to private parties. All the lands were situated on St. Helena, Ladies, Port Royal and Parry's Islands. On the 16th day of September last, the President of the United States issued instructions to said Tax Commissioners. On the 12th of December, these instructions were published in the Free South, and occupied two entire columns in the balance of the lands bid in and now absolutely owned by the United States, viz.: 60,296 acres. These instructions reserve 6,081 acres for school purposes, and 13,370 acres for "war, military, naval, revenue and police" purposes, leaving 40,845 acres to be sold. 24,316 of these acres are to be put into lots not exceeding 320 acres each, to be sold at public sale; the balance, or 16,529 acres, are to be sold at private sale "to the heads of families of the African race."

On the 5th of December, the Commissioners, in their advertisement of the public sale to take place on February 18th, 1864, say that "the lands to be sold comprehend in all about 23,000 acres"—or, according to the above estimate, 24,316 acres. Here is a slight inaccuracy, but it is not material for this purpose. If we add the 24,316 acres of the 16,429 acres sold in March last, we shall have 40,795 acres large tracts which will have been sold to such facts as are given in the above estimate, and 16,529 acres to be divided into lots not to exceed 20 acres, at such sum, not less than \$1.25 per acre, as the said Commissioners shall designate and determine as proper to be charged for said lands to the negroes.

For the capitalist, then, we have 40,795 acres. For the negro, we have 16,429 acres. In 40,795 acres, there are 1,274 lots, containing 320 acres. If we put a negro on each lot, we shall have an aggregate population of 637, or 64 acres per head. If we reckon the colored population on St. Helena, Port Royal, Ladies and Parry's Islands at 8,000, and divide 16,429 acres among them, it will be 2006 acres per head; or, The white man gets 32 acres of the land, while the negro gets 1 chance.

Here in Port Royal, where the eyes of all thoughtful and humane men, not only in our country but abroad, are hopefully turned, but to such facts and figures prove the truth is, that, so far as the purchase is concerned, the United States Tax Commissioners, for the District of South Carolina, in March last, the fairest, best located, and most fertile portion of these lands, including the best of the buildings, for, on the average, about 95 cents per acre, being 25 per cent. below government price for the lands alone, under the late instructions of the President, dated December 31, 1863. Now they propose by their advertisement which appears on the 5th day of February, 1864,—a thirty-day day in twelve days from this date 24,316 acres, in 320 acre lots, to only such as can afford to buy. And who are these? "The negro," does any one say, singly or in combination? No, emphatically no! But to the capitalist, who, tempted by the fabulous prices of cotton, comes here to run these lands and laborers at the exorbitant point, to make the greatest amount of money in the shortest possible time, and then to go.

mean this? Do the People mean it? Is this here? ...

The white man and capitalist, then, with all his intelligence ...

On the 18th day of January, or thereabout, the Commissioners ...

THE OLD FREEMEN OF LOUISIANA. To the Editors of the Evening Post: ...

THE OLD FREEMEN OF LOUISIANA. To the Editors of the Evening Post: ...

The free colored people of Louisiana, previous to the rebellion ...

Many, indeed the greater portion of these people, are descendants ...

The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated into the Union ...

That treaty was concluded and signed at Paris on the 30th day of April ...

After a lapse of more than sixty years, many of the children of the ...

But these people do by no means find their claim to recognition upon this ancient pledge ...

In June last, while General Banks was laying siege to Port Hudson ...

The Louisiana Journal, in attempting to correct the reliable statement of Mr. Whittier ...

Magruder did not make his appearance, and some six weeks afterwards ...

At the present moment, New Orleans is not agitated by a threatened attack ...

At the present moment, New Orleans is not agitated by a threatened attack ...

of the State to the Union as a loyal State. Under these circumstances ...

Respectfully yours, JAMES MCKAYE.

The Liberator.

No Union with Slaveholders! BOSTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 1864.

GEORGE THOMPSON INVITED TO THE NATIONAL CAPITAL. We do not know whether this distinguished advocate of universal freedom ...

WASHINGTON CITY, (D. C.) Feb. 22, 1864. HONORABLE GEORGE THOMPSON: DEAR SIR—The undersigned, constituting the Board of Managers of the "Washington Lecture Association," ...

At the same time, we are highly gratified to be able to offer to these, we are highly gratified to be able to offer to these, we are highly gratified ...

H. HAMLIN, CHARLES SUMNER, H. WILSON, JAS. HARRIS, WM. SPRAGUE, ALEX. BAKER, JOHN CONNOR, TIM. O. HOWE, M. S. WILKINSON, L. F. S. FOSTER, DAN'L CLARK, J. W. GAINES, E. D. MORGAN, JAMES DIXON, Z. CHANDLER, H. S. LANE, IND., S. C. ZIMMER, KANSAS, J. H. LANE, KANSAS, W. P. FESSENDEN, SOLOMON FOOT, H. B. ANTHONY, JNO. C. TEN ERICK, JOHN STURMAN.

Mr. Thompson's engagements are such that he will not be able to comply with the flattering invitation ...

George Thompson will deliver an address before the Central Union Club of Brooklyn, in Plymouth Church, on Friday evening, March 11th.

HENRY OLAY AND MR. GARRISON. John G. Whittier, the poet, states, that while Wm. Lloyd Garrison was in prison in Baltimore, in 1850, Henry Clay wrote from Lexington, Ky., to a friend in Baltimore, directing him to pay the fine and costs, and liberate Mr. Garrison.

The statement is not entirely correct. Mr. Clay related to us the facts in July, 1850. A few months before, Mr. Garrison, editor of an emancipation paper in Baltimore, was prosecuted, imprisoned, and fined for a libel on Woolfolk.

100,000 PETITIONERS! On the 1st of April, the second instalment of the Emancipation Petition will be sent to Washington; and so on, the 1st of every month, during the session of Congress.

Ten thousand petitions have been mailed within a few days from the office of the Women's League Room, 20 Cooper Institute, to the North, the South, the East, the West; thus giving loyal men and women everywhere another opportunity to register their names for freedom.

We ask all loyal editors to print copies of our petition, and circulate them through every school district in the country.

We ask the clergy of the land to circulate it in their congregations—to lay it on their communion tables, bidding their people remember that the only sacrifice the God of love demands is that they "do justice, and love mercy"—that they "break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free."

We ask every woman to give her name for freedom, and thus let the moral power of the nation be felt on the right side.

To this end, let one and all sign and circulate the petition, and return it without delay to the Women's League Room, 20 Cooper Institute, New York.

In this connection we must entirely dissent from the opinion of our esteemed friend Gerrit Smith, that the friends of freedom should not give heed to any proposition—at least, until the rebellion is put down—to amend the Constitution of the United States, so as to make slaveholding an unlawful act in every part of the country.

General Butler learned from his residence and administration in the regions of secession, that the way to provide for permanent peace in this country is not only to be severe with rebels, but to be just and kind to the four millions of human beings whom those rebels held in bondage.

General Banks, with the same opportunities, seems not to have learned this important lesson. His recent elaborate "General Order No. 23," ordaining, in twenty-five specifications, "A Labor System for Louisiana," substitutes serfdom for slavery, and seems merely a modification of that intermediate state which Great Britain found to work so ill, and was ultimately forced to put short and abandon, in her West India Colonies.

Starting with the ideas that continuous cultivation of the land is of very great importance, and that idleness and vagrancy, crimes in everybody, are to be severely repressed and punished in the cases of colored people, he gives the following directions:—

V. Plantation hands must not pass from one place to another, except as permitted by the Provost Marshal. X. The unauthorized purchase of clothing or other property from laborers will be punished by fine and imprisonment.

XII. The payment of half the [very small] monthly wages of labor shall be reserved until the end of the year.

XIII. Laborers will be permitted to choose their employers; but having chosen, they will be held to their agreement for the year.

XVI. It is advised to discourage monthly payments so far as it can be done without discontent, and to reserve the yearly wages to the full harvest.

No. XX., starting with the truism that "labor is a public duty, and idleness and vagrancy a crime," proposes to enforce this duty upon "that portion of the people identified with the cultivation of the soil," and "every enlightened community has enforced it upon all classes of people by the severest of penalties."

No. XXII., commencing with the statement that successful industry and an increase of the products of the soil are especially necessary at the present time, proceeds to say—"It is upon such considerations only that the planter is entitled to favor."

General Banks is called a Republican, and a portion of the Republican party are still blind and lukewarm enough to favor him.

General Banks is called a Republican, and a portion of the Republican party are still blind and lukewarm enough to favor him.

General Banks is called a Republican, and a portion of the Republican party are still blind and lukewarm enough to favor him.

General Banks is called a Republican, and a portion of the Republican party are still blind and lukewarm enough to favor him.

General Banks is called a Republican, and a portion of the Republican party are still blind and lukewarm enough to favor him.

General Banks is called a Republican, and a portion of the Republican party are still blind and lukewarm enough to favor him.

General Banks is called a Republican, and a portion of the Republican party are still blind and lukewarm enough to favor him.

General Banks is called a Republican, and a portion of the Republican party are still blind and lukewarm enough to favor him.

General Banks is called a Republican, and a portion of the Republican party are still blind and lukewarm enough to favor him.

General Banks is called a Republican, and a portion of the Republican party are still blind and lukewarm enough to favor him.

MR. MASON JONES ON THE AMERICAN WAR. MASON JONES, the eloquent and popular Irish orator, is doing good service to the American cause in England by a series of lectures on the Rebellion and its Cause.

Notwithstanding the violent scenes which prevailed on Saturday evening, a very large audience assembled in the Free-trade Hall to hear Mr. Mason Jones's second and concluding lecture on the American war.

After a passing allusion to "The Southern White-washing Association," Mr. Spence's non-acceptance of his challenge, Mr. Jones urged that it was impossible for the North to let the South go, because the preservation of the Union was a national and geographical necessity.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

Mr. Mason Jones then proceeded to mention numerous reasons for the indivisibility of the United States, maintaining that the Northern people owed a stern duty to liberty, to religion, to posterity, to civilization, and to mankind at large; and that they were now fighting no less than the battle of labor and liberty for the whole world.

GERRIT SMITH TO HIS NEIGHBORS. Dear you beyond Constitutional restrictions. Down with the Rebellion of whatever cost to the Constitution. "The body is more than raiment!" The country is more than the Constitution. Time now for nothing but to crush the rebellion. "Damn the Constitution!" said one in the hearing of myself and several others. I had always disliked profanity, and I had always honored the Constitution—welcoming every part of it. Nevertheless, this exclamation was music in my ears. Why was it?—It was the sense of the connection and spirit in which it burst from the speaker. He was arguing, with rapid and fervid eloquence, that the Government should pay every possible means for the speedy crushing of the Rebellion, when a listening Conservative threw in the qualification, "But all according to the Constitution." No wonder that the speaker could not brook this interpretation! No wonder that an oath should leap forth to attest the indignation of his patriotic soul! It was not contempt for the Constitution, but displeasure at the thrusting of it in his way, which prompted the profanity. Had it been the Bible itself, that was thus impudently cited, an oath might still have been the consequence. In a past century, a New England puritan, in order to reconcile his black boy to the periodical whippings he gave him, said: "I whip you for the good of your soul." To which the sufferer very naturally replied: "I wish I hadn't a soul!" Often during this war has the excessively tender and untimely care for the Constitution tempted me to wish that we had a Constitution. Thus was I tempted when, July 22, 1861, the House of Representatives, instead of manfully resolving that the war was for putting down the Rebellion, and for upholding the supremacy of the Constitution. Thus was I tempted when, a year or two ago, was ridiculously employed looking into the possessions of the millions who were striking at the life of the nation. "You see, that, now again, Congress is, in this same connection, twitting about the Constitution. Thus was I tempted when President left it to the Judges, or in other words to the Constitution, to say whether Proclamations, which he had issued as Head of the Army, should be allowed to stand. Unhappiest and most contemptible of all nations are we, if, whilst every other nation can carry on war with all the latitude of the law of war—of the law of necessity and of self-preservation—we are to be "cubbed, cribbed, confined," by a mere paper! Infinitely better that we had no Constitution, than that we should have one which is allowed to fetter our freedom, and restrict our choice of means in the time of war. By the way, the most cheering instance of resistance to this practice of supplanting the law of war with the Constitution is the recent disclaimer of the Supreme Court, in Vallandigham's case, of authority to review the proceedings of a Military Commission. Never yet have we carried on an unconditional and square fight with the rebels; and never can we, until we shall have the political and moral courage to resist and rise above the endeavors of demagogues and sympathizers with the rebels to embarrass our conduct of the war by these impertinent Constitutional questions. But these questions are not the only hindrance in the way of the only proper mode of warfare. Another and not less serious hindrance has sprung up in the untimely agitation of the question: "Who shall be the next President?" It is fearful to think how mighty are the electioneering influences which will now be set at work by office-holders, office-seekers, army contractors, and many other classes. It is fearful to think how wide-spread and deep a concern there will be to conduct the war, not so as to end the Rebellion and save the country, but so as to promote party and individual interests. It is fearful to think of the possible extent and character of the divisions that may now do more than the enemy can do to destroy our beloved country. Who shall be the next President should not have been spoken of before mid-summer. The New York Independent says it should only have been thought of. But it should not even have been thought of before that time. In the judgment of this journal, to be thinking from this early day of the Presidential Election—to be prudently considering—"to ponder" it—would be the people's best preparation for acting wisely in it. But their unspokeable better preparation would be to forget the whole subject for the coming four or five months, and to be, during all that time, united as one man in wiping out the last remains of the accursed Rebellion. Such a perfect union for such a righteous end would be their best possible education for selecting none but a fit man for the Presidency. Quite a natural fruit of this premature agitation of the Presidential question is, that there are already, on the one hand, Union men, who are slandering and vilifying Abraham Lincoln; and on the other hand, Union men who will not tolerate even the most generous and friendly criticisms on any of his views and measures. And still another hindrance has been thrown in our way. The proposition to amend the Constitution tends to produce divisions amongst ourselves, and to divert us from that one work which should absorb us—the work of crushing the Rebellion. It is said that, for the sake of posterity and to prevent the recurrence of the Rebellion, we must have a Constitutional prohibition of slavery. I reply that we cannot afford to attend to posterity now—that our own case needs all our present attention. It will be time enough to amend the Constitution after we shall have ended the Rebellion. The leisure which peace affords is necessary to devise and adopt amendments of that precious paper. I do not object to the abolishing of slavery. No sooner had slavery fled at Sumter than Emancipation should have fired at slavery; and this, too, Constitution or no Constitution for it. It was our right, because our necessity, to kill that which aimed to kill the nation. At no time since the war began should Congress have delayed to abolish by force of its War Power every remnant of slavery—dealing generously at the same time with loyal slaveholders. Moreover, as to guarding posterity from slavery, and therefore from a war for slavery, I would say that the lead once cleared off, slavery will never again be set up in it. Slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out slavery from the Southern States; but the freedom and the arms we are giving to their slaves will. Where a people want slavery, they will have it, whatever the Constitution. Our Constitution is against slavery. But the people wanted slavery. To say the least, they felt interested in consenting to it. Hence they fell in with the pro-slavery interpretation of the Constitution. Good men fell in with it because it was the prevailing interpretation. I said that our Constitution is against slavery. Certainly it is—for it says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"; and "No State shall pass any bill of attainder." But slavery is an abomination which the people, who have once got rid of it, are never disposed to recall. It is a disease which no people take a second time. The French learned this lesson in their mad attempt to re-enslave the Haytiens. When, a few years ago, Spain grasped San Domingo, she promised the Dominicans not to introduce slavery. The promise was superfluous. The Dominicans will take care to protect themselves from slavery, and from Spain also. Constitutional provisions against slavery will not avail to keep out

Poetry.

TO THE PIONEERS OF THE ABOLITION MOVEMENT. Ye have made a wide breach in the fortress wall...

THE HEROIC BLACK.

A colored soldier in Tennessee was mortally wounded. He told his officer that he could not live, but would die fighting for the flag of liberty...

TO GEORGE THOMPSON.

I've heard thee when thy powerful words Were like the cataract's roar, Or like the ocean's mighty waves...

A NORTHERN SONG.

Now joy and thanks forevermore! The dreary night has well-nigh passed; The members of the North are o'er...

The Liberator.

PARLIAMENTARY TALK ON AMERICAN AFFAIRS.

Lord Russell gave the following exposition of French policy, showing the senseless folly to which even an enlightened English aristocrat can give utterance...

Lord Russell gave the following exposition of French policy, showing the senseless folly to which even an enlightened English aristocrat can give utterance...

Lord Russell gave the following exposition of French policy, showing the senseless folly to which even an enlightened English aristocrat can give utterance...

Lord Russell gave the following exposition of French policy, showing the senseless folly to which even an enlightened English aristocrat can give utterance...

Lord Russell gave the following exposition of French policy, showing the senseless folly to which even an enlightened English aristocrat can give utterance...

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE SLAVE.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 24, 1864. The Senate is not engaged upon important business to-day. In the House, Mr. Dawkins...

MASON & HAMLIN'S CABINET ORGANS.

Advertisement for Mason & Hamlin's Cabinet Organs, featuring an illustration of an organ and text describing its quality and availability.

THE COLORED PEOPLE OF NEW ORLEANS.

NEW ORLEANS, Feb. 21, 1864. While enthusiastic meetings were being held last evening in the different public squares of this city...

NON-RESISTANCE.

MR. GARRISON—I love and venerate the character of the Divinely Inspired Teacher of Christian Non-Resistance...

INTERNATIONAL LEAGUES.

Any experienced engineer, sitting down before a fortified place, can, by aid of experimental analysis, foretell nearly the period at which the reduction of the fortress shall be effected...

W. FARMER.

There is no combination of talent or power which can fortify error so strongly, that the opposition of moral, political, and physical dynamics cannot overcome and destroy it...

W. FARMER.

As these premises are true, so true is it that, from necessity, from natural law—or, if it is more authoritative, from the will of the Eternal—alliance of the highest human developments, to elevate the race, must obtain the end sought, and in progress towards it destroy all opposition...

W. FARMER.

The foundation of all social improvement is in the honesty of the people. It is, however, practical lying of the worst description to instruct a starving, or even hungry people to be honest, when the law of instinct teaches them imperatively to take food, and raiment, and shelter, or perish...

W. FARMER.

It should not be a source of uneasiness to stare the fact in the face, that society has to be entirely changed from its beginnings, in order to secure progress in the right direction. It takes time, but the generations soon succeed each other, and what was a myth at first, becomes not long after a reality, to be remembered and referred to...

W. FARMER.

Of this nature will be the moral schooling of a whole nation of children. Of this nature will be the statute, that no lawyer, or physician, or surgeon, shall be suffered to charge a fee for his attendance at court, or upon the sick and dying; that no debt can be legally collected...