

Last evening I attended a tea-meeting, at which about 100 persons were present—members of the Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society, cotton-spinners, and others. The speaking fell upon me, and I think I must have talked about two hours, altogether.

After beginning with an address, which occupied about half an hour, I invited questions, and some were forthwith handed. They were of a judicious character, and furnished me with texts for Sunday school speeches, of which I shall be five or six; this, however, is to be done on the following Sunday.

The various questions put to me, and my replies, excited deep attention, and caused me to go off in a most lively, animated, and edifying manner. Arrangements have been made for my lecturing at Blackburn, Bury, Clitheroe, Heywood, and Rochdale. So, you see, I am once more fairly in the harness. In the meanwhile, steps are in progress to have a short course of lectures in this city, either in the Friends' meeting-house, or some other eligible building.

Mr. Chesson is laboring nobly and usefully, in this important field, and is a most valuable auxiliary.

November 30.

The Friends' Committee have given their answer to the application made to them for the use of their meeting-house for my lectures; it was given through Mr. Thomas Binyon, and is as follows:

With respect to the lectures, intended to be given by George Thompson, the Society of Friends has great pleasure in placing their meeting-house at his disposal for that purpose, and hopes that the cause may be promoted, through his able advocacy.

This is very gratifying, and makes our course in this city perfectly clear. We have now the building best adapted for our purpose, central, spacious, with an anti-slavery prestige—the building to which the Friends themselves will most willingly come, and from which no other class will keep away. This building, too, we have gratuitously, which is a boon, in the present state of our finances.

The Friends shall have no cause to regret their liberality, so far as I am concerned. My lectures here will give our cause a fair start in this district, and will aid our efforts in other places.

I begin to feel as though I had again put on the armor. God grant I may wear it worthily and with success!

December 2.

You may rely at all times upon my intention to be strictly impartial; when I undertake to repeat the sayings and doings of others, my opinions may be erroneous, but my facts, as far as possible, shall be fairly stated, and my judgment be, at least, an honest one. I am giving Mr. Chesson, the editor of the Anti-Slavery Watchman, in odd chapters; the history of our movement for the last twenty years, and he is drinking in the knowledge I am able to impart, with great avidity.

December 3.

I have just come in from Bury, where I lectured last evening. The meeting was held under most unfavorable circumstances. Scarcely any local offers had been put forth, and the notice was by a few placards, printed here, and sent out by the post. The town is in a very lamentable condition. The population is about 30,000. Out of this number, 7,000 are engaged in the cotton trade, which has led to the stoppage of every mill, and the payment of £4,000 weekly in wages. In such a state of things, I could not expect that the masters and the operatives would come together to the same meeting. The former do not come before the latter, while such misunderstandings prevail. Yet, in spite of these drawbacks, we had an audience of from 600 to 700 persons—chiefly tradesmen and operatives, and including four or five dissenting ministers. My lecture was well received, and a proposal was made, that I should visit the town in more auspicious times, and aid in the formation of a local society.

December 11.

Now for a sketch of my anti-slavery proceedings during the past week.

Monday, Dec. 5.—Haywood. Here I lectured in the Mechanics Hall of the Mechanics' Institution; the chair was occupied by Charles Cheetam, Esq., a Wesleyan, and one of the leading manufacturers of the town. After my lecture, a resolution, expressing sympathy with the American Anti-Slavery Society, and all similar associations, was moved by an Independent minister, seconded by a Wesleyan minister, and carried unanimously. I retired at the house of Mr. Fenton, one M. P. for Rochdale, at whose election I had assisted, in 1832.

Tuesday, Dec. 6.—Blackburn. Here I lectured in a very fine new school-room. The chair was filled by the Rev. Francis Skinner, a highly respected Presbyterian minister, who was supported by the Independent, Baptist, and Wesleyan ministers of the place.

Wednesday, Dec. 7.—Clitheroe. Here I was entertained by Edward Hodgson, Esq., the Mayor, who was also the chairman of the meeting, which was a very crowded one, in the Independent chapel. Two Wesleyan ministers, besides the pastor of the church, were present.

Thursday, Dec. 8.—Rochdale. Here I was the guest of John Bright, M. P. The meeting was in the Public Hall, and was a very splendid one. The chair was occupied by Henry Kilsale, Esq., a very wealthy and, better, a most worthy man, the most extensive worsted manufacturer in the world. At the close of my lecture, Mr. Bright seconded a resolution, declaring sympathy with the principles I advocated. Mr. Bright, in a very happy speech, I had a great deal of conversation with him, and he entered warmly into the British India department of our anti-slavery movement.

Friday, Dec. 9.—Came back to Manchester, and was engaged the rest of the day with Mr. Chesson, in making arrangements for the lectures here.

Saturday, Dec. 10.—Mr. Chesson and I spent the evening with the Secretary of the Manchester Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society. About two dozen ladies and gentlemen were present. After tea, we had a conversation for more than two hours. It was to say, I talked for that time—giving as much information as I could, respecting the person, characters, and modes of action of our friends in the United States, especially the Boston abolitionists. It is not improbable I may give a lecture under the auspices of this Society. Mr.

Chesson was with me at Heywood and Rochdale, and Mr. Weston, his co-secretary, at the other two places. About 250 Watchmen have gone off at these meetings. My lectures, at these meetings, have, in all essential particulars, been identical in their character and topics.

The American movement, in its origin, growth, and present extent; and its influence upon the literature, religion, politics, and government of the United States. 2. The Anti-Slavery Movement.—Its commencement, progress, principles, instrumentalities, trials and successes. 3. The Remedies for Slavery.—Moral action, religious action, commercial action, &c. Finally, the means which English possessors of reaching American slavery, and the duties and responsibilities of our countrymen and country-women, &c.

In all these addresses, I have sought to show the real position, value and efficacy of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and its claim to be regarded, not only historically, but throughout the entire movement, as the Anti-Slavery Society of the United States. I have introduced it, without disparagement to the efforts of others; on the contrary, I have spoken as if they merited of the Tappan, Childs, Jays, Adamses, Grinkes, Welds, Sumners, and others, who, in their several spheres, at different periods, have done good service to the cause.

Yours, GEORGE THOMPSON.

THE JAMAICA PEASANTRY.

A bugbear which the pro-slavery and commercial press in this country are forever thrusting forward against the claims of justice and humanity for three millions of slaves, is the 'ruin'—as they are pleased to term it—wrought by emancipation in the West Indies. The calamity has been referred times enough, but since its authors stick to it, we are the more bound to stick to the truth. It is with much satisfaction, therefore, that we quote from the London Missionary Herald the testimony of a competent observer. The following is from a letter of Rev. D. East, principal, we believe, of an academic institution in Jamaica, founded by the Baptist Missionary Society.—Watchman & Register.

During the vacation, I had been to Spanish Town, Kingston, Four Paths, Porus, Thompson Town, Sligoville, Passago, Fort, Clarksville, Brown's Town and Guy's Hill. My observations of the social condition of the people was anything but to justify the slanderous reports which you sometimes meet with, both in Jamaica and English newspapers respecting it. Almost involuntarily I found myself ironically quoting the terms, 'starvation,' 'vagrancy,' 'idleness,' 'inordinance,' which the enemies of the Jamaica peasantry have reproachfully applied to them. Do not listen to them, but rather plant the seeds of truth in the minds of the people. When you find them in a state of semi-barbarism, I found them in comfortable houses, decently clothed, and with well-cultivated provision grounds,—some of them as clean as an English kitchen garden; and that is saying much, in a land where, after rains, a crop of weeds will grow up in a night. But I shall for now, say no more, and I could not bear saying this to you, and yet I could not bear saying this to my friends at home. They are big boys, the people are not starving, nor like to do so. Neither are they vagrants, or likely to be so. They are not idle, when they are properly remunerated for their labor. They are not sinking into barbarism, but rising in the scale of civilization.

SLAVERY AND THE GOVERNMENT.

In a recent speech at Washington, Mr. Giddings defined his own position, and that of his political slavery associates, in regard to Slavery and the Government, in the following terms:—

Mr. GIDDINGS. And now, Mr. Chairman, I have but one word in reply to the member who has just taken his seat before I proceed to some other remarks, which I had intended for a future occasion. When the gentleman here represents that this Confederacy was a Confederacy of States, and that this body possesses no jurisdiction which has not been specifically delegated to it, he and I agree. It is the State-Rights doctrine, in behalf of which, for seventeen years, I have contended; and when he says that this body has no right to interfere with slavery, he and I stand together, where we both stood in 1840. [Laughter.] Now I desire, in this place, before the country, to meet the imputation which he has thrown out here, that his colleague, [Mr. SUMNER], and those who associate with his colleague, have called upon this Government to interfere with slavery. Our position is directly and unqualifiedly the opposite of that doctrine.

We have been claiming that this Government should wash its hands of slavery; that it should purify itself from its contaminations, and leave it to the States, where the Constitution left it. We demanded that it should cease to interfere with it.

And, now, in justice to that gentleman, [Mr. DEAN], and in order that he may set himself right, I call upon him to stand up here, and tell this committee of an instance in which any man here—mean of the Free Democracy—has called upon this Government to interfere with slavery. He has represented us as doing that, and I call upon him now to back his imputation, to meet it like a man, before this body, and before the nation; or else shrink from his position, and dodge it. And now, sir, I await the challenge of that gentleman.

[Cries of "Go on!" "Go on!"]

Mr. GIDDINGS, (resuming.) No, sir, I say to that gentleman, and to this House, that the day has arrived when we have the public ear, and the people of this nation are no longer to be deceived and misled. A hundred and fifty presses will bear to the whole North this exposure of his misrepresentation: we are trying to interfere with slavery in the States, or where it constitutionally exists. When that gentleman, upon this floor, deliberately votes to silence all agitation of this subject, and main-

tains a commerce in the bodies of women in this District, refuses to repeal our own laws by which women are bred in this city, and sold in the market; when he upholds the commerce by which the bodies of women are sold here to supply the 'hells' of New Orleans; when that gentleman, with such guilt and crime resting upon him, says that Congress has nothing to do with slavery; that the Government which authorizes this execrable commerce, and is now sustaining it with every energy it can put forth—be either over-estimates his own influence, or the credulity of the people. This slave trade here, and on the high seas, is sustained by unconstitutional laws of Congress, which we say shall be repealed, and which he and his friends say shall be maintained. This is the issue between us. They are for continuing this interference; we say it shall cease.

THE LIBERATOR, A S. STANDARD AND PENNSYLVANIA FREEMAN.

It is not to reopen, but, if possible, to close up our account with these Anti-Slavery journals, that we fling before our indulgent readers the various comments bearing upon the personal controversy between us—a controversy into which we believe every candid observer will admit, we have been very reluctantly drawn, if not absolutely forced. Our assailants, having carried the questions before us to the bar of public opinion, it seems to be nearly proper that the verdict rendered should be made known to the parties concerned; and, although we have only selected a part of the whole testimony to this end, we think what we have given fairly indicates the judgment of the public upon the case submitted to them. For ourselves, we have not now, as we had not at the beginning, the slightest wish to be embroiled in personal conflict with anti-slavery men of any sort; there is better work for all of us to do, than to keep up a warfare against each other.

With this view of the case, and considering that whatever good could arise out of the controversy in question has been, already, most fully attained, we shall readily abandon the further prosecution of it. If Mr. Garrison and his friends have lost confidence in us, the world has been most fully made acquainted with the fact; and the views which we entertain, in respect to our assailants, are, perhaps, as widely known. Here, therefore, we do not matter safely repose. The world is wide, and the need of effort for the overthrow of slavery, is abundant. There is no need of collision, in the present state of facts—and there will not be, unless something shall transpire to give a different complexion to existing affairs. In this washing our hands of this personal matter, passionate, willful and malicious as we are supposed to be, we assert no claim to having been absolutely right at every point of the controversy;—but we do say, that when any man shall prove us to have been in the wrong, we shall most readily and heartily retract. Of one thing we confess ourselves glad: the evident willingness of our opponents to suspend hostilities, as shown by their several valdettos, enables us to leave off the controversy in the simple attitude of defence, and not in that of aggression, or passionate defiance. To the various mischievous and scandalous charges brought against us, we have humbly pleaded, throughout, our CULPRITY, and have exposed the complicated sophistry, and the false and fallacious evidence upon which our condemnation was sought, without, in any the least degree, wishing to retaliate, or to discredit our accusers, further than was absolutely necessary to our own proper vindication.—Frederick Douglass's Paper.

THE GARRISONIANS VS. FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

Since Frederick Douglass, pursuant to a change in his views, respecting the interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, ceased to act with the Garrisonian Abolitionists, and attached himself to the 'Liberty Party,' or 'Free Democracy,' he and his paper, have been objects of attack, on the part of his old associates. He announced his change of views at the anniversary meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society at Syracuse, in May, 1851. Up to that time, he had been a Garrisonian, repudiating the Constitution and its interpretation as it stood, and on the fanatic's issue. Nay, more, he had been, without any important helper of their treasury and organ, Garrison's Liberator. Since that time, he has acted with another branch; and as we said before, his old co-laborers are 'down on him.' But Douglass is not a man to be frowned out of existence. His career is well known. From the abject condition of a slave in Maryland, he has raised himself to influence, note and respectability. He has received position and fame as well known in Europe as here. Comparing him, not with his own oppressed race, but with the ablest and most distinguished of ours, he is a remarkable man. No one will deny this, who has listened to his public displays, or who knows him in private life. In point of eloquence, energy of character, and rapid—almost miraculous progress, he stands pre-eminent among the colored men of this country, and it would be difficult, indeed, to find his parallel among the whites.

Such a man cannot well be forgiven by the Garrisonians for deserting their flag, more especially as he has had the presumption to set up one of his own. Instead of being an agent of the LIBERATOR, he himself publishes a paper. Looking no longer to the Garrisonians for direction, he now wages the Anti-Slavery war on his own way, and on 'his own hook.'

This audacious conduct they do not feel like tolerating, and accordingly their organs, chief among which are, the Liberator, Anti-Slavery Standard, Pennsylvania Freeman, and Anti-Slavery Bugle, have been playing their batteries upon him for a considerable period of time. They charge him with lack of 'gratitude,' 'courtesy,' and 'fidelity' to his old associates; with falsehood in selling some of them 'infidels,' with being 'callous and ambitious,' and with other offences of like sort.

To all the accusations brought against him, Mr. Douglass replies in his paper of this week, in an article filling twelve columns. He meets his foes, as we think, triumphantly. Their attacks reached even to his family affairs, and although he might have well declined reply to an insult so utterly unjustifiable, this slander is not evaded, but put down with the rest.

We regard the war made upon Douglass by Garrison and Co., as a striking exhibition of the vindictive spirit in which professional philanthropists of that stamp usually pursue brethren who do not bring water to their particular mill. They hate and denounce nobody with quite so much bitterness as another 'friend of the slave' who differs from them in matters of detail and expediency.

We suppose we need not disclaim sympathy with Douglass's political views and conduct; but as a man of color, once a slave, who has raised him-

self, and thus given practicable evidence that his race are susceptible of elevation, we regard his case and his career with strong interest.—Rochester American, Dec. 9, 1853.

'WAR TO THE KNIFE'

The Garrisonites, with Garrison at their head, are bound to make a hero of Frederick Douglass. They have commenced a war of extermination; and, in their blind rage, exhibited a malice we have rarely seen equalled in public warfare. Garrison, in the Liberator of a week or two since, invades the domestic circle of Douglass, to find matter of accusation: a spot sacred to all, save barbarians and fiends. This is strong language; but it is a strong case to which it applies. And yet, Garrison is so 'Christ-like,' that he preaches the doctrine of non-resistance; that if he is wronged, he shall not strike the body, and inflict a wound on that; but, assasin-like, can strike a barb into the soul of a fellow-man—not to promote public welfare, but to gratify private malice or senseless ambition to the King of Anti-Slavery—which shall rankle and fester till the grave casts its peaceful shadow over the troubled breast. Truly, this is Christianity, with a vengeance!

Frederick Douglass's Paper, for last Friday, contains the following account of the truth of what we have just said. A whole page is filled with articles from the Garrisonian press, defamatory of Douglass, while the whole of the second and third pages are devoted to a reply, in which he pays his respects all around, in one of the most manly, eloquent, high-toned and vigorous articles we ever read in the columns of a newspaper.

We learn two things from this controversy. First.—That Douglass is, and is to be, the leader among the colored men of the United States. There are other colored men who are his superiors in learning, and in particular lines of talent; but, when aroused, he has no superior in America, as an orator; and, moreover, he has just that combination of powers which makes a man a leader, from necessity. Second.—The Garrisonians look with comparative contempt on the whole negro race; and do not withhold their sneers at Douglass, because one of them. We refer in this to the leaders of the Garrisonians. Full evidence on this point is furnished in the number of Douglass's Paper on which we are commenting; and which we find an interesting development, and will attract the attention of intelligent men, as a peculiar manifestation of some law of psychology. But that, in the ranks of uncompromising, out and out Abolition, we are hereafter to have the White and the Black 'Roses,' is a 'fixed fact.' Douglass has set up on his own hook, and all the powers of Garrisonism cannot batter him down.—Syracuse Journal.

ANTI-SLAVERY MOVEMENT.

Douglass once believed in non-violence; and afterwards changed his opinions. When he changed them, like an honest man, he said so. But did he abandon his labors in behalf of his colored brethren? Not at all. His efforts were redoubled, as all who are acquainted with the history of this truly noble and eloquent man know. But what did the Garrisonians!—the Liberator and the National Anti-Slavery Standard—the two organs of the Garrisonians; the two organs which so long and so bravely upheld the cause of the oppressed? They hurled their ball of accusation at his head; and though Douglass treated their assaults with silent and merited contempt, scarcely a week passes over, that these meek champions of Humanity do not impute to Frederick Douglass a character and motives which would benefit only a robber of hen-roosts.

(With the peculiar views of Douglass, or of the 'Garrisonians,' we have nothing to do; but we think we are justified in saying that, as a man, Douglass enters a large share of the public mind of this city and county. He is a man of mark; and we must be allowed to say, for ourselves only, the most eloquent man to whom we ever listened. We thought, therefore, that this notice of a little bit of 'persecution for opinion's sake,' among professed brethren, would not be altogether uninteresting to our readers.—Lid.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS AND THE GARRISONIANS.

We knew the Garrisonians had conceived a great dislike to Frederick Douglass. The breach was first manifested at the American Society's Anniversary in this city. Mr. May (we think it was recommended the Liberty Party Paper to be included with the Garrison papers in the regards of the Society. This motion was opposed by Mr. Garrison and his friends, on the ground that the Liberty Party Paper claims that slavery was unconstitutional. Mr. Douglass took the opposite ground, and defined his position on that question. He claimed that the Constitution was Anti-Slavery; and did not protect slavery. From that time, and for that reason, the breach was made between Douglass and the Garrisonians. We noticed the fact, not its progress. We observed Douglass's paper, week before last, was mainly occupied with an expose of it. We are astonished and confounded at the unwarrantable and apparently deeply malicious assault upon Douglass. One would suppose they would, if possible, destroy him, and that they thought they could do it. The allusion to Douglass's family was especially unjustifiable and offensive to every generous mind. Our friends in Boston will find they have made an important and manifest blunder in this matter.—Syracuse League.

INFIDELITY AND ANTI-SLAVERY.

The Christian Press, a vigorous Anti-Slavery paper, published at Cincinnati, is arousing the evangelical Christians of the country to an appreciation of the fact, that most of the leaders of the Garrison party, under the guise of promoting anti-slavery, are really with more zeal making an earnest attack upon the Bible and its doctrines, under the cloak of Anti-Slavery. Frederick Douglass, has come to the same conclusion, and when called upon to retract his charge, retorts with spirit by reiterating it, insisting that the charges has other foundations than 'church malice.' We give room to an extract from each of these papers, as of historic interest.—N. Y. Journal of Com.

TROUBLE AMONG THE GARRISONIANS.

The former pet of this party—Frederick Douglass—is now an abused outcast. Garrison and his friends are bitterly denouncing him, because he will not adopt their peculiar views on the Constitution of the United States. Black-balling a black man is the richest joke of the new year.—Boston Catholic Pilot.

Austria strikes another blow at Hungary by decreeing that public instruction shall be given in the German language only, from the 1st instant. Heretofore, the Hungarian and Latin, as well as German, have been used for this purpose.

JOHN MITCHELL vs. DANIEL O'CONNELL.

From 'The Citizen,' by John Mitchell.

MR. HAUGHTON TO MR. MEAGHER SENDS GREETING.

James Haughton is a merchant of Dublin, a worthy and sincere man, but an avowed monarchist. He has published a Letter addressed to Thomas Francis Meagher, to whom he 'wants to say a few solemn words across the Atlantic.' The purport of these solemn words is all contained in the three extracts here following:

'Is liberty the right of the black man than of the white man? If it be so, prove it. Be consistent, then, and while you are a land of slave-drivers, sanction not their denial of civil and social rights to the colored people by your silence, or you will become a participant in their wrong.'

'But I have better hopes of you, my friend. I trust you will distinguish yourself as an American citizen as the friend of freedom—freedom for all. You cannot stop short on the threshold of the temple—you must enter boldly into the interior, and there, in the face of men and angels, proclaim yourself a true disciple.'

'This is enough. Mr. Haughton has written at least one thousand letters, all to this precise effect; and especially six or seven years ago, while the doomed white slaves of his own country were in the very crisis of their own agony, we well remember that this worthy gentleman was seized with a paroxysm of violent sympathy with the fat negroes of America. His words, in the midst of the most hideous and ignominious slavery that ever defamed the world, 'Slave-drivers' were living in Eades street, around his very gates; slaves were crowded around the poor-house gaols, within sight of him, dying like dogs, surplus slaves that they were, in the charnel-garrets of the Liberty. Slaves, we say, with no more rights, social or political, than Alabama negroes—the difference being that an Alabama negro is of value to his master, and that prudent men actually pay certain dollars for one, and feed and clothe him afterwards; but the poor who are sold, was not only of no value to his born owner, but was found to be 'surplus,' and money was paid to chase him, kill him, make away with him off the face of the earth. Mr. Haughton knew it well; but the poor creatures labored under two fatal disqualifications for the sympathy of so benevolent a man: they were white, and they were at his own door. His heart was in Africa; his tenderness was all dark in its complexion, telescopic in its view. Millions of his own countrymen were perishing, body and soul, in blind and bitter slavery and barbarism; thousands of ship loads of the food that providence sent to them, were floating off every morning to be consumed by their enemies; and the cruellest of all slave-drivers stood over them to see the deed done. Mr. Haughton was a deep political economist, besides being a corn-merchant; and we do remember that when the Irish people were crying out in passion of terror and rage to close the ports, to the export of provisions, to bind up the open arteries that poured out their life so fast, the enlightened emancipator of the human race declined to join in any such demand, would not interfere with 'free trade,' and was even so determined to carry out the great gospel of political economy, (buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest) that he stored up corn, hoarded like gold, always hoping the market would come to the very lowest, until it rotted in his store, and was thrown away into the river and the sea.'

'We cannot blame him—man must live—besides, his feelings were too much absorbed at that time by the sufferings of Africans, not to speak of the Rajah of Satara, whose unmerited wrongs touched his very soul. His indignation was all pre-engaged, and poured itself out upon 'man-stealers and cradle plunderers' many thousands of miles from home. At last he became a weariness, shall we say a bore; and people began to abhor the very name of negro. (.)

'I have now, after six years, we find Mr. Haughton as fresh as ever, saying the very same things that were then so tedious to us. Others may exert themselves to gain justice and freedom for Irish serfs; he, for his part, will stand by the negroes, and scathe the cradle-plunderers. But, what right has this gentleman to expect Thomas Francis Meagher, or the others whom he has named, to take up his wearisome song—which they always refused to sing at home? Now let us try to satisfy our own consciences, if possible, by a little plain English—we are not abolitionists in the sense of the English—we are not abolitionists in the sense of the English;—that Moses, or Soates, or Jesus Christ! (!)

'I want to say, that I would wish to cultivate the friendship of such men; but the criminals and the abettors,—those who commit, and those who countenance the crime of slavery,—I regard as the enemies of Ireland, and I desire to have no sympathy or support from them. (Cheers.)

'I have the honor to move that this document be inserted in full upon our minutes, and that the grateful thanks of the Repeal Association be given to the Anti-Slavery Society of America who sent it to us, and in particular, to the two officers-bearers, whose names are signed to it.'

In the year '25, when I left my profession, and went over to England, there was an anti-slavery meeting, at which I attended and spoke; and afterwards, when I went to Parliament, another meeting was appointed, greater in magnitude. The West India interest was 27 strong in the House of Commons—the Algebras being carried through the House by a majority of 19—therefore, the emancipation bill was in the power of the West India interest; but when they sent a respected friend of mine—the Knight of Kerry—to me, to ask why I did not take a certain course with regard to it, what was my answer? I represent the Irish people here, and I will act as the Irish people will sanction. Come liberty, or come slavery to myself, I will never countenance slavery, at home or abroad. (Cheers.) I said I came here on principle; the Irish people sent me here to carry out their principles; their principles are abhorrent of slavery; and, therefore, I will take my part at that anti-slavery meeting; and though it should be a blow against Ireland, it is a blow in favor of human liberty, and I will strike that blow.—[Cheers.]

'To America, let me be execrated by them—let their America be taken from Ireland—still, Slavery, I denounce you wherever you are. [Loud cheers.] I denounce you, come oppression to Ireland, Ireland be as the May—I will have my conscience clear before my God.—[continued cheers.]

'We are told that the speech I make in this room will put an end to the remittances from America, and that the Americans will not again contribute to the funds of the Association. If we should never get one shilling from America, my course is plain, my path is straight. I am attached to liberty; I am the uncompromising hater of slavery wherever it is to be found. [Cheers.]

No Union with Slaveholders!

THE U. S. CONSTITUTION IS A COVENANT WITH DEATH AND AN AGREEMENT WITH HELL.

'Yes! It cannot be denied—the slaveholding lords of the South prescribed, as a condition of their assent to the Constitution, three special provisions to secure the perpetuity of their dominion over their slaves. The first was the immunity, for twenty years, of preserving the African slave trade; the second was the stipulation to surrender fugitive slaves—an engagement positively prohibited by the laws of God, delivered from Sinai; and, thirdly, the exact, fatal to the principles of popular representation, of a representation for slaves—for articles of merchandise, under the name of persons... In fact, the oppressor representing the oppressed!... To all governments thus constituted a democracy, is to insult the understanding of mankind. It is doubly tainted with the infection of riches and slavery. Its reciprocal operation upon the government of the nation is to establish an artificial majority in the slave representation over that of the free people, in the American Congress; and thereby to make the preservation, propagation and perpetuation of slavery the vital and animating spirit of the national government.—John Quincy Adams.

From the New York Independent. **JOHN MITCHELL AND SLAVERY.**

BY HENRY WARD BEECHER. What place in the world has been unweaved with the story of the wrongs of Ireland? Who did not feel his heart burn as he read the terrible philippic of the Irishman, English oppression? Who did not rejoice in the noble bearing of the Irishman on trial and in prison for defending his fatherland? Who, when they became felons under English law, and were exported to penal colonies, did not send his heart with them? For we thought them faithful Witnesses for a Principle. They were Confessors for Liberty, and their living martyrdom was for the health of the whole world. It did the soul good to know that there were yet men, like Mazzini and Kosuth, who could suffer the loss of all things for the sake of liberty; that there were yet noble Irishmen willing to bear an obloquy or penal suffering, rather than endure voluntary servitude!

Since the world began, there has been something in the simple lore of liberty, so sacred and ennobling, that, more than any other trait, it has called down upon him who suffered for it the world's unmeasured praise.

When it was announced that Meagher had escaped from the convict-isle, the continent rang with congratulations; and only his modesty prevented the outburst of a reception even more wildly enthusiastic, if it were possible, than that which greeted that greatest man of his age—Kossuth! But, lately, that joy was re-kindled at the tidings that *Mitchel*, the great Irish patriot, the unrelenting foe of oppression, the martyr of liberty, whose personal freedom had been offered up on the altar of the world's liberty, had escaped from Fenell—had crossed our shores. After rejoicings, festivals, and public demonstrations, Mr. Mitchell entered upon the noble vocation of an editor. The *Commonwealth* was established. The press could scarcely supply the heroic demands for a paper conducted by such a hero of liberty.

This *Citizen* has, however, become like John's apocalyptic book, that, being eaten, was sweet in the mouth, but exceedingly bitter in the belly. In the very second number, Mr. Mitchell, in replying to an exhortation from Mr. Haughton, after not a little fierce retort, thus defines his position in regard to the only question of liberty which exists prominently before this nation:

'Now let us try to satisfy our pertinacious friend, if possible, by a little plain English—We are not abolitionists—no more abolitionists than Moses, or Socrates, or the just God. We mean that it is a crime, or a wrong, or even a PECCADILLO, to HOLD SLAVES, TO BUY SLAVES, TO SELL SLAVES, TO LET SLAVES TO THEIR WORK, BY LOGGING OR OTHER NECESSARY COERCION. By your silence,' says Mr. Haughton, 'you will become a participant in their wrongs.' But we will be silent, when occasion calls for speech; and, as for being a participant in the wrongs, WE FOR OUR PART, WISH WE HAD A GOOD PLANTATION WELL STOCKED WITH HEALTHY NEGROES IN ALABAMA. There, now—is Mr. Haughton content?'

This is not only plain English, but as loathsome as it is plain. Such sentiments are shameful, come from whom they may, but shameful beyond expression in a man who has but just been redeemed from bondage.

But why should Mr. Mitchell tarry longer in New York! There is a great want of slave-drivers in Alabama; and diligence in that vocation would be a sure stepping-stone to the consummation of all his visions of liberty—a good plantation well stocked with healthy negroes in Alabama.

It is plain, from the opinion now expressed by Mr. Mitchell, that he wages his warfare with England, without any real principle of liberty at the bottom. He did not believe that there was any moral question of right or wrong involved. For he does not think that there is any wrong in oppression.

Mr. Mitchell does not regard it as wrong to take from men every civil right, every social right, every religious right. He does not think it wrong to place all the sacred relationships of life, those of parents, husbands, wives, and children, brothers and sisters, in the irreparable hands of absolute masters, to be regarded or neglected just as their commercial interests require. Mr. Mitchell does not regard it wrong to put every affection of the heart, and every conceivable human attribute, upon the scale of commerce, and leave them without any other defence than that which lies in selfishness.

Mr. Mitchell thinks it perfectly right to convert a man into a beast of burden, and to compel him to his hateful daily tasks by whip and goad. Just as we do our other animals. Here are his words:

'We deny that it is a crime, or a wrong, or even a peccadillo, to hold slaves, to buy slaves, to sell slaves, to keep slaves to their work, by logging or other necessary coercion.'

After this, on what ground can a man stand? Oppression is so far from being wrong, that he ardently wishes to own a gang of his fellow-men, and would willingly drive them up to their unequalled labor by flogging!

Of course, with such sentiments, there could be no principle in his struggle with England. It was not a question whether England had a right to oppress Ireland; according to his own showing, she had the right to do it, if she could. The Irish rebellion, therefore, in so far as Mr. Mitchell is concerned, was a graceless insurrection of subjects against their rightful masters. And John Mitchell falls from the category of men persecuted for asserting the great doctrines of human rights, into the position of a pitiful calf, who made an abortive attempt to get rid of work, and was sent to a convict-island for his insubordination.

Was there ever before such a waste of sympathy upon a proffered principle? The man that shouted in the name of the apostle of liberty, as they thought, will sink from an unmasked advocate of the worst tyranny with horror and disgust. It is the modern version of the fairy fable so often told, and in so many ways. It was a sweet and lovely virgin that they beheld coming to them, but once clasped, the enchantment broke, and a shrunk and hideous hag grinned and chattered in their bosom!

We wish it to be understood distinctly that our remarks have nothing to do with Mr. Mitchell as a private man, and in his personal character. For ought that we know, he may be the most estimable of men. It is as a public man, as a teacher, and simply in relation to his published sentiments, that we have concern with him.

This disclosure of the interior sentiments of a false apostle of liberty, will scarcely be less disgusting in the South than in the North. For, though the South holds slaves, it on that point has a more sensible policy of management. Political and party animosities may divide public men, and some others, into extreme positions in relation to slavery. But we are sure that among the calm and sober citizens of the South, there is a deep and daily stronger sentiment against the institution of slavery. The only question with them is, how to get rid of it. If once they were safely freed from the curse, we believe that there would be universal joy in the South.—When northern ruffians, therefore, eagerly desire to enter upon all the trials and miseries of such a system, nowhere is their folly more strongly apparent than in the South; and there is but one opinion there as to the character of apostate Yankees as slave-masters. They are the most un sympathizing, the hardest, the most exacting, and cruel of all slave owners.

Here comes to thee, O Alabama! a weary pilgrim, whose life has been spent in warfare with oppression! Those scars, these the memorials of a life of struggle for human rights, the smitten eye, the pines in long confinement borne for liberty's sake. And now his consecrated life bears to thy soil. O thrice fortunate Alabama! and that breath that has blown the trumpet against kings and tyrannies, is heard in soft whispers along thy streams, asking for a fat plantation! That resonating voice that awoke the sympathy of the world for freedom, now sends terror through the cotton field; or vociferates triumphant bids for comely girls and healthy boys of divided families, among squabbling Legrees, around the auction-block. A poor chance to be heard hath any other bidder, whose voice hath not been rounded out and made sonorous in the service of Liberty!

Let England rest. Tumultuous John Mitchell will vex her no more about the foolish abstraction of Liberty. But we will not believe such a slander of Ireland. We will rather believe that the long imprisonment has soured a noble and healthy boy of feeling, as is returned to the gall of misanthropy? We know that such a gallant nature as Meagher's would repudiate such sentiments. We do not believe that Dillon and O'Gorman, O'Brien, and hosts of memorable others, are so sordid and so selfish in their conception of human rights and liberty, as to unite for their motto, 'My liberty everything; MAN'S liberty nothing.'

From the Pennsylvania Freeman. **JOHN MITCHELL.**

MY DEAR FRIEND.—In 1848, I published several articles in my paper, *The People*, in favor of John Mitchell, and in opposition to the Government that persecuted him. I mourned over the oppressions and wrongs of the Irish, as I still mourn; I felt indignant at their oppressors and plunderers, as I still feel. I looked on Mitchell as a friend to popular freedom, and rejoiced in his endeavors to separate Ireland from the British Empire; and when the tyrants seized him and lodged him in a prison, I risked my liberty and life in his defence. I denounced the priests, the aristocrats and princes of England, as the greatest criminals in the country, and expressed my wish, both in my lectures and my paper, for their utter and eternal overthrow. I never dreamed that Mitchell was a friend of a man, a lover of liberty universal, an advocate of right for all. I had no idea that a man who hated the tyranny of the English monarchy and aristocracy, could favor the tyranny of American oligarchy. It could never have entered my mind, that the defender of the rights of his countrymen, could be indifferent to the rights of other men. I should as soon have expected the earth to open to the heaven, or the sea to swallow up the land, as to see Mitchell in favor of slavery, or declare to the world, I wish that he had a plantation stocked with slaves. I should as soon have praised the basest devil in the fabled hell of orthodox, as knowingly eulogize an Irish republican embryo slaveholder. The filthiest and most venomous thing that crawls could not have been more hateful or loathsome to me, than the loud declaimer against English tyranny, if I had known at the time, that he harbored in his soul, and concealed beneath his public lessons and dignified appearance, the same sort of that most heartless, infamous and execrable despotism, American slaveholding despotism.

Yet such, alas! was the case. John Mitchell, the Irish repealer and republican of 1848, was, in heart, a tyrant, a despot, a slaveholder. His professions of patriotism and love of freedom were a lie. It was power—the power to tyrannize, to plunder and to kill, that he was seeking; not freedom and the rights of man. He has published to the world his avowal, that he would like to see a slaveholder. He has made the same avowal, that he would like to see a slaveholder, that is, a man who would like to see a slaveholder, that is, a man who would like to see a slaveholder. He has made the same avowal, that he would like to see a slaveholder, that is, a man who would like to see a slaveholder. He has made the same avowal, that he would like to see a slaveholder, that is, a man who would like to see a slaveholder.

It is in vain to say that four years' suffering from the hands of tyrants has corrupted him; it has only developed him. He has not degenerated, but shown himself to have been originally and radically bad. Had his heart been true to humanity, the indignities of his tyrant persecutors would only have fired his soul the more against the deeds of tyranny. In the freedom, the equality and the rights of the love of man, he would have seen the same rights in the love of his fellow-men, that he would have seen in the love of his fellow-men, that he would have seen in the love of his fellow-men.

Mr. Mitchell does not regard it as wrong to take from men every civil right, every social right, every religious right. He does not think it wrong to place all the sacred relationships of life, those of parents, husbands, wives, and children, brothers and sisters, in the irreparable hands of absolute masters, to be regarded or neglected just as their commercial interests require. Mr. Mitchell does not regard it wrong to put every affection of the heart, and every conceivable human attribute, upon the scale of commerce, and leave them without any other defence than that which lies in selfishness.

Mr. Mitchell thinks it perfectly right to convert a man into a beast of burden, and to compel him to his hateful daily tasks by whip and goad. Just as we do our other animals. Here are his words:

'We deny that it is a crime, or a wrong, or even a peccadillo, to hold slaves, to buy slaves, to sell slaves, to keep slaves to their work, by logging or other necessary coercion.'

After this, on what ground can a man stand? Oppression is so far from being wrong, that he ardently wishes to own a gang of his fellow-men, and would willingly drive them up to their unequalled labor by flogging!

Of course, with such sentiments, there could be no principle in his struggle with England. It was not a question whether England had a right to oppress Ireland; according to his own showing, she had the right to do it, if she could. The Irish rebellion, therefore, in so far as Mr. Mitchell is concerned, was a graceless insurrection of subjects against their rightful masters. And John Mitchell falls from the category of men persecuted for asserting the great doctrines of human rights, into the position of a pitiful calf, who made an abortive attempt to get rid of work, and was sent to a convict-island for his insubordination.

Was there ever before such a waste of sympathy upon a proffered principle? The man that shouted in the name of the apostle of liberty, as they thought, will sink from an unmasked advocate of the worst tyranny with horror and disgust. It is the modern version of the fairy fable so often told, and in so many ways. It was a sweet and lovely virgin that they beheld coming to them, but once clasped, the enchantment broke, and a shrunk and hideous hag grinned and chattered in their bosom!

We wish it to be understood distinctly that our remarks have nothing to do with Mr. Mitchell as a private man, and in his personal character. For ought that we know, he may be the most estimable of men. It is as a public man, as a teacher, and simply in relation to his published sentiments, that we have concern with him.

This disclosure of the interior sentiments of a false apostle of liberty, will scarcely be less disgusting in the South than in the North. For, though the South holds slaves, it on that point has a more sensible policy of management. Political and party animosities may divide public men, and some others, into extreme positions in relation to slavery. But we are sure that among the calm and sober citizens of the South, there is a deep and daily stronger sentiment against the institution of slavery. The only question with them is, how to get rid of it. If once they were safely freed from the curse, we believe that there would be universal joy in the South.—When northern ruffians, therefore, eagerly desire to enter upon all the trials and miseries of such a system, nowhere is their folly more strongly apparent than in the South; and there is but one opinion there as to the character of apostate Yankees as slave-masters. They are the most un sympathizing, the hardest, the most exacting, and cruel of all slave owners.

Mr. Haughton was co-worker with Mr. O'Connell in the Irish Repeal Association, and was a constant attendant upon its meetings. On one occasion, when Mr. Haughton himself presided, Mr. O'Connell took occasion to speak of that personage with respect for the chairman, which he had long and always felt.

And let me also say, that there could not be a greater slander uttered against another man, than that which Mr. Mitchell utters, when he speaks of Mr. Haughton's sympathies being all sent away from Ireland to India and America. Father Matthew, and thousands of other laborers in the Temperance cause in Ireland, both Catholic and Protestant, know Mr. Haughton as a most unwearied laborer side by side with the most active and devoted of them, in efforts to rescue his countrymen from the self-imposed bondage which their free use of intoxicating drinks had brought upon them. Is there a true manliness in John Mitchell, when he can so speak of one of Ireland's truest and most steadfast friends? Is there in him a true and generous love of liberty, when he can insult such a man as Mr. Haughton, and make his lowest bow to the slaveholders and slave-traders of Alabama? Will he feel in advance the sting of Mr. Haughton's coming rebuke. But let not any man, or journal, which stands upon the side of the slave, endorse this recreant's sneer upon so true and unselfish a laborer in humanity's cause as JAMES HAUGHTON, of Dublin.

I am, Sir, yours truly, SAMUEL MAY, JR.

Franklin Place, Jan. 19.

We are not acquainted with Mr. Haughton, and all we know of him has been gathered from his frequent communications in some of the anti-slavery papers.

These communications have given us the feeling we intended to express by that word 'bore.' Perhaps our feeling is unwarranted; but certainly is not a feeling which denies or questions Mr. Haughton's honesty or worth. Some of the best men we are acquainted with are intolerable 'bores' now and then; and several persons whom we like very well, frequently 'bore' us most uncomfortably with crude or tedious articles, in the *Commonwealth*, which they think would bring the Millennium 'right along.'

We acknowledge that we have thought of Mr. Haughton with similar feelings. Perhaps we have been unjust to him, and we very gladly give our readers this communication from Mr. May.—Ed. Com.

CONGRESS.

In the Senate, Mr. Sumner rose and said—Mr. President, I have in my hand a memorial from citizens of New York, in which they request Congress will take such steps as may be necessary to separate the federal government from all connection whatever from slavery and the slave trade; by repealing all acts authorizing and supporting the same. Among the signers of this memorial are men eminent in the various walks of life. Here are the names of William Jay and John Jay, who, in the second and third generation, honor the name of the illustrious revolutionary patriot, our first Chief Justice. Here is also the name of our recent associate in this body, John P. Hale. As this memorial, in its various provisions and bearings, does not come within the province of any of the standing committees of this body, I shall not move its reference at this time, but I shall avail the motion for the appointment of a special committee to consider the subject. In the mean time, I move that it be laid upon the table. The motion was agreed to.

I have also a remonstrance signed by some of the same persons, citizens of the city of New York, against the proposed act to amend an act approved on the 26th of March, 1850, which act authorized the people of Missouri territory to form a constitution and State government, and for the admission of such State into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to prohibit slavery in certain territories, wherein it is expressly enacted that in all that territory ceded by France to the United States under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of 36 degrees and 30 minutes north latitude, not included within the limits of the State contemplated by the act, slavery and involuntary servitude, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall be, and is hereby, forever prohibited.

In the House of Representatives—Mr. Gerrit Smith offered a resolution, that all the members of the human family, notwithstanding all contrary enactments, have at all times, and under all circumstances, a right to the soil, as much as to light and air; and that the duty of the civil government is only to regulate the occupation of the public lands, and this on the principle that the great right of the soil is as equal, inherent and sacred as life itself.

On motion of Mr. Hubbard, the resolution was laid on the table. THE LIBERATOR. No Union with Slaveholders. BOSTON, JANUARY 27, 1854.

THE LIBERATOR.

No Union with Slaveholders. BOSTON, JANUARY 27, 1854.

JOHN MITCHELL.

The recency of this mock patriot to every principle of honor, justice and liberty, as evinced by the scurrilous and dirty article from his pen, in relation to JAMES HAUGHTON, of Dublin, and to Slavery in America, (see our last page), is securing for himself universal contempt and disgust, and eliciting from the press, (even a portion of the Hunker press,) the most scorching rebukes. His attempt to stain the character of Mr. HAUGHTON as a philanthropist and reformer is as base as it will prove abortive. Ireland has not a more devoted friend that walks upon her soil, the suffering Irish have not a more sympathizing and untiring advocate, than JAMES HAUGHTON. Mitchell's attack upon him is the height of ingratitude and villany. O, that DANIEL O'CONNEL were living at this moment! But, thank Heaven! though dead, he yet speaks in thunder tones that shake the accursed slave system to its foundation, and cause the hearts of its supporters to palpitate with terror. We have put him along side of John Mitchell, column by column, as the most summary method of crushing the life out of such a moral reptile.

THE ANNUAL MEETING.

Our paper goes to press early to allow us to give a report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, which commenced in this city on Wednesday forenoon. The weather was intensely cold, and the attendance, therefore, comparatively thin. On Wednesday evening, resolutions of a scathing character were presented, in reprobatation of the mock 'patriot' JOHN MITCHELL, for the avowal of his atrocious sentiments on the subject of slavery; and these were earnestly and eloquently advocated by Mr. Kemp, of Ireland, Prof. W. S. Brown and John C. Clure, of Scotland, Joseph Barker, of England, and Wendell Phillips. If ever a man was 'used up,' it was the traitor aforesaid; and most hearty was the approval of the audience, of the merited castigation meted-out to him.

Among the speakers who will address the meeting this (FRIDAY) afternoon, will be THEODORE PARKER. TO CORRESPONDENTS. For want of room, this week, we are obliged to defer the publication of a letter from Rev. Hiram Wilson. Also, a reply from Edmund Quincy to the communication of Lahey Sutherland. Also, a letter from Dr. Grandin, of Maine—and another from Henry C. Wright, pertaining to John Mitchell and James Haughton—and various other matters.

WEBSTER'S BIRTH-DAY.

No matter how deformed or monstrous the idol may be, its worshippers are none the less ready to bow down, and adore it as pre-eminently great, illustrious, and powerful.

This truth was illustrated afresh, in this city, on the evening of the 18th instant, at which time, the 'Massachusetts Webster Association' commemorated the birthday of DANIEL WEBSTER, at a dinner at the Bevere House, the head quarters of gentile dissipation. The company, it is said, numbered about six hundred. Among them all, it would be preposterous to suppose that there was one who was not both a time-server and a sycophant. 'Birds of a feather seek together.' To eat 'a sumptuous dinner,' and to drink freely of intoxicating wine, requires no special virtue, no exhibition of moral heroism. To shout on the popular side, is precisely what any sneak can do, and what every sneak is disposed to do. In looking over the names of the persons who figured on this occasion, either officially or as speakers, one can see at a glance, that the sum total of independent manhood among them all, amounted exactly to a cipher. In the scales of eternal justice, one humble advocate of an unpopular truth would outweigh millions of them. Their sense of right, their standard of rectitude, cannot be higher than the object before whom they are seen prostrating themselves. 'If the god is a monkey, what must the worshippers be! If the man who gave the last two years of his life, actively and unremittingly, to the support of the Fugitive Slave Bill—to the 'crushing out' of the anti-slavery life of this nation—to the suppression of free discussion—the to henting of fathers and mothers, husbands and wives, children and babes—to the perpetuity of a blood-curdled Union, within the pale of which, more than three millions of slaves are chained and scourged—if such a man is set up as the idol, it is not difficult to determine who and what are the idolaters. They are not the friends of the country; they are not men of unbending principle; they are not good citizens. Respectable, popular, honored, they may be; but this is only because of the general corruption. Locate them where you will on the surface of the globe, and they will as readily take the side that is strongest, and espouse the cause that is uppermost, as 'the sparks fly upward.'

At the dinner referred to, the 'Hon.' Marshall P. Wilder presided—occupying any thing but an 'honorable' position, if man-hunting and man-enslaving be a damnable employment. The American flag was suspended from the ceiling behind his chair—the flag of a proud, selfish, defiant, remorseless nationality—anti-Christian and anti-human, as every national flag is—the stripes of which are symbolical of those daily inflicted, on all the Southern plantations, to the shedding of torrents of blood, by merciless slave-drivers. Appended to this was a banner, having upon it the words—'I speak to-day for the preservation of the Union. Hear me for my cause.' Great is Diana of the Ephesians—of course! What claims had Daniel Webster to a hearing, when he was for silencing every voice in this land, that was raised in behalf of 'the suffering and the dumb,' and 'such as are appointed to destruction? If the Union had turned him, and his wife, and his children, into mere chattels, 'to all intents, purposes and constructions whatsoever,' furnishing them with fetters and driving them like beasts to unrequited toil, would he have been solicitous for its preservation, or would he not have execrated it as the concentration of human villany? What a world-wide difference it makes, as to whose ox is gored! Let who will support the existing Union, it is none the less accursed—and out of it the pure and the good ought to flee, as Lot fled from Sodom. Thank God! its perpetuity is not possible; its dissolution is sure! Omnipotent forces are against it, and it must fall. It is utterly godless, utterly corrupt, utterly beyond salvation. It was formed at the sacrifice of justice; it shall be destroyed by the weapon of justice. 'Its sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered their iniquities.' In one hour its judgment shall come; and 'the merchants which are made rich by it, and every ship-master, and all the company in ships, and sailors, and as many as trade by sea,' shall weep and wail at its overthrow.

But, 'Daniel Webster was a great man.' Great by what standard? Great, physically; great, intellectually; great, legally; great, to pride and self-esteem. But, morally, spiritually, a *paria*—a *corpse*—retrospectively, as besotted as any devotee. He never led his party; he never transcended it. In no instance did he ever exhibit any moral independence. Into none of the great reforms of the age had he the courage to throw himself. He did not believe in progress, and had no vision for the future. He believed in the past—in Washington, and Adams, and Hancock; in Bunker Hill, Lexington and Concord; in the Mayflower and its Pilgrim occupants; in Independence Day and Plymouth Rock; in the American Constitution and Union. Just as the Pharisees and Scribes believed in Abraham, and Moses, and the Prophets. Beyond these, he believed nothing, and hoped for nothing. Beyond these, it would not be safe or prudent to go. They were the embodiment of all human wisdom and excellence, and nothing remained but to stand still and adore! If he ever lauded virtue and goodness, it was in general terms—pointless and barren. If he denounced the foreign slave trade at Plymouth Rock, it was not till after that trade had been pronounced piracy by the nation itself, and public opinion every where cordially responded to his sentiments. If he spoke eloquently at Bunker's Hill, in praise of those who had poured out their blood in defence of American liberty, it was because around him were gathered a hundred thousand approving voices, and no more popular step could be taken by him. And so of all his speeches and actions. He could eulogize Massachusetts—New England—the nation; was the risk in so doing? He was 'the Defender of the Constitution'! What a title, and what a claim to the gratitude of posterity! What amazing courage it required, to defend what none but a few 'hair-brained fanatics' were assailing!

Of course, at the dinner, there was any amount of adulation bestowed upon his memory. Every one of the speakers called good evil, and evil good. The President spoke of him as 'one of the main pillars in the temple of American liberty!' The champion of the Fugitive Slave Bill a pillar of liberty! What a mighty prop to Christianity was Judas Iscariot! 'The temple of American liberty'—ah! that is well-qualified, for that is a peculiar kind of liberty—complexional, fill-bustering, land-stealing, chain-forging, whip-plaiting, and so forth. And so, 'tremendous cheering' very naturally followed the compliment.

Again—the President said, (growing wild and *Wilder*), that Mr. Webster's labors had 'shaken the thrones of kings, and changed the direction of human affairs'—the detentions of the world hang upon the lives of such men! And, growing devout, he declared, 'My heart shall never cease to rise in gratitude to the Giver of all Good, for the immaculate mind of Webster—a mind towering above all others, like the loftiest summit of his native hills; but, unlike that, never clouded, but clear as the blue ether of the upper heaven! This is poor stuff. To the thrones of kings, abroad, Mr. Webster never evinced any objection, and was the last man to think of shaking them; if he at any time 'changed the direction of human affairs,' it was only in his own case, and for the worse; and as for his mind, if it was sometimes 'clear as the blue ether,' it was not unfrequently of the same color.

Lieut. Gov. Plunkett responded in a felicitous manner, making the alarming announcement that Massachusetts and Daniel Webster are one and indivisible! We trust this is a mere hallucination of the brain; though, if it be a true representation of the exact position of the old-day State, there is daily need of the annual ejaculation, 'God save the Commonwealth of Massachusetts!'

The toasts and speeches were all in the same strain, and to the same effect—Daniel Webster, the Constitution, and the Union—the Union, the Constitution, and Daniel Webster. Among the former, was the following:—'The Union—May its perpetuity be the beginning, the centre, and the end of all our efforts.' Remember what the Union is, according to the understanding of those who responded to the toast—more than one half of its territory constitutionally devoted to slavery and slave-breeding—in all its domains, fugitive slaves hunted like wild beasts—the whole land under and its more than imperial sway of the Slave Power! And its 'perpetuity' should be 'the beginning, the centre, and the end of all our efforts! Why, this is to be infernally patriotic!'

But—aside from these terrible features—it is the acme of infatuation to make the perpetuity of any organization an object of paramount importance. What is government, at best, but a means to an end? What, but clay in the hands of the potter? What, but 'the image and superscription' of the popular will? Radical changes must inevitably take place in all institutions and customs, as the human race becomes enlightened. What is of value to-day, may be worthless to-morrow. It is not in the power of men to perpetuate anything of their own manufacture; nor is it desirable. 'All human combinations change and die.' Truth, Justice, Liberty, and Right—these are immutable and eternal, the embodiment of infinite wisdom and goodness. But men are finite, ignorant, perverse, though happily progressive; hence, they can build nothing that shall not come to an end. New occasions teach new duties—Time makes ancient good uncouth; They must upward still, and onward, who would keep abreast of Truth.—'Abrast of Truth—' Lo! before us gleam her camp-fires! we ourselves must Launch our Mayflower, and steer boldly through the desolate winter sea, Nor attempt the Future's portal with the Past's blood-trusted key.'

Daniel Webster. Among the former, was the following:—

'The Union—May its perpetuity be the beginning, the centre, and the end of all our efforts.'

'Remember what the Union is, according to the understanding of those who responded to the toast—more than one half of its territory constitutionally devoted to slavery and slave-breeding—in all its domains, fugitive slaves hunted like wild beasts—the whole land under and its more than imperial sway of the Slave Power! And its 'perpetuity' should be 'the beginning, the centre, and the end of all our efforts! Why, this is to be infernally patriotic!'

Another toast—'The City of Boston—The birth-place of liberty, the home of patriotism. Boston will never cease to cherish and revere the memory of Daniel Webster.'

And this, so soon after the putting of the Court *Hogue* in chains—the occupancy of Faneuil Hall with armed troops—to make sure the return of a poor, helpless, friendless fugitive slave to the bell of slavery! Boston—where the Money Power is supreme, the headquarters of a parasitic Aristocracy, the endorser of the Baltimore Platform, the contemner of the Higher Law, the worshipper of the Almighty Dollar—Boston, 'the home of patriotism—the birth-place of liberty'!

In the same sense, and to the same extent, is Belgium the seat of reason, and Pandemonium the abode of the blessed. It is to be expected, therefore, that while the city is controlled by such a spirit of commercial selfishness and brutal inhumanity, 'it will not cease to cherish the memory of Daniel Webster.'

Frederick Douglass (over whose recent election our Free Soil friends so loudly exult) responded to this toast, and stated that no where in Europe, Asia or Africa, did he find an intelligent man who was not familiar with the name of Daniel Webster. He closed with a sentiment, eulogizing the U. S. Constitution as 'radiant with the glory of its great defender,' who maintained that the Fugitive Slave Bill of 1850 was entirely constitutional, and obligatory upon every man's conscience! 'Glory!'

The sixth toast was as follows:—'The Right of Search—The guns of our navy and the guns of Webster have annihilated it forever. The sailor shall walk free decks on free seas, while the stars and stripes are the emblems of our Union.'

This was responded to by the Reverend Matthew Hale Smith, Esquire—a facile religious and political adventurer, whose sermons and trivialisations are well known—who, of course, did not make any allusion to the humiliating fact, that to none of the colored seamen of Massachusetts do 'the stars and stripes' give any protection in Southern ports, but they are seized and hurried to prison on their arrival, from which they are liberated only by paying for their prison expenses, or, falling to do this, they are sold to the highest bidder, and doomed to toil and die as slaves. 'The Right of Search,' as applied to Northern vessels arriving at the South, is an outrage of daily perpetration. Massachusetts dare not defend her own citizens against a far worse doom than imprisonment!

The following extraordinary sentiment was forwarded by 'a Baltimorean,' who was prudent enough to keep his name a secret:—'The Fourth of July, 1776, and the Seventh of March, 1850—the former gave birth to the American Union; the latter imparted upon it the seal of perpetuity.'

Even in these days of brazen effrontery, it is difficult to find any thing to match this for audacity. The Fourth of July, 1776, gave to the world the immortal Declaration, affirming the endowment of every human being, by his Creator, with an inalienable right to liberty. The Seventh of March, 1850, witnessed the shameful prostitution of the intellect of Mr. Webster to the service of the Slave Power, and his utter apostasy to the cause of human liberty. And the two days are here blended as identical in spirit and purpose, the latter consummating the glory of the former! The manner in which this detestable 'sentiment' was received, clearly reveals the moral condition of the company. There were loud calls for the name of its author, but no response being made, three cheers were given for 'Baltimore!' O, base degeneracy of soul!

The last toast was, 'The Union—its continuance our life; its dissolution our death.' Reverse the statement, and the truth will be substituted for a falsehood. Letters were read from Senator Bell, of Tennessee, a slaveholder; from Senator Cass, of Michigan, whose position, both by choice and nature, has long been upon all fours before the Slave Power; from Senator Everett, of Massachusetts, who is insensibly possessed with the notion, that, by paying court to the Southern kidnappers, he shall secure his nomination for the Presidency; from Hon. Daniel S. Dickinson, of New York, one of the vilest of Northern doughfaces, and the most profligate of politicians; from Rufus Choate, who, looking up to the defunct Northern Apostate, and shouting, 'It is the voice of a god, and not of a man,' shows the fearful depth of his own moral degradation, and who has yet to evince the least regard for outraged humanity; from George T. Curtis, the slave-catching Commissioner, so notorious in the case of Shadrach and Sims;—&c., &c.

So much for the 'second annual dinner at the Bevere House,' to commemorate the birth-day of Daniel Webster. Had that dinner been dispensed with, we should have had no special provocation, at this time, to write this article.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

We have copied from Frederick Douglass's Paper, on our first page, an article from his own pen, and several others which we find in his columns, extracted from journals always inimical to the American A. S. Society, with a single exception, respecting the controversy which has sprung up between him and his old associates. The best evidence of the badness of his present position is the sympathy and aid extended to him by such vile papers as the *Journal of Commerce*, *Colonization Herald*, *Boston Pilot*, &c., &c. If he cannot blush in presenting such backers to his readers, we can blush for him. The declarations made by them, and endorsed by himself, that he has been proscribed and denounced for his anti-slavery views of the Constitution, and that we are the aggressors, are absolutely and basely untrue; and we defy him or them to quote a single line from the *Standard*, *Freeman*, *Bugle*, or *Liberator*, condemning him for any thing but his aspirations of those who have been his best friends, and to whom he is eternally indebted for his emerging from obscurity.

SAMUEL J. MAY ON POLITICAL ACTION SYRACUSE, JANUARY 18, 1854.

DEAR GARRISON: In his account of the 'Second Annual Meeting of the Garrison Association,' Mr. Nell has not so repeated the definition I gave of my position, in reference to political action, that any body can perceive any thing peculiar in it, or worthy of consideration. Allow me, therefore, to repeat, as nearly as I can remember, the substance of what I said on that point.

'I have always deplored the organization of an Anti-Slavery Political party. I remonstrated against it from first; I have reiterated my remonstrance at subsequent periods; and my observation of the working of that expedient has confirmed me in the conviction, that my distrust of it was, and is, wise. The support and management of a Political organization involve the expenditure, the waste of a great deal of time, energy, money and morality. If all this needs be, let the friends of liberty and humanity can attain their objects without the worst part of such sacrifice. They may be obliged to devote a great deal of time, to expend a great deal of energy, and a great deal of money, but they may keep their hands clean and their hearts pure. I have ever advised, that the friends of the slave should show that they have no desire for the honors or the emoluments of office, but that they are intent only upon the redemption of the oppressed. This would exonerate them from the suspicion of being prompted, in their political activities, by selfish purposes, and so add a moral power to their movements. They should be so far organized as to keep in ceaseless operation those instrumentalities by which anti-slavery sentiments and sympathies may be implanted in the bosoms of the people—so far organized as to act politically, at the polls, wherever they can do so with good effect to the cause of the enslaved. It should be seen and known of all men, that abolitionists are indifferent to the minor issues, which the two political parties attempt to keep up between each other, as the ground of their opposition. It should be seen and felt that true men care, first of all, for the rights of humanity; and that whenever they see that either of the political parties promises to do something for the emancipation of the enslaved, they (the abolitionists) will be sure to throw themselves with all their votes, at the polls, into the scale of that party. A body of such men, animated by such a principle, and known to be true to it, would be a mighty power in the State and in the nation. The abolitionists did act in this wise, in this State, for a few years, and well in high revolutionized the Commonwealth. Had it not been for the mistaken policy of Liberty-pampering—had the abolitionists persevered in the course here described, (notwithstanding the impositions that were sometimes put upon them,) they would long since have purged Massachusetts, at least, of all pro-slavery influence. And now, a few thousand abolitionists in each of the States, and not more than twenty-thirty thousand of them throughout the Union, acting together in the manner I have commended, would hold the balance of power between the two political parties in the States, and in the Republic, and compel them or the other to do their bidding.

who would hold an even hand between the friends and the oppressors of the 'Rescue,' that he incurred the charge (most unjustly) of attempting to break up the meeting. When, therefore, he was put in nomination, the opponents of his election endeavored to make him especially odious as, in effect, one of the leaders of the 'Rescue of Jerry.' I felt, therefore, that he ought to be sustained. I voted for his re-election, rather than for him; and, in helping to secure his election, I felt that, without any sacrifice of principle, I have helped to obtain in our country a triumph scarcely second, in its immediate effects, to the election of Mr. Smith, in his District.

Thus, friends, have I attempted to illustrate the views I take of the use you should make of your political power, your elective franchise.

WHO ARE THE FANATICS?

In a recent article, a friend thus writes—'These raving Abolitionists only disgust me.' To the writer, and to all who sympathize with such disgust, the following remarks are offered: I do not know to whom you refer, as 'raving Abolitionists.' All with whom I am acquainted are more rational in their views of Slavery, and more consistent in their conduct concerning it, than those politicians, law-expounders, clergymen and teachers, who have the reputation of being sober, sane men. Those who use the strong language with which Jesus smote the Scribes and Pharisees of his day, are really more sound in their judgment of men and institutions, than are the fawning sycophants for office and power. And even when a noble zeal for human rights oversteps the bounds of moderation, how much more excusable than the sinful indifference upon which its persecutors ride into favor!

Who are they, who usually bring the charge of fanaticism against Abolitionists? They are politicians and their blind followers—lawyers, doctors of divinity and their 'locks,' office-seekers—the ins and the outs. Their political creed is—'All men are born free and equal, with the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' They are uproariously boastful of this principle, and of their attempts to apply it to life. They profess it is their aim, to cast all our institutions that mould. At the same time, they hold three millions of human beings in bondage—deprive them of all their rights. They frame laws to send back to slavery every fugitive. They stigmatize, as traitors, those who refuse to obey such laws. They denounce, as fanatics, those who advocate a higher Law. Yet, candidly considered, what is more treasonable to the creed they boast of, than the conduct they pursue? What scheme more visionary, than an attempt to organize the Declaration of Independence, by an adherence to chattel slavery? These schemes, so far removed from fanaticism, in the popular estimation, are hateful to their country's creed of liberty, yet not ashamed of their practice of slavery; glorying, alike, in the rescue of Kossuth and in the rendition of Simms; rewarding Ingraham and punishing Torrey, Walker, Chapin and Drayton, for the same acts; welcoming Kossuth and Meagher, and hunting back into slavery, refugees from a tyranny more galling than Hungary or Ireland ever knew. Who are the fanatics?

The creed of the Abolitionist is—'Immediate emancipation—the duty of the slaveholder, the right of the slave.' Slavery is a sin which ought to be repented of at once, and abandoned; consequently, he earnestly and steadfastly separates himself from voluntary connection with the Government which shelters and defends it, and from the Church which sanctions it. Garrison unfolds to the breeze, the uncompromising banner—'No Union with Slaveholders'; consequently, he wages a war of extermination against them—a destroyer, yet a builder too;—for out of the ashes of the slaveholder, he would have the man arise; from the ruins of three million slaves, he would make as many freemen. Here, creed and life agree. Here is consistency, sound faith, sound practice.

The American Church and clergy profess reverence for the Bible and love for Jesus Christ—all themselves disciples of him who preached the gospel to the poor, deliverance to the captive, and love to all men. They cry, 'Lord, Lord,' morning and evening, and every Sunday repeat the cry. Their worship is veiled with the most beautiful melodies and lovely hymns. How different the worship of their Lord! Yes, their sermons expiate and bygone to shame. They inculcate the return of fugitive slaves, as a duty. Dr. Denny would send back his own mother or son. Dr. Gannett would not conceal, harbor or aid a woman fleeing from oppression, if she 'owe service' under the laws of a slave State. The clergy, with rare and noble exceptions, teach obedience to the Fugitive Slave Law, openly or by silence; for silence, upon such a law, is consent to it.

The N. S. Presbyterian Assembly can hurl their resolutions against 'promiscuous dancing,' while they wink at, or only tamely and reluctantly allude to, wholesale robbery and adultery, as practiced in slaveholding communities. The Unitarian Convention can spend three days in talking about the 'communion' and a 'liturgy,' while men are legally kidnapped in their midst, and scarcely none say, 'Why do ye so?' Yes, many members of that sect openly pledged themselves to sustain the kidnapping law! They do not oppose it as a body; rarely individually. The same sect, shocked at Theodore Parker's heresies, 'disgusted' at the 'raving Abolitionists,' hold up, in their Annual Register, Daniel Webster as a model of religion to the Unitarian youth!

Dr. Cox and other 'evangelicals,' can be solemnly indignant, when a foreign government imprisoned the Mission for reading the Bible, which is denied the slave, and no whisper of indignation is heard against the power which fines and imprisons American women, for teaching their colored sisters to read the same book.

Dr. Sharp could fellowship a slaveholding Doctor of Divinity; and the Baptist minister of this town told me, that he could not consider it a sin to hold slaves in the way Dr. Fuller, of South Carolina, does—the same Dr. who occupied Dr. Sharp's pulpit. Yet, both of these ministers would excommunicate persons, because they preferred sprinkling to immersion!

All this is true of the popular clergy and churches. They are called 'Christians.' From such, often comes the charge of 'raving Abolitionists'—'fanaticism.' I think it is more fanatical to call them 'Christians,' than to call slaveholders 'men-stealers,' and 'women-whippers,' and 'cradle-plunderers.' It is nearer the truth, to call such exhibitions of life as the churches give, *hypocrisy*—a severe term, but justly applicable. You say, my friend, 'these raving Abolitionists disgust you.' I am disgusted with ambitious, unprincipled politicians; with hypocritical priests; with selfish merchants; and with the indifference manifested, among all classes, to the sin of American Slavery. 'Raving Abolitionists!' There is more fanaticism outside the Anti-Slavery movement, than all the D. D.'s ever imagined in it. I deliberately deny the charge of 'fanaticism,' brought against the Abolitionists. It is as false as the charge of 'infidelity.' Their principles are based on the soundest philosophy; their measures are based on the off-spring of reason and unfeeling religion. Cool, calculating, far-seeing really distinguishes them from the timid, cowardly, compromising, vacillating majority. I charge upon the Government and Church, with their adherents, that which is worse than superstitious, more to be dreaded, than fanaticism, more dangerous than mania, viz: unblushing hypocrisy.

The Abolitionists believe, that 'God hath made of one blood all nations of men—that He is the Father of all, and that all are brothers.' In accordance with this belief, they extend to the slave a hand, whose fingers are 'Love, Justice, Liberty, Equality,' with a thumb of steady, sincere effort. With this, they mean to right the slave and his headless, oppressive, barbarous master. With this, will they uplift both the victim and the spoiler from the degradation which Avarice and Selfishness, leagued against Weakness, have brought upon them. This hand has been branded as a thief, by the State, and as infidel by the Church; but, as Paul glo-

ried in the Cross of Christ, so do we glory in the Branded Hand. We are willing to show it to the All-Seeing Eye, and abide the judgment of God and posterity. Let them decide who are the fanatics.

'Why, that brand is highest honor—than its traces never yet. Upon old armorial hatchments was a prouder blazon set: And thy unborn generations, as they tread our rocky strand, Shall tell, with pride, the story of their father's BRANDED HAND!' Framingham, Jan'y, 1854. H. O. S.

BUSINESS ENTERPRISE OF COLORED PEOPLE IN BOSTON.

Within the past ten years, this class of our citizens have exhibited a very commendable business tact and talent—a fact all the more gratifying, when remembering that, but a few years since, they were, by general consent, looked upon as an inferior portion of God's children.

The present aspect must be encouraging to anti-slavery men and women, who, in countless ways, by word and deed, have smoothed the path of competition which the colored American always finds more rugged than any other aspirant.

The following deserved tribute to him who has distanced all competitors, and is hailed as the Prince of Caterers, has been published in the city papers, and should find a place in THE LIBERATOR.—

Boston, Nov. 17th, 1853. The Dinner Committee of the Sons of New Hampshire avail themselves of the occasion to express to Mr. J. B. SMITH their entire satisfaction at the manner in which he met his engagements to the Committee. The abundance and variety of the well-prepared viands; the prompt attention of the well-disciplined waiters; the elegant bouquets, and the other adornments of the tables, conspired to render the entertainment one of the best public dinners ever provided in the city of Boston.

We take much pleasure in recommending Mr. Smith as a most excellent caterer, hoping that those who may employ him, may duly appreciate, and generously reward his labors for their gratification and entertainment.

DAVID BRANT, SELDON CROCKETT, J. H. SILNEY, SILAS DUBREK, P. P. CHENEY, DAVID CHAMBERLIN, S. S. SEAVEY, JESSE MAYNARD, THOS. W. ROBINSON, EZRA FORBISTALL, N. HOGGINS, W. G. HANAFORD, SAM'L ORBELL, AVERY PLUMER, JR. Then there is the Boston Gymnasium in successful operation, under its accomplished proprietor, JOHN B. BATELY, of Baltimore, who, having won golden opinions at home, is daily registering pupils from the wealthy and other circles of Boston and vicinity. A visit to No. 4, Franklin Street, will convince all, that he has superior facilities 'for every imaginable mode of exercising the human body.'

A Boot and Shoe Store has recently been opened in Cambridge Street, by two young men—DEBORAH & DEUX—whose well-selected stock, practical knowledge of the business, and agreeable treatment of customers, are fast securing for them a good share of patronage. Dr. JONAS V. DEGRASSE, No. 40 Poplar Street, skillful and faithful in his practice, though laboring under the obstacles that beset all young physicians, will soon, it is hoped, realize a fair reward for the labor and cost, which, in the Parisian hospitals and elsewhere, have qualified him for administering to the various ills that human flesh is heir to.

JOHN W. LEWIS, too, in Richmond Street, master Blacksmith, employing, constantly, several journeymen. Merchants, ship-owners and house-builders find him prompt and competent, in the various branches of his craft. Madame CARTEUX, 126 Washington Street, has elicited encomiums from the ladies of Boston, for her preparations for improving the hair and complexion, as also her skill in applying the same. I might enumerate others:—ROBERT MORRIS, Lawyer; LEWIS HAYDEN, Trader; J. S. ROCK, Dentist; besides Gilbers, House and Sign Painters, Printers, Tailors; and so through the whole list of Mechanical, Artistic and Professional skill; but the present will suffice. The success of one, is a guaranty for others. Let colored men and women persevere in well-doing, and they must exert from apprehensions an appreciation of their abilities in these several departments, hitherto monopolized by the more favored class in the community. W. C. N.

Boston, Jan., 1854.

STATE COUNCIL.

EXTENDED FRIEND GARRISON.—The Massachusetts State Council of Colored Americans was held in Boston on the 21st instant, as announced. Perhaps a brief sketch of its proceedings, in advance of the official report, may be acceptable to your readers.

The inclement state of the weather, together with other obstacles, prevented the attendance of several members, whose attendance would have augmented the good that was done, and, at the same time, saved the Council and the anti-slavery cause from that harm, which, it is feared, will result from some of its actions. Among the objects which concentrated the most harmony was that of Protective Unions, on which Henry O. Remington and others imparted valuable information; the only point of difference being, whether these should be exclusive, or participated in by white and colored. Jeremiah B. Sanderson adjourned the latter view. From the various plans suggested may yet be developed one which will unite all the members.

Several resolutions were introduced, eliciting interesting discussions. One, recommending colored men and women to unite their efforts with the Anti-Slavery Societies; another, discountenancing the general emigration scheme; also, one inviting colored lecturers, now abroad, to return at their earliest convenience, and buckle on their anti-slavery armor.

A resolution, based on that of Professor Reason, as adopted by the Rochester Convention, protesting against complacent exclusiveness, was opposed by Rev. Leonard A. Grimes, and supported by Wm. C. Nell, and finally adopted.

Lewis Hayden introduced a series of resolutions, in which was embodied a complaint against HARRIS BURNETT STONE, for not having appropriated moneys in aid of the contemplated Manual Labor College. This was deemed premature by several members, inasmuch as no evidence had been submitted of any definite promise, or violation thereof; and for the reason that it seemed to dictate to Mrs. Stone the mode in which certain donations were to be applied.

The resolutions were adopted, but protested against by Wm. C. Nell, Jeremiah B. Sanderson, Jonas W. Clark, and Henry Hatton.

The most exciting scene was the election of additional members to the National Convention. It had been agreed upon to dispense with a nominating committee, and elect by ballot. After tellers had been appointed, Jeremiah B. Sanderson expressed the hope that the claims of CHARLES LENOX REMOND would be remembered by the voters. He said, that whoever else might be acceptable, (and he had not a word to offer against any one,) he hazarded nothing in saying, that by no one would the interests of Colored Americans be more faithfully and intelligently represented. The remarks of Mr. Sanderson proved the signal for an opposition wholly unexpected, characterised by personal allusions equally irrelevant and bitter; and the attempt to do Mr. Remond justice was cut off by the previous question, and a routine of action pursued, disgraceful to an assembly of freemen.

If the Council be not wrecked by the injudicious action of its professed friends, certainly the rejection of such a man as CHARLES LENOX REMOND will be seriously felt in its future deliberations. There is this consoling reflection, however, that his friends present did what they could; and well do they know, that a full Massachusetts vote would have secured his triumphant election. W. C. N.

Boston, January, 1854.

GENEROUS AID.—The following letter, containing the sum referred to therein, is from one of the warmest and most reliable friends of the anti-slavery cause; who will accept our hearty thanks for his donation made in behalf of one, who, 'being dead, yet speaketh'—assured that it comes very opportunely, as our struggle to sustain THE LIBERATOR is still 'against wind and tide,' and probably is destined to be, while it remains a free, independent, and fearless journal. WENDELL PHILLIPS, Feb. 23, 1854.

DEAR BROTHER GARRISON.—I send you FORTY DOLLARS for the support of THE LIBERATOR. It is the last that was entrusted to me by our brother PHILANDER WARE, for the poor slave.

This expresses my confidence in your integrity and fidelity to principle. Continue faithful. Let both sides be heard, even at the expense of present defeat. God will reign forever. As his truth will stand forever, though wicked men and devils rage and devour for a time. Right first—then union, peace, love and joy. I should be happy to be at the annual meeting this week, but cannot. Love to friends.

Your brother, ABNER BELCHER. W. L. GARRISON.

CASE OF STEPHEN WEAKEY.

For daring to give 'aid and comfort' to certain fugitive slaves, on their way to Canada, STEPHEN WEAKEY, an estimable friend of humanity in Pennsylvania, has been stripped of all his property, by an act of judicial villainy, to the amount of three or four thousand dollars. To save him from utter destitution, and to show to the government that such a noble spirit is not to be crushed by its power, it is proposed that the friends of the dying fugitives, and of all in bondage, contribute their share, whatever they may choose to consider it, towards making up the amount stowed. Our friend JOSEPH BARKER, of Ohio, now temporarily in this city, makes the following generous engagement of the sum subscribed by him a short time since. May his example be widely imitated!

MY DEAR FRIEND—I have raised my contribution to the fund for indemnifying STEPHEN WEAKEY, from TEN TO FIFTY DOLLARS. Will the friends of freedom, who have already contributed, try to raise their contributions, or obtain a few new ones? Yours affectionately, JOSEPH BARKER.

Boston, Jan. 23, 1854.

PARKER PILLSBURY.—We shall hope to receive, ere long, intelligence of the safe arrival of this beloved friend, and veteran advocate of the slave, in England. He sailed from this port on the 4th inst., in the Canada steamer America, and no doubt is now in that land on whose soil every chattel slave instantly becomes transformed into a freeman. Wherever he may travel, we commend him to the hospitality, esteem and confidence of all freedom-loving spirits, as one strong in intellect, noble in soul, uncompromising in principle, fearless in conflict, and trustworthy in every temptation. Europe never entertained a worthier guest from these shores. The best wishes of thousands, in this land, for his health and safety; go with him. We know not how to spare him, even as a matter of respite, from the lecturing field; but his spirit is world-wide, and wherever he goes, the cause of freedom and suffering humanity will be sure to be strengthened by his presence.

SOLEMN EXCOMMUNICATIONS.

'Tidings, my lord the king! Tidings!' The divine right of the Church vindicated!—Offenders cut off—Heresies signally punished, and made an example to the rest of mankind! Yesterday, January 6th, in the year of our Lord 1854, a church in this town excommunicated six of its members, for that greatest of modern crimes, loving humanity more than sect, and the suffering slave more than religious popularity. And to-day, our streets turn pale with the august spectacle of one of the 'holy brethren' diligently searching out the anathematized rebels, and delivering to them letters of excommunication. Among the number is a poor widow, of blameless life. Pure religion and unfeeling before God is this, to visit the widow and fatherless with letters of excommunication, and keep yourselves unspotted from heresy.—St. JAMES.

Of course, what they 'bind on earth, is bound in heaven.' How does this remind one of the days of the Inquisition! In our courts of civil justice, even the murderer is allowed the right of defence. But these 'vile criminals' were not allowed to know so much as the time or place of their immolation. Oh, Church of Rome! 'Holy Mother,' drunk with the blood of martyrs, behold here thy descendants, thy faithful children! A TERRIFIED OBSERVER.

Cannington, Mass., Jan 6, 1854.

THE IRISH SLAVE-DRIVER.

A friend at Williamsburg, N. Y., in the course of a private letter, very justly remarks—'What a disgraceful avowal is that on the part of John Mitchell, in relation to slavery! How easily deceived the public are, sometimes, in regard to character! Here is a man who had prated of liberty and oppression, and boasted of being a martyr also; who never had the first spark of freedom kindling in his bosom, nor the first sign of a conscientious relationship to that Deity who is no respecter of persons, but whose love, like the sun's rays, radiates in life-beams upon all.' 'For a manly repudiation of Mitchell, see Letter of JOSEPH BARKER, in the preceding page.

VALUABLE AND IMPORTANT HISTORICAL PAMPHLET just published, and for sale at the Anti-Slavery Office, price 25 cents.—Proceedings of the American Anti-Slavery Society, at its Second Decade, in Philadelphia, Dec. 3d, 4th and 5th—with speeches by Wendell Phillips, Edmund Quincy, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Samuel J. May, William H. Furness, Joseph Barker, J. Miller McKim, Charles C. Burleigh, Henry C. Wright, Lucretia Mott—&c. &c.

The General Agent of this paper acknowledges the receipt of £2 from John R. Nell, Belfast, Ireland, by the hand of J. M. McKim.

American Colonization Society.—The thirtieth anniversary of the American Colonization Society, was held at Trinity Church, in the city of Washington, on the evening of Tuesday, Jan. 17. Mr. J. H. B. Latrobe, President, presided. The Rev. Mr. Lane, Secretary, read an abstract of the annual report. The receipts for the past year were \$84,454. The expenditures were considerably more, leaving the Society in debt \$20,000. During the year, 1843, 785 emigrants to Liberia. The colony is in a prosperous condition; her commercial and political importance rapidly advancing; her government recognized by England, France, Prussia, Belgium and Brazil, to mutual profit and advantage. Liberia was the first and only free government on the continent of Africa. She is, in fact, the only government in the world, which it would be advantageous to her morally, and to us politically and commercially. The European States will monopolize the trade, if we do not bestir ourselves. England has two lines of steamers running to Africa. A steamer leaves England twice a month. Addresses were made by Mr. Latrobe, and Judge Wayne of the Superior Court; after which, the meeting adjourned.

Miss Lucy Stone in Pittsburgh.—We learn from the Pittsburgh Gazette, that Miss Lucy Stone, who went from Salem to the above place, met with a very enthusiastic reception there. She lectured in Pittsburgh two or three evenings, and, on each occasion, the large hall in which she held forth was filled to overflowing, and many were obliged to go away without gaining admittance. We are much pleased to learn that such a radical reformer as Miss Stone has become so popular as to be able to call out such large and respectable audiences to hear her.—Honest Journal.

JOSEPH BARKER, OF OHIO. Proposes to deliver six Lectures, in the city of Boston, on the following topics:—THE BIBLE—ITS ORIGIN, CHARACTER, AND TENDENCY. Is it the production of God, or of man? Is it a mass of divine oracles, or human thoughts? Is it all true and good, or is it a mixture of truth and error? Is its tendency, when recognized as of divine authority, good or evil? Discussion allowed after each lecture. The lecturer offers to discuss the whole question with any recognized minister of the leading churches of the country.

The Lectures will be delivered in the Melroseon, on TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY, THURSDAY and FRIDAY, Feb. 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th—and on TUESDAY and WEDNESDAY, Feb. 14th and 15th. Admission free, 10 cents.

ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR IN FITZBURGH.

An Anti-Slavery Fair will be opened at the Town Hall in Fitzburgh, on WEDNESDAY evening, Feb. 8th, and will continue through THURSDAY, 9th. A great variety of useful and fancy articles will be offered for sale, among which will be found many rich and rare foreign articles, from the late Boston Bazaar.

We cordially invite all the friends of the cause, in Fitzburgh and the vicinity, to cooperate with us in furnishing refreshments for the Fair. Donations of money, or other available articles, will be gratefully received. The proceeds of the Fair will be devoted to the use of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

Public speaking may be expected each evening. Refreshments may be sent to the Hall, during the Fair, or left either at the Committee.

ELVIRA KIMBALL, MARGARET P. SNOW, SARAH T. D. ROBINSON, EMILIE J. WELD, ADELIA C. SMITH, LOUISA JOSELYN, SARAH BARKER, FITZBURGH. FRANCES H. DRAKE, MARIA PHILLIPS, CATHARINE D. LAKE, Loomister. LUCINDA MILLS, Mrs. BIGELOW, Westminister. ELIZA HOWE, SUSAN B. EVERETT, Princeton. SARAH LAWRENCE, MARTHA BARKER, Gardner. WENDELL PHILLIPS will speak at the Fair, on Wednesday evening, February 8.

JUSTICE TO WOMEN.

CONVENTION AT ALBANY. TUESDAY AND WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14 AND 15. The Petition, asking for such amendments in the States and Constitution of New York as will secure to the women of the State LEGAL EQUALITY with the men, and to females equally with the males a RIGHT to SUFFRAGE, will be presented to the Legislature about the middle of February. We, the Committee appointed at the Convention held at Rochester in December, by whose authority these petitions were issued,—do hereby invite all fellow-citizens, of either sex, who are in favor of these measures, to assemble in Convention, at Albany, on Tuesday and Wednesday, February 14 and 15.

The so-called 'Women's Rights Movement' has been so much misrepresented, that it is desirable to make the appeal for justice earnest, imposing and effective, by showing how eminently equitable are its principles—how wise and practical are its measures. Let the serious-minded, generous, hopeful men and women of New York then gather in council, to determine whether there is any thing fractional or revolutionary in the proposal that fathers, brothers, husbands, should treat their daughters, sisters, wives and mothers as their peers. This reform is designed, by its originators, to make woman womanly, in the highest sense of that term,—to exalt, not to degrade,—to perfect, not to impair, her refining influence in every sphere. The demand made is only to take off burdens, to remove hindrances, to leave women free, as men are free, to follow conscience and judgment in all scenes of duty. On what ground,—except the right of might,—do men, claiming to be Republicans and Christians, deny to women privileges which they would die to gain and keep for themselves? What evil—what but good—can come from enlarging woman's power of usefulness? How can society be otherwise than a gainer by the increased moral and mental influence of one-half of its members? Let these and similar questions be fairly, candidly, thoroughly discussed in the hearing of the Legislature of New York.

Come, then, fellow-citizens, to this meeting, prepared to speak, to hear, to act. LUCY STONE, WENDELL PHILLIPS, Mrs. C. L. H. NICHOLS, and other earnest friends of the cause from New England and the West, as well as from our own State, are to be with us: And may the spirit of truth preside over all!

Those having petitions in their hands will please send them to Susan B. Anthony, Rochester, until the first of February; after which, they should be forwarded to Lydia Mott, Albany. ELIZABETH C. STANTON, WM. HENRY CHANNING, SAMUEL J. MAY, WM. HAY, ERNESTINE L. ROSE, BERUBORG PHILLIPS, ANTONETTE L. BROWN, LUDIA ANN JENKINS, SUSAN B. ANTHONY. Editors, please copy. January 23, 1854.

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, for Jan. 1854.

Art. I. The Woman Question; by Rev. John Weiss. Art. II. Reflections; by Edward Wigglesworth. Art. III. The Genuineness of the Gospels; by Rev. J. H. Morrison. Art. IV. Dr. Judson's Life and Labors; by Rev. E. B. Hall, D. D. Art. V. The Piety and the Poetry of the Saps; by Rev. W. F. Alger. Art. VI. Osgood's Footprints of Providential Leadership; by Rev. S. K. Lathrop, D. D. Art. VII. Infancy; a poem. By S. F. Clapp. Then the usual Literary Notices. This work is published bi-monthly, by Crosby, Nichols & Co., at \$4 per annum. THE NEW HYGIENIC COOK BOOK, with three hundred receipts for cooking on hygienic principles, containing also a Philosophical Exposition of the Relations of Food to Health; the Chemical Elements and Proximate Constitution of Alimentary Principles; the Nutritive Properties of all kinds of Aliments; the Relative Value of Vegetable and Animal Substances; and the Selection and Preservation of Dietetic Materials, &c. &c. By R. T. Trull, M. D. With one hundred illustrative engravings. 1 vol. 12mo. Price, delivered free, 87 cents. Published by FOWLER & WELLS. New York, No. 131 Nassau street. Boston, No. 142 Washington street. Philadelphia, No. 231 Arch street. Feb. 23.

Shocking Calamity.—The dwelling-house of a Mr. MacAndrew, printer in the British American office, Woodstock, Upper Canada, took fire on Sunday morning, while the family were asleep; before any of the individuals in the house were awake, the flames had taken possession of the upper part of the building and staircase. Mr. MacAndrew was first made aware of the existence of the fire when the flames had burned into his bedroom; the smoke nearly suffocated his wife, rendering her quite helpless; the husband accordingly brought her to a window, through which both of them made their escape, losing in the effort an infant child, which was lost in the density of the smoke. The melancholy result of the conflagration is the death of Mr. MacAndrew's mother-in-law, his servant girl, and infant child, all of whom were burned to a cinder.

The Riband and George of the Garter, vacant by the death of the Duke of Beaufort, is to be given to the Earl of Carlisle, who travelled in the United States as Lord Morpeth, and is brother to the Duchess of Sutherland.—Mrs. Harriet Stone's noble patroness, Mrs. S. in Athens, a translation of Uncle Tom has been introduced as 'Omparap Tloma.' That's fame.

THE UNA—A Monthly Journal devoted to the elevation of Woman. Published at PROVIDENCE, R. I., and edited by Mrs. PAULINA WRIGHT DAVIS. Price ONE DOLLAR a year. The second volume commences Jan. 1, 1854. NOTICES OF THE PRESS: 'It is filled with original matter, is gentle in tone, steadfast in purpose and tasteful in appearance.—[Tribune.] 'The editress has enlisted valuable aid, and is herself adequate to the work she undertakes.—[Phila. Register.] 'We welcome "The Una." May it find its way into many homes, and that its seeds of truth may be a hundred fold.—[Wor. Spy.] 'The editress is valuable, and the communications of more than average merit.—[Glosser News.] 'We hope it will receive a patronage which will speedily warrant a more frequent publication.—[Penn. Freeman.] 'We accept it as the inauguration of an idea, which cannot be answered down nor extinguished, and whose ultimate triumph is certain.—[Madison Co. Free Press.] 'The writing in the first number contains much that is worthy of the space it occupies.—[Home Journal.] 'Its tone is liberal and decided, but calm and gentle.—[Cor. of Boston Post.] 'With such an organ, the women can make a dignified stand in the cause they have espoused.—[Vates Co. Whig.] 'It will sell all that it is to be said on that side of the question.—[Agric. Journal.] 'We know of no paper so well calculated to aid the movement of emancipating women.—[Syracuse Journal.] 'It shall not want a good word from us.—[Prov. Journal.] 'THE UNA can be found at the store of Bela Marsh, Bookseller, No. 25 Cornhill. Price 10 cents single copy.

ESSEX CO. ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.—A Quarterly Meeting of the Essex County Anti-Slavery Society will be held at ESSEX, on Saturday evening, and Sunday, day and evening, February 4th and 5th. Rev. ANDREW T. FOSS, CHARLES L. REMOND, and other speakers, are expected to be present. JOSEPH MERRILL, Secy.

CHARLES C. BURLEIGH, an Agent of the Mass. Anti-Slavery Society, will lecture as follows: Shelburne, on Sunday, Jan. 29. Wrentham, on Monday, " 30. Foxboro', on Tuesday, " 31. Walpole, on Wednesday, Feb. 1. Medfield, on Thursday, " 2. Dover, on Friday, " 3.

ANDREW T. FOSS, an Agent of the Massachusetts A. S. Society, will lecture in Rochester, N. H., and neighborhood, on Sunday, Jan. 29, and during the week ensuing.

HENRY C. WRIGHT will hold meetings in the Town Hall in Abington, on Sunday, February 6, during the day.

MARRIED.—In this city, 18th inst., by Rev. L. E. Caswell, Rev. John Davis, of Toronto, Canada, to Mrs. Eunice R. Davis, of Boston.

DIED.—In this city, December 24th, 1853, Mrs. MARY BROWN, aged 60.

In this city, Jan. 16th, Mr. PETER M. HOWARD, aged 77; a much esteemed and well-known citizen. His event, though long anticipated, has removed one whose sons and daughters, with their alliances, all fondly remembering the mother, a few years since departed, has impressed upon them a sense of double bereavement. Rev. John T. Raymond, in his remarks to the family and friends, awarded to him, who had just 'walked the way of nature,' the tribute which was warranted by his own observation, through many years acquaintance—confirmed by others who had been familiar with the deceased a much longer period. He enumerated his fondness for the arts, and, above all, his characteristic love of home and its associations.

Words of Christian counsel were also administered by Rev. LEONARD A. GRIMES. These blended offerings deeply moved the large concourse of friends, whose presence evinced their respect for the dead, and sympathy for surviving relatives.

In Dorchester, January 16th, Mr. WILLIAM P. PEAKES, aged 49. Mr. Peakes was well known to many of the readers of THE LIBERATOR as an earnest friend of the various reforms which have attracted the attention of the true-hearted for the last quarter of a century. He says, I think, been a reader and subscriber of the old 'pioneer sheet' for nearly twenty years. Elected in the strictest sect of old-fashioned Orthodoxy, he gradually changed his views, as he received light, until sectarian chains were unable to bind his free spirit. He had trials and afflictions more than usually fall to the lot of humanity. Sickness and death had many times entered his family circle. He looked upon affliction not as springing from the ground, or as mysterious dispensations of Divine Providence sent to afflict the sons of men, but as the consequence of disobedience to the Natural Laws of God. He exhibited Christian patience and resignation in his last sickness, and expressed to a friend that 'he believed in the Fatherhood of God, and the Brotherhood of the human race. If his mission was ended, he might as well go at one time as another.' His disease was a cancerous tumor upon his leg. Eminent physicians decided upon amputation of the limb. He consented, but disease had so fastened upon his whole system, that he survived the operation but a few days. He has left a wife and two children.—Com.

At his residence near Geneva, Ontario County, N. Y., on the 14th inst., the venerable ASA PALMER, aged about eighty-three years. Calmly, quietly and joyfully, this faithful friend of the slave passed into the world of spirits.

Of him it may be truly said, that he did his day's work in the day time. Into every question of reform which claimed his sympathy, he entered with his whole soul. He was active in the distribution of reform publications, and lost no opportunity in showing that his sympathies were with the right and the true. An ardent lover of little children, he always had a kind word for them, and never failed to secure their friendship and love. A few days previous to his departure, he expressed to me his entire willingness to die, and said it was a pleasant reflection that he had advocated the reforms of the age. The pernicious tendency of secret societies he would frequently advert to.

When the Geneva Yearly Meeting of Friends, of which he was a member, had, by their persecutions and proscriptions, driven the more liberal portion of their members to form the Yearly Meeting of Congregational Friends, to escape ecclesiastical tyranny, and secure the benefits of a religious association which should not 'keep in the quiet' in a country full of injustice and oppression, he gave that movement his cordial cooperation. This he referred to as affording him great satisfaction at this time.

I cannot find words adequate to express the deep interest he felt in the anti-slavery cause. The fugitive slave never appealed to him in vain. In early life, true to the instincts of his nature, he assisted slaves to escape from their masters in the land of Roger Williams, of whom he was a lineal descendant. He held in utter abhorrence the infamous Fugitive Slave Law, and did not hesitate, when an opportunity offered, to trample on its provisions. He also expressed great admiration for the character of Wm. Lloyd Garrison, and spoke in the highest terms of his efforts in the cause of freedom and progress.

The life of a good man leaves a pleasant impression in the memory of his survivors.

Sunderland's New Method of Cure FOR ALL forms of Disease, by NUTRITION, without medicine. The desire for 'Narcotics destroyed!' Available for the Sick, the Lame, the Deaf and the Blind, in any part of the country! No need of personal consultations.—Pamphlets of Information sent post free, on receipt of one dime, pre-paid. Address New METHOD ON CORN, 23 Elliot St., Boston, Mass. January 27.

The Year 1853. Has been a year prolific in good Books. John P. Jewett & Company, Among their numerous issues, have published the following, which have met with great favor from the public, and large sales, and which should be found in every Library. Mrs. Child's Life of Isaac C. Hopper, One of the most intensely interesting books ever published. 10,000 copies in 4 months.

THE STADY SIDE, BY MISS HICHELL. A thrilling tale of the vicissitudes of a country minister's life. 27,000 copies in 3 months.

THE MYSTERIOUS PARLOR, OR, SATANIC LICENSE. A powerfully written Temperance Tale. Fourth Thousand. LECTURES TO YOUNG MEN, BY REV. ELLIS W. CLARK. First thousand sold in four days.

Voices from the Silent Land, OR, LEAVES OF CONSOLATION FOR THE AFFLICTED. BY MRS. H. DWIGHT WILLIAMS. A beautiful gift for a friend in affliction.

THE LAST HOURS OF CHRIST, BY W. G. SCHAFER, Missionary at Constantinople. A religious work of rare excellence and beauty.

THE PERSIAN FLOWER, Being a Memoir of a daughter of Rev. Justin Perkins, of Persia. A sweet child. DR. E. C. ROGERS'S GREAT WORK ON THE Philosophy of Mysterious

POETRY.

AN OLD YEAR'S POEM.

The London Notes and Queries gives the following antique poem from the fly-leaf of an old book. It is not only appropriate to the month, but a gem of its kind—

Though I be poor, yet will I make hard shift,
But I will send my God a new year's gift.
Nor myrrour nor frankincense
Can I dispense,
Nor gold of Ophir
Is in my coffer;
With wealth I have so small acquaintance as
I scarce know time from silver, gold from brass.
Oriental rubies, emeralds greene,
Blow sapphires, sparkling diamonds I have seen,
Yet neuer yet did touch
Or gemme or ouch,
Nor pearle nor amber
Are in my chamber;
These things are in my mind, but neuer yet
Vouchsaf'd to lodge within my cabinet.
My ever living, ever loving King
Yet shall from me receive a better thing;
For princess' diademes,
Flaming with gemmes,
With richesse drest
Of east and west,
Match not this gift, which if my God shall owne,
I'll not change lots with him that weares a crowne.
An heart with penitence made new and cleane,
Fild with faith, hope, and love, must be my praye.
My God, 'y didst not slight
The widow's mite,
Accept of this
Poore sacrifice,
Though I nere give but what before was Thine,
A treasure taken out of Thine owne mine.

HOME IS HOME.

The lines below, written by Dr. Beaumont, who was born in 1616, have lost none of their freshness and homely flavor, in the lapse of more than two centuries. With the quaintness of garb peculiar to the times, every line is the warm pulse of a poet's heart, to which men's hearts will now throbb in response—

Home's a home, although it reached be
Through wet and dirt and night. Though heartily
I welcomed was, yet something still,
Methinks, was wanting to fulfill
Content's odd appetite. No cheer,
Say I, so good as that which meets me here.
Now here at home; not that my board
I find with quaintier, richer dainties stored;
No, my high welcome all in this
Cheap, simple word, presented is,
My home; a word so dearly sweet,
That all variety in it I meet.
When I'm abroad, my joys are so;
And therefore they to me seem strangers too;
I may salute them lovingly,
But must not too familiar be;
Some ceremonious points there are,
Which me from pleasure's careless freedom bar.
But Home, sweet Home, release me from
From anxious joys, into liberty
Of unconflicting delight;
By being absolutely free,
Enthrones me in Contentment's monarchy.

Dickens, in his "Household Worlds," occasionally preaches a seasonable discourse, abounding in as much good sense as sentiment. The following is from a late number of that popular periodical—

WINTER SERMON.

Thou dwellest in a warm and cheerful home,
Thy roof in vain the winter tempest lashes;
While houseless wretches round thy mansion roam,
On whose unsheltered head the torrent splashes.
Thy board is loaded with the richest meats,
O'er which thine eyes in satiate languor wander;
Many might live on what thy mastiff eats,
Or feast on fragments which thy servants squander.
Thy limbs are muffled from the piercing blast,
When from thy fireside corner thou dost saze;
Many have scarce a rag about them cast,
With which the frosty breezes toy and dally.
Thou hast soft smiles to greet thy kiss of love,
When thy light step resounds within the portal;
Some have no friend save Him who dwells above,
No sweet communion with a fellow-mortal.
Thou sleepest soundly on thy costly bed,
Lulled by the power of luxuries unnumbered;
Some pillow on a stone an aching head,
Never again to wake when they have slumbered.
Then think of those, who, formed of kindred clay,
Depend upon the doles thy bounty scatters;
And God will hear them for thy welfare pray—
They are his children, though in rags and tatters.

CUI BONO?

BY JOHN H. BAZLEY.
Pray, what is the use of grasping for gain,
Of boundless desires, which tend to maintain
Injustice and wrong?
Or what is the good of distinction and wealth,
Obtained at th' expense of honor and health?
This, answer in song.
Does greatness consist in tact and display?
Is truth of no use in this politic day?
Must vice ever reign?
Expediency, policy, fraud, and such like,
At the base of religion and honesty strike?
Is not this very plain?
Shall principles true be regarded as naught?
Shall rights never be our first and last thought?
Must might be the rule?
Shall a nation like ours, which boasts of its deeds
In Liberty's cause, be sown with the seeds
Of crime and misrule?
Shall we follow the footsteps of folly and pride,
So that those who observe us may laugh and deride?
And republiques condemn?
No, no! let us rather be wise in good time,
Less selfish and vain, with more reason and rhyme,
And wear truth's diadem.
O, Father of all things, grant that we may desire
Only those which are good, and which thou dost re-
quire:
And take for our theme,
Man's wants are but few, when wisely restrained;
Self-denial is better than pill self-obtained,
But virtue's a supreme.

SOLITUDE.

It was a green spot in a wilderness,
Touched by the river Jordan. The dark pine
Never had dropp'd its tassels on the moss
Tufting the leaning bank, nor on the grass
Of the broad circle stretching evenly
To the straight larches, had a heavier foot
Than the wild heron's trodden. Softly in,
Through a long aisle of willows, dim and cool,
Sleat the clear waters with their muffled feet,
And, hushing, as they spread into the light,
Circled the edges of the pebble tank.
Slowly, then rippled through the woods away.

LIFE AND DEATH.

Life is a city, fill'd with straying streets,
And death the market-place where each one meets.

THE LIBERATOR.

[Reported for the Philadelphia Register.]
GREAT DEBATE ON THE BIBLE,
BETWEEN MR. JOSEPH BARBER, OF OHIO, AND
REV. DR. BERG, OF PHILADELPHIA.

[CONTINUED.]

SECOND EVENING.

Mr. THOMAS IMMAN, Moderator—Mr. Barber will commence the discussion.

Mr. BARBER took his place at the stand. (Applause and hisses.)
Rev. Mr. CHAMBERS—It is requested that all marks of approbation, or the contrary, shall be dispensed with this evening.

Mr. THOMAS IMMAN joined in the request of the other Moderator.

Mr. BARBER—I trust that the meeting will conduct itself with decorum, that attention will be paid to what both speakers may say, and that there will be no obstruction to the most free discussion. If what I have to say be true, it is both your interest and duty to hear it. If it be false, you will, if you listen, be better prepared to set me right. You send missionaries to visit other nations from their cherished religious opinions. You do so in the hope that they will listen to what differs from their views. In a certain respect, my case is similar—one; I would win you to views other than those you cherish, and ask a hearing. [The speaker here recapitulated rapidly the topics of the discussion as agreed upon, and the points made in his speech of the previous evening. He thought he had proved that the Bible represented the Supreme Being as subject to human infirmity, eating, drinking, washing his feet, resting after work, deficient in power and in knowledge, having a dwelling-place, changeable, partial, unjust, cruel, accepting human sacrifices, and sending strong delusions and lying spirits; and also that on all these points it represented him in colors directly the reverse, contradicting itself in each particular. He thought he had proved that the Bible, while recognizing many of the virtues, also justified many enormities, such as despotism—civil, ecclesiastical and domestic; polygamy, cruelty, and the most implacable rage and vengeance.] My opponent did not answer me on any of these points. He spent his time in discussing matters, many of which were entirely foreign to the question. I will notice these briefly, though most of them do not logically belong to the first part of the discussion.

My opponent thought proper to bestow upon me thirty or forty foul names. These I pass over; they require no answer from me. Perhaps Dr. Berg himself will agree with me on this subject, and use them no more. If he continue to use them, however, I shall let him travel alone on that path. His anecdote of George the Third, who told Bishop Watson—"Sir, the Bible needs no apology," proves nothing. The word of a defunct English monarch is without authority here.

He said that my doctrines are subversive of all virtue. This charge will be met in its appropriate place in the second part of this debate—when we come to the tendency of the Scriptures. We are now discussing the divinity of their origin. I may observe here, that what he said was backed by no argumentation.

He spoke of socialism. Now, as there are between fifty and one hundred different doctrines that go under that name, he should have been particular in stating which of them he meant to charge me with. But I have said nothing in favor of socialism, or about it. We are discussing the Bible, not socialism.

He mentioned a card, in which a member of the Sunday Institute proposed to discuss, whether the outrageous conduct of the Rev. Mr. McCalla, in the late debate, and the alleged partiality of Rev. John Chambers, were consistent with the character of a Christian divine. He thought it a tribute to the purity of the Christian character. It was not so, for its author thought the conduct complained of was in harmony with the spirit taught by the Bible. In fact, I know of no conduct, bad or good, that some part of the Bible may not be found to justify.

My opponent says that 'I know' no faith outside of the Bible is worth anything. I know nothing of the kind. His idea is an imputation on the goodness of God, for nine-tenths of God's children on this earth have died without hearing of Christ or of the Bible. Are they then lost? I must say, that there are no arguments more charged with blasphemy against the goodness of God, than many of those which are put forward in behalf of the tenets of Christian sects.

He speaks of the death of infidels. Well, I have seen Christians die, full of horror. I never saw infidels die so. Why should they? What can they fear? They believe in no awful and eternal hell, in no great malignant devil. For them, God is Perfect Love, without the ingredient of Hate or Malice in his character. Many of them believe in an immortality of happiness and purity; their minds are not tortured with apprehensions of malignant demons. Among them are many of the best and happiest people I am acquainted with. My opponent says that I am blind, and wish you to put out your eyes. Nothing of the kind. I want you to keep them, and especially to keep them wide open to-night, to see which of us wanders from the question.

He says that we have no faith—that we believe nothing—that infidelity is a great negation. And this he does not believe the divinity of a certain book. It does not follow that we believe nothing, because we disbelieve the fables, fallacies and follies of antiquity. Dr. Berg does not believe in the Mormon Bible. Suppose a Mormon should, on this account, charge him with believing nothing—with living in a great negation. He would probably answer: 'Is there nothing in the broad Universe to believe but your hateful and hideous fables?' And so I answer the Doctor.

He asks me how I can tell what is right or wrong, without the help of the Bible. If men cannot tell this without the Bible, then is the Bible not true, for Jesus himself refers to the test within the bosoms of men, and the Bible speaks of the law written on the hearts of men. There is the light of the human conscience, made brighter by experience and observation, which is enough to guide us safely. There is a test and touchstone of right in the moral constitution of man himself. Dr. Berg refuses himself in speaking as he does of internal evidence.

He thinks we owe all our good ideas to the Bible. Why does he not claim that we owe to it what we know of steam, electricity, and other natural agents? No, we owe the present state of our conceptions of truth and goodness to the great law of progress which pervades the Universe. It is stamped on every thing we see, on man as well as the animal and vegetable creation. We see the earth discarding the old and imperfect, and clothing herself with new forms approaching more nearly to perfection. The primitive vegetable tribes are replaced by better ones. Each stage is a step in advance. And just as each successive vegetable production is an improvement on its predecessors, so is each new form of civilization broader, grander and better than those which went before it.

Dr. Berg maintains the necessity of successive and progressive revelations of the character of God. On this we are agreed. Only I maintain that these revelations are not supernatural, but are due to the experience of man himself.

The Doctor exclaims—"See how dark the world has been, wherever the Bible has not been known!" I answer, See how dark it has been where the Bible has been known! The Jews had the Bible. Were they better than the Gentiles around? The prophets thought not. Isaiah denounces them as rotten from head to foot. [Mr. Barber here read from Isaiah.] And what did Jesus say of them? Did he not call the Scribes, Priests and Pharisees, the professors and clergymen of his day, hypocrites, liars, children of the devil, serpents, &c. [He here read from Matthew 15 and 23.] And did not these same teachers of the Bible of their day treat Jesus

as a blasphemer, a seditious man, who wished to upset the government, and who was so devoid of patriotism as to be hostile to the nationality of his people? They thought him not only from the devil, but coming in the name of Beelzebub, the prince of devils. (Laughter.) In the history of the world, there are some hundreds of years designated as the Dark Ages. Then the priesthood and church ruled. Their supremacy was complete, uncontradicted. It was then, and in that church, that a certain fearful institution, called the Inquisition, was originated.

In the last few years, two millions of people have been starved to death in Ireland. By whom? By archbishops, bishops, and an aristocracy who swear on the Bible, and monopolize the soil. A historian says that, in the reign of Henry VIII, the first Protestant King of England, seventy-four thousand persons were hanged. The Doctor speaks of the first French Revolution. This is a large subject, requiring time for its discussion. There are many slanders against the actors of that period, and the Doctor appears to credit some of them. In the after part of this debate, I expect to prove three things. 1. That the first French Revolution was due to the mismanagement, tyranny and cruelty of preceding kings. 2. That believers did more to cause it than unbelievers; and, 3. That it has proved a blessing to France, by abolishing iniquitous laws and oppressive institutions; doing away with exactions, increasing wealth, and what is better, distributing it. I will prove, and pray by Orthodox authors,—that the French are better fed, better clad, more happy, and more peaceful.

As to the Romans, who, he says, were so vile, I think their ideas of morality were better than those of the Jews. He speaks of miracles as proving the truth of the Bible. Will he say what a miracle is—and how he prove the divinity of a book? Will he tell us, too, how the fulfilment of a prophecy prove the record of it divine? If my opponent's author divinely illuminated, but proved nothing as to the character of the book. There are many prophecies which have never been fulfilled, and never can be.

The Doctor charges us with opposing the family institution. On the contrary, we love it. We love it when the family is composed of one husband and one wife, who live together in affection and equal honor, discharging their duties to each other, and to the world, and rearing a virtuous offspring. Such is the family institution which I hold to be of Divine authority. But this is not that of the Bible. What family institution does the Doctor mean? One with one husband and many wives, or one with several husbands and one wife, or one where the husband is a master and the wife a slave, or one where the parties are equal? Is it Abraham's family that he means, where there were wife and concubine, and the latter with her young child was turned out into the wilderness, at the risk of starvation? Is it Jacob's family, where there were two wives and two concubines? [The time here expired, and Mr. Barber took his seat. Applause and hisses.]

Dr. BERG.—(General and long-continued applause.)—I feel under obligations to my opponent to present the positive side of the argument for the Divine origin of the Bible; but I will notice his objections. These do not come regularly. His first speech contains propositions under both topics of this debate. You will excuse me the episode, before I proceed to establish a few propositions bearing on the question. While my opponent was speaking of the attributes of Jehovah, I was forcibly reminded of the passage in Job—"Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? as deep as hell; what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea." We can appreciate the motives of God only so far as they are revealed. The imperfect understanding of man cannot conceive God. His ways are not as our ways. They are as high above them as heaven is above the earth. Before any objection to the acts of Jehovah can be considered valid, the mind of the objector must embrace the vast range of the Universe; he must be as wise as Jehovah himself. What shall we think of the man, who, with feeble intellect, presumes to sit in judgment on God? It is said by the wise man, that if a man judge a matter without first hearing it, it is a shame to him. One thing is certain, that when God created the world, he never took counsel of my opponent. (Laughter, slight applause, and a few hisses.) History shows that all the revelations of God to man have been progressive, developing themselves as the human mind was able to comprehend and act upon them. It took four thousand years to prepare the world for the introduction of Christianity. The system was foreshadowed by types full of portentous meaning. A code of laws was granted, imperfect, it is true, but enough to secure the Jews civil and religious privileges vastly superior to any enjoyed by contemporaneous nations. Moral truth was revealed as fast as men were prepared to receive it. Christ said to his disciples that he had many things to say to them, but they could not hear them at that time. Men may be prevented from accepting the truth by their passions, or from understanding it by their imperfect social organization. As time rolled on, God became more intelligible to his people; always, however, accommodating his language to human weakness. If the ancient Scriptures spoke of God as having a body, it did no harm to the Jews, for it was revealed to them that God is a spirit. They made no mistake, were led into no error. Even my opponent, dark as his mind is; never was misled by this language. He would repudiate any such construction of the whole of those books. Their excellence was great. They taught that eternity was real, that there were higher and lower spheres of being, that heaven was the development of the greatest glory to which man can be raised, and hell the realization of the greatest misery to which he can be sunk.

Our present state is a pupillage for something higher and better, just as the Jewish system was. We can regard this book as the progressive Revelation. It should be taken and interpreted as a whole. The imperfect language, adapted to human weakness, of one part, may be perfected in another. If my opponent finds in the Old Testament that David is represented as being tempted of God, and that this is better expressed in the New, and our requirement him to make the correction. In James 1:14, we read—"Let no man say, when he is tempted, I am tempted of God, for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man;" and the apostle adds the significant words,—"But every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed."

That the Bible, as a whole, is a progressive revelation, is an answer to many of the insulated objections urged by Mr. Barber in his first speech; but I will answer them more in detail. What shall we say, however, of a mode of reasoning? It is laborious, certainly, but of a purely mechanical character. We look in vain for anything in it broad and philosophical. We find in it assertion upon assertion devoid of foundation, and lacking every other attribute except unparalleled effrontery. (Vehement applause, and hisses.) Does my opponent believe in a God? If so, what are his attributes? What is he? I asked him this before, and he omitted to answer. He omits to answer the very questions upon which the gist of the matter turns. Is his God one of perfection? Whence does he derive his ideas of God? From the works of Nature? Let him explain them by reference to Nature, if he can.

My opponent says that the God of the Bible is unjust and cruel. May God, in his infinite mercy, open his eyes to the light! The slaughter of the Canaanites, with their women and children, would have been cruel, if there had been no divine command. But God is sovereign, and could thus testify his indelible determination to punish their villainess. Holiness may require severity for its justification. A God all mercy would be an unjust God.

I said, last night, that my opponent would be driven to take his stand among the gods of atheism. Let us see where his principal argument would lead him. Is this world, with its varied events, controlled by a superintending Providence, or is it not? How is it with the ten thousand human beings who recently fell before the pestilence in a Southern city? What will you say of that population decimated by the hand of the destroying angel, of the people living on the borders of the Mississippi river, who were cut off, and the women and innocent children taken from this earth, not by a momentary pang, but by the slow process of a frightful disease? Will he lift toward Heaven his daring hand, and say that God is cruel? Even now the public mind is agitated by the painful rumor that a vessel has gone down at sea, with hundreds of human beings, of all ages, on board. If she has, will my opponent lift his bold face and cry—God is unjust? But we Christians will bow before the dispensation of Providence, and say his ways are on the sea, and his path on deep waters.

The ordinary operations of Providence offer a more stupendous difficulty than the cases cited by my opponent. Men die. Why do they die? Why is there upon them the incurable taint of mortality? Can infidelity solve the problem? The daily deaths on the face of the earth are fifty million, daily illustrations of the truth announced in the Bible: 'He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down; he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not.' All die—men, women and little children. Will my opponent stand by the fresh graves of the dead, and say: 'O God! thou art cruel!' Let him. We will rather say: 'Lord, so teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.' He may ask, in reference to these natural phenomena, was the flood necessary? We answer: Behold a flood which sweeps away generation after generation; besides, geology proves the truth of the Deluge.

My opponent spoke of Jehovah as repenting, though immutability is one of the divine attributes. I might make a stand here on philosophical ground, but I waive that. No child could mistake the meaning, none but an infidel; an infidel driven to desperation would make of this a contradiction. So, again, when God is represented as resting after labor, being refreshed, depending on human action, coming down to Babel, and visiting Sodom—all this is owing to the use of human language in its ordinary acceptation.

He represents Jehovah as encouraging immorality, because some of his favorites were guilty of bad acts. I must pronounce this a blasphemous slander. This is strong language, but it is merited. Did God regard these acts with favor? Are we not told that he punished them? How, then, will my opponent dare to say that God encourages immorality? (Cheers and a few hisses.)

The punishment of David, Abraham, and others, is recorded. They were God's favorites, not because they were without sin, but because they were habitually devoted to his service.

He represents God as partial, because He had a chosen people; and the Bible as contradictory, because it says He is no respecter of persons. In one sense, God is impartial, treating all alike. In another, he is a sovereign, dispensing favors as seems good to him. He dispenses health and sickness, wealth and poverty, high and lowly station. He judges king and peasant by the same law, and assigns to master and slave the same mortality. He gives to whom he pleases, station, power, and the endowments of grace. He is the only Eternal, Invisible, and Wise God. Glory and dominion to him forever. Amen. (Slight applause.)

My opponent represents Jehovah as accepting human sacrifices on his altars. Is this so? I would be justified in using strong language here, but I will be as moderate as the case will allow. He cites Abraham's intended sacrifice of Isaac. It is true God ordered Abraham to sacrifice his son on Mt. Moriah, but when he was about to do it, we read that the angel called to him, and said: 'Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto him; for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thy only son from me.'

This important statement was omitted by my opponent. God proposed to try the faith of Abraham. Did He not know? Surely he did. But the trial was needed for Abraham's profit, and for an example to the Church for all succeeding generations. Jehovah requires human sacrifices! Yes, Mr. Barber, He requires you and me to offer ourselves as living sacrifices to His service. But He is no Moloch. If God had permitted Abraham to complete the sacrifice, He had a right to do that, or any thing else his sovereign wisdom might demand.

My opponent represents the God of the Bible as practicing deceit, as sending strong delusions, and lying spirits. The doctrine that God abandons men, who will not repent, is true. They harden their hearts, and he gives them over to believe lies. (Dr. Berg was justifying the doctrine of judicial blindness, when his time expired. He sat down, remarking, that as he had been indebted, last evening, to the courtesy of Mr. Barber for a few minutes more, he would now repay the debt. Long and loud applause.)

Mr. Barber. I am glad that my opponent has thought proper to attempt an answer to my arguments of last night. But how does he answer them? He says that God commanded Abraham to sacrifice his son, not for his own sake, but for Abraham's, and that of the Church. This is what Dr. Berg thinks, but the Bible says exactly the contrary. It gives the reason: 'for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me.' And so in the parallel passage, assigning the reason for the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness: God is said to have taken this means of trying and proving the Israelites, because he did not know whether they were fit to be his people or not.

The Doctor passed over, without notice, the passage in the 21st chapter of Samuel: 'Then there was a famine in the days of David, three years, year after year; and David inquired of the Lord. And the Lord answered: it is for Saul and for his bloody house, because he slew the Gibeonites.' Here, the idea is, that God sent a famine to destroy an innocent people, because the king had, long before, been cruel to another people, the Gibeonites. How inconsistent is this, with all proper conceptions of the character of a Being of perfect justice! But David's mode of propitiating God to stay the famine is no less shocking:—

'But the king took the two sons of Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah, whom she bore unto Saul, Armoni and Mephibosheth; and the five sons of Michal, the daughter of Saul, whom she brought up for Adriel, the son of Barzillai, the Melohathite;—

'And he delivered them into the hands of the Gibeonites, and they hanged them on the hill before the Lord; and they fell, all seven together, and were put to death in the days of harvest, in the first days, in the beginning of barley harvest.'

After this hanging up of seven innocent men, we are told, (1st Samuel, 22:14), that 'after that, God was entreated for the land.'

My opponent asks, can we, by searching, find out God? Can we know Him and His attributes? He might not have asked the questions, if he had read the 1st chapter of Romans. Paul tells us that 'That which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse.'

We think, with Paul, that the character and attributes of God are to be known by the works of His hands. We judge a tree by its fruits, a man by his acts, and the Supreme Being by His works. The Doctor says that God's ways are not our ways. I think that there are some people whose ways are very much like those attributed to God.

He thinks it is necessary we should have all the wisdom of God, before we can appreciate his works. Dr. Berg. My opponent misrepresents me. Mr. Barber. Will Dr. Berg please state what he did say?

Dr. Berg. I said that, in order to be able to appreciate the motives which govern the conduct of God, we must have all his wisdom. (Applause.)

Mr. Barber. To appreciate my conduct, we need only to know what it is. If we could know the estimate placed on his character in the Bible, we need only see the deeds ascribed to him. Human judgment is according to the fruits. If these are bad, the tree is bad. We read, in I. Samuel, 22, that God ordered the total destruction of the Amalekites, not for their own sins, but because of the acts of their forefathers, four hundred and fifty years before.

'Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, I remember that which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid wait for him in the way, when he came up from Egypt. Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass.'

Now, I say that the ascription to God of the command for such an inhuman butchery, is sheer blasphemy. The Doctor says that I placed Mormonism on a level with Christianity. I did not. What I did say was, that a Mormon could not properly charge the Doctor with believing nothing but a negative, because he disbelieved the Mormon Bible; nor can he make the same charge against me, because I do not accept the books of the Scriptures as of divine origin.

He says that God reveals truth as man is prepared to receive it, that revelation is accommodated, in its types and language, to human weakness. I maintain, that men are always more ready to receive truth than falsehood, and that the best way to prepare them to receive the highest truth, is to announce it as having.

He thinks that God is spoken of as sending a body, in order to make truth plainer. I think that, so far from making truth plainer, such language obscures truth. Its tendency is to make false impressions and perpetuate false ideas. Certainly, it did immense injury to the Jews. Moses is the veil between them and truth, up to the present day. Such incorrect writings are calculated to do great injury. The crude and false representations of creation in Genesis are even now blinding to millions. So long as men believe these errors have the divine sanction, they cannot read the earth's real history in the facts of geology; they cannot learn from the wonders of creation, to adore the character of its Author.

He says that to understand the Bible, we must take the whole range of the events of history, and the moral government of the world. That is to say, before we can learn any thing from the Bible, we must know ten times more than all the men who have ever lived. He quotes James to show that God tempts no man. Then the Bible does not say that he does.

He called me a few more bad names, but these I pass over.

He asks whence I derive my ideas of God? The Bible says that the Divine character may be learned from the works of his hands. The revelations of his attributes in the varied productions of creation, are the guides given to the human mind.

He says that I represent God as cruel and partial. I did not: I said that the Bible represented him so. The Doctor thinks that God sends plagues and pestilence, and that the yellow fever at New Orleans, and the agues in the Western country, are among the operations of Providence. I do not believe this. I believe that agues spring from swamps, stagnant water, and—(Here the speaker was interrupted by a violent explosion of hisses, laughter, and applause; the explosions being in small minority.)

Dr. Berg. I beg my friends not to interrupt the speaker, but to listen in silence to what he may say.

Mr. Barber. Strange that Americans should doubt a proposition of this kind! Should doubt whether swamps, stagnant water, and similar causes, are the causes of agues? Pestilences have a similar origin. They may originate among the decaying carcases of a battle-field, where men, in defiance of divine law, have cut each other down in combat; they then spread with fearful rapidity from country to country. If men would but study the laws of health, the laws of nature, and the causes of disease, they will be far more likely to find out the means of lengthening human existence and saving the race from the ravages of pestilence, than by ascribing them to the anger of Deity. Does God send the drunkard's headache? If he will abandon his cups and lead a sober life, he will get rid of that complaint. Does God send dyspepsia? Let the dyspeptic abandon his tobacco and immoderate use of coffee, and he may be cured. Does God take the life of the suicide? If men would only study the laws of their mental, moral, and physical existence in the works of nature, in the living book of God, instead of in out-of-date documents, they would be infinitely healthier, infinitely happier, and infinitely better. Do not attribute your diseases to God, or you will be apt to look to God for their cure.

The Doctor says that God destroyed the Amalekites for their villainess and sins. The Bible says that he commanded them to be destroyed because of what their tribe had done, some four hundred and fifty years before. The Doctor asks, is this world governed by a superintending Providence? Yes—and his government is by means of unchanging laws, discoverable by man, and to which he must conform his acts, and from which he must not expect God to swerve for the sake of accommodating himself to human ignorance or weakness. The great duty of man, is to bring himself into harmony with the laws of God.

The Doctor says that the truth of the Deluge is proved by geologists. Geologists do not agree with him. Dr. Hitchcock and others say, that there were successive deluges, and that they all were innumerable ages prior to the age assigned by Christians to the world.

He thinks that the language of the Bible is accommodated to human modes of thought and expression. So it is, for the reason that the writers spoke as they knew and felt. They expressed ideas as lofty as they could comprehend. They believed that God could not work straight ahead six days without being tired; and they said so. (Suppressed laughter.) Their ignorance colored their literary productions. I have no doubt, that if Dr. Berg wrote a Bible, he would write a better one. His mode of interpreting the one we have, would explain away all the contradictions in the Mormon Bible. We cannot accept his interpretation. We have to do with the Bible as it is, and not as Dr. Berg or we would have it.

The Doctor charges me with representing God as encouraging immorality. I do not; I said the Bible represented him so. We find his alleged favorites guilty of polygamy, concubinage, adultery, and other crimes, and yet not blamed. David had numerous wives, and yet we are told in the Bible that he was without sin, 'save in the case of Uriah.' Solomon is pronounced, by the same authority, the 'wisest man,' notwithstanding his abominable polygamy, he is not spoken of as an adulterer. Indeed, in those days, nothing seems to have been considered adultery, except seducing a wife that had a living husband. The law does not define adultery. Strange law that would allow the having seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines to pass for virtue.

The Doctor says that I thought the Bible represented God as partial, in saying that he loved Jacob and hated Esau. This was not my only ground. He is said to have loved one and hated the other, before either was born.

tution, of the scenes in the families of David and Solomon. The wisest man had lost all respect for women, and thought all was vanity and vexation of spirit. Are these the forms of the family, advocated by Dr. Berg? The Doctor thinks that worshippers become assimilated to the character of their deities. This is, in truth, so much the greater is the necessity for great care in the selection of our objects of worship.

He assumes the Decalogue as a standard of virtue. Not at all. I have already said it does not define adultery, nor forbid polygamy or concubinage. It enjoins the observance of the Sabbath. How shall it be observed? Must there be no work, not even the kindling a fire or cooking a meal? Dr. Berg does not think this. And so with the other commandments. They are interpreted in a thousand different ways among Christians themselves.

The Doctor says that infidel morality is a mere wax. Are the rules of the Bible more certain? If so, why are there so many sects? It is not possible to fix in writing the standard of right and wrong. What is right for one, may not be right for another. Each man has his law within himself, which, if he will follow it, will guide him as securely and happily as the instinct of the bird guides it on the wing. In order to obtain a rule of life from the Bible, one would have to make impossible inquiries. He should ascertain whether the original text was dictated by God, whether the copies were perfect, the translators infallible, and the sense certain. Impossible! Every passage is perplexed. Take, for instance, the sermon on the Mount, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit.' When are they blessed? and how? In Luke 6:20, the words 'in spirit' are omitted. It says, 'Blessed be ye poor.' Are the poor blessed? We read, also, 'Blessed be they that mourn.' In every stricken mourner a blessed man? How? On such passages, men put their own meaning. Each man puts his law into the book, and does not take it from the book.

I intend now, to notice a few of the philosophical errors contained in the Bible.

The account of creation in Genesis is at variance with the revelations of geology in twelve or fifteen particulars.

1. The Bible teaches that the heavens and the earth, and all the things therein, were created in six days. Geology shows that thousands of ages were expended in the creation.

2. The Bible makes the earth to be only six or seven thousand years old. Geology proves it to have existed for millions of ages.

3. The Bible teaches that only a day or two elapsed, from the creation of the first animal to the creation of man; Geology shows that countless centuries elapsed between the creation of the first animals and that of man.

4. The Bible teaches that all races of animals were created about the same time; Geology shows that the first races of animals perished, ages upon ages, before the present race of animals came into existence.

5. The Bible teaches that death entered the world by Adam's sin; Geology shows that death was in the world long ages before man existed on the earth.

6. The Bible says that the sun was made from six to seven thousand years ago; Geology shows that plants and living things basked in its beams, innumerable centuries before.

7. The Bible speaks of but one deluge, and that only four thousand years ago; Geology shows there have been many deluges, infinite ages ago; but can see no signs of such a flood as that described in the Bible.

8. The Bible speaks of a firmament or solid framework above the earth, in which the sun and moon and stars are placed. Astronomy shows there is no such thing; and proves the sun and moon and stars to be placed at different distances from the earth.