



A. S. MEETINGS ON THE SABBATH.

We copy the following correspondence from the Scottish Press. It has grown out of the circumstance, that at the Anti-Slavery Conference held at Manchester, on the 1st of August, 1854, Rev. W. Guest was reported to have made some strong remarks in reprobation of the practice of the American Anti-Slavery Society, in holding its meetings upon the Sabbath, which he considered to be a violation of the principles of Christian churches, and a contravention of the public feeling.

To the Editor of the Scottish Press.

Sir—Will you grant me insertion in your next issue, of a few lines, not in reply to Mr. May's letter in the Scottish Press of the 22nd ult., in defence of the meetings of the American Anti-Slavery Society on the Sabbath day, but on the question which was raised by me at the late Anti-Slavery Conference in Manchester. While I make no notes of the words used by me on this subject, I have, nevertheless, a strong and confident impression that the published report, which represents my remarks as 'reprobating' the practice of Sabbath meetings 'in very strong terms,' is not correct. I was in no humor to reprobate what was done by earnest and often suffering advocates of anti-slavery sentiments in America. What I did say was—that it appeared to me to have been unchristianlike, for the sake of the day that the American Anti-Slavery Society should have held its second meeting in Philadelphia on the Saturday and Sunday of December last, rather than on the Friday and Saturday, or any other days. I did not at all raise the question of the propriety or impropriety of Sabbath meetings. This would have been out of place on such a broad platform as that of abolitionism. My observations were directed not to what was lawful, but what was expedient. The gentlemen who were present in Philadelphia during the morning and evening sessions on the Sabbath, held views that do not doubt fully justify to their own conscience their selection of that day. If so, to their own Master they stand or fall. It is not fitting that any party in this or the other hemisphere should not 'reprobate' their doings. But there are Christians in the Northern States of America, who are abolitionists, and also, in the Southern States, who are free to confess I am one, who think that the subject of slavery is so closely interwoven with all their political relations, as a great Union, with the internal government, and representation of individual States, and with manifold collateral topics, that they do not think it well to hold public meetings in relation to it on the Sabbath day. They conceive that to select that day for political and controversial controversy, would be neither in harmony with the views of the majority of the Sabbath, nor tend to their own moral and spiritual ability to withstand slave-owners and all other wrong-doers. The leaders of the American Anti-Slavery Society may deem the class I speak of mistaken, but this does not justify them in doing violence to their opinions. Nor is it quite true, as Mr. May says, that the meetings on the Sabbath are 'simple, solemn, and decorous.' It would be a singular misapplication of terms to apply either of the two latter to the controversy which arose on Mr. Joseph Parker's references, during the Sabbath meeting in Philadelphia, to the English aristocracy. I pleaded, however, in Manchester, and do still, that for the sake of three millions and a-half in bondage, we should refrain from any procedure that would give pain to our brethren, by outraging some of their dearest and noblest convictions. Surely a union of forces is of the utmost importance, in the presence of such a huge and inveterate American slavery; and there cannot be union, unless we take heed of offending what is dear to each other. And let it be remembered, that with the gentlemen of the American Anti-Slavery Society, there can be no objection of conscience to giving way on this matter of the Sabbath. They could as pleasantly meet on the Tuesday as on the Sunday. This indifference to days, however, does not situate on the part of the other side. Proper as it is to be borne in mind, is the fact that it is not necessarily advanced by Sabbath meetings above all others, as Mr. May's logic would almost imply. It may be true, as I remarked at Manchester, in reply to Mr. Garrison's reference to our Lord, that it would be a gross affectation of ceremonious observance to refuse to lift a sheep out of a pit on the Sabbath day, and equally wicked to refuse to do anything for the slave on that day. But the question, it is to be borne in mind, is the best time for public meetings. And assuredly it would be an extraordinary mode of honoring the Sabbath, for a man to let a sheep lie in a pit all the six days of the week, and choose the Sabbath day for delivering it. Let me re-state, in conclusion, that it was not in the spirit of reprobation that I spoke of the American Anti-Slavery Society, as may be seen by references to the Manchester papers. I acknowledge I did thus speak, and must do so, of those who dishonor their profession of the equalizing influences of Christianity by a pro-slavery advocacy. But, among others, I sought union, and that each party should avoid doing aught that would prevent their standing side by side. I said, further, feeling persuaded that I might thus interpret English feeling, that if the gentlemen who originated the Anti-Slavery Conference in Manchester had held Sabbath views, they would have allowed the Sabbath meeting on the Lord's day, they would have refrained from doing so out of regard to the sentiments and opinions of their fellow-citizens and Christians who thought otherwise; and in that assertion, I believe I had the token of concurrence from every gentleman on the platform. I am yours very truly,

WILLIAM GUEST.

Leeds, Sept. 25.

REPLY BY PARKER PILLSBURY.

To the Editor of the Scottish Press.

Mr. Editor—Permit me to thank you for inserting in your excellent paper the reasons given by the Rev. Mr. May of Boston, why American abolitionists hold their anti-slavery meetings on the first as well as on other days of the week. In your last issue a reply to Mr. May from Rev. Mr. Guest of Leeds, but as neither the excellent gentleman nor myself can have any wish or reason for a newspaper controversy on the Sabbath question, if you will just allow me to correct a few misapprehensions into which some people who read his remarks may fall, I will dismiss the subject.

It is a serious mistake, when Mr. Guest says that 'with the American Anti-Slavery Society, there can be no objection of conscience to giving way on this matter of the Sabbath.' They have the same objection that any true minister would have, and should have, to giving up the best day of the seven—that day which custom and usage (if not God himself) have set apart, as the great speaking and hearing, giving and receiving, instruction-day—when more can be done, and is done, to influence the public mind and heart than on all the other days of the week—the day, especially when pro-slavery religion is proclaimed, than on all other days besides. The American abolitionists do not surrender that day without incurring the deepest guilt.

As to the 'political aspects' of which Mr. Guest speaks, I leave them to be settled by what are called 'political abolitionists.' The true abolitionists see no more impropriety in proclaiming their doctrines upon slavery, than every British dissenting minister must feel in preaching his religion, while, in his government, the State and Church, the religion and the laws, the Bible and the constitution, are all sustained and united under the same authority, with the same appeal and the same executing power.

Mr. Guest alludes to some who might 'let the sheep lie in the pit all the six days, and choosing the Sabbath on which to let it out.' Of course, he does not charge the abolitionists with any such absurdity. No day in the seven, no hour in the twenty-four, is improved by them. Their peculiar mission is to preach deliverance to the captive, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; and no day, in their judgment, is too holy for such a work.

If my respected friend Mr. Guest cannot work with us on the first day of the week, let him be faithful on the other six, and he will find the American abolitionists ever ready, not only to respect, but to defend his right of conscience. But let not those of his persuasion attempt, on the other hand, to abridge our right of conscience in this matter. American ministers occasionally preach anti-slavery, temperance, and sometimes peace, on Sunday—shall not we? Is it innocent in them, and a country? It is not often so considered in our country. I hope it is not generally so held in Great Britain. Yours, Mr. Pillsbury, only for the true and right.

PARKER PILLSBURY.

Glasgow, 30th September, 1854.

HENRY J. GARDNER AND HIS PRO-SLAVE-VERY ANTECEDENTS.

In reference to the pro-slavery antecedents of Henry J. Gardner, Esq., Judge Allen, of Worcester, says—

The rescue of Shadrach in 1851, by a few colored men, will be remembered, and also the aid made by President Fillmore on that occasion. He thought the Union endangered by the sudden act of a few friends of the fugitive, and he issued his unnecessary, ridiculous and insulting proclamation, 'Fugitive men,' in the language of the day, rushed to his aid, and the city government of Boston passed resolutions in support of his action. Mr. G., not satisfied with the resolves, as they were drawn up by a gentleman whose love of the compromises was unquestioned, outstripped his competitors in his eagerness to sustain the fugitive slave law.

The whole proceeding has been published in the newspapers within a few days, and there is no need of extending this communication by inserting it. There has also been published within the same period, the call for a public meeting, for the purpose of nominating Mr. Webster for the Presidency, signed by Henry J. Gardner, B. B. Curtis, Samuel A. Eliot, and other intense 'Union men.' This call was issued in 1851, and yet Mr. G. says 'he was never associated for a moment with the fugitive slave bill.' But it is time to pass. These judges of the slaveholders' will surely 'cover from beginning to end a much longer political life,' than Mr. Gardner's. It would be cruel to encumber it with the weight of adornings like these.

No notice has as yet been taken of Mr. G.'s complaint that he is charged with belonging to the body guard of the Marshal, when Simms was consigned to slavery. There is every reason to believe that the information communicated to me on this point was substantially true, and that Mr. G. did offer his aid on that occasion. Why should he not? He was a supporter of the compromises, of which the fugitive slave law, as the late Mr. John Davis truly said in a speech in the Senate, Jan. 29, 1852, became from its passage, altogether the most important of any measure embraced in the category. 'The Fugitive Slave Bill,' which Mr. G. says he was so conspicuous, passed several resolutions, which they say that 'the people of Boston have in good faith conformed to and executed that portion of the compromise laws of 1850, (the fugitive law) which was most obnoxious to the sentiments and convictions of the people of the North; and most insisted on by the people of the South; and those measures were, in the same resolution, declared to be the result of the exertions of the great and patriotic men of 1850.'

These resolves are in the chosen language of Mr. G. and his associates. Having taken credit to himself, as one of the people of Boston, that the fugitive law had not been merely conformed to, but 'executed,' not by the officers of the United States, but by themselves, the people of Boston, what hypocrisy does it not manifest, now to start back, when asked for him what he had said for himself? Other evidence will be adduced, should the thought occur, which the shortness of the time prevents from being now procured, and laid before the public.

In proof that Mr. Gardner has not been a pro-slavery man, he states what he calls 'one fact,' that is, his alleged action in the Whig Committee last spring. It would be pleasant, indeed, to find one fact, honestly stated, in the letter of Mr. Gardner. But unfortunately for him, the solitary chance is destroyed by the testimony of his associates on that committee. I leave that issue in his hands and theirs. But there are two more pieces of evidence adduced by him in support of his anti-slavery pretensions. He says he signed a petition 'last June for the repeal of the fugitive slave law.' So did John H. Pearson, whose name as a slave catcher is familiar to all, and so did many others who had been the steepest of the mountain of indignation at what was called the 'treasonable failure of the South to fulfil its part of the bargain.'

Evidently stung to the quick by Judge Allen's allusion to his base and inhuman conduct, Mr. J. H. Pearson comes out in the Boston Courier as follows—

Boston, Nov. 11, 1854.

Hon. Charles Allen.—In your letter to the 'Know Nothing' candidate for Governor, you make free use of my name, and refer to me as 'the notorious slave catcher.' Perhaps you may have some new Free Soil dictionary, that can distort words to any application, like your Free Soil principles. Facts, however, are generally understood, so to lay hold of my name to spread a net, &c., none of which did I ever do, or use any means to entrap any white or black person. If you intend to allude to a black boy who smuggled himself on board one of my vessels at New Orleans, and who stole the boat and landed at South Boston, and was pursued by the master and taken, you are under a great mistake, for I was not in the city, and had no knowledge of the transaction till some time after it took place.

The master was perfectly justified in detaining the intruder, to have him sent back to the point from whence he started, as he had no right to jeopardize another's life or property by secreting himself on board of any person's ship, whereby the master would be deprived of his occupation; or if he returned to a slave State, he would be 'burned,' perhaps even unto death; or placed in a leathern prison, to die by yellow fever. The captain had no objection to my not as he did, or subject himself to those afflictions.

As to my taking him back in one of my vessels, I plead guilty; and let fifty similar cases occur, I shall surely land them from their starting point, if in my power to do so. No one has any right to walk into my house or my ship, to make it his home or vehicle, without first asking consent; and if your Honor, or Charles Sumner, or Henry Wilson, or even the pious 'Good old party,' should secrete yourselves on any one of your vessels, you may be assured you should be 're-landed on the shores of old Massachusetts,' and given up to the legal authorities.

You well know there are State laws South as well as in Massachusetts, and for acts done in those States, every person is amenable thereto; therefore every ship-master and owner is liable to their several penalties, if they violate them.

Your antecedents towards the slave are too well known to be forgotten, and I will only say every act of your party, and particularly the leaders, are corrupt and void of all principle, and their whole management has been for selfish motives, down to the last act, in the drama of their fusion with the Know Nothings.

It is true, I signed a petition for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Act, and until the South retrace their steps, to the understanding of the compromise of 1850, it is immaterial to me how many of their peculiar property use their locomotives and escape, provided they do not endanger the life or property of innocent persons.

JOHN H. PEARSON.

ANTI-SLAVEY EXCITEMENT IN WORCESTER, MASS.—Our readers are probably familiar with the fact connected with the treatment of one Asa O. Butman, in Worcester, grounded on his connection with the arrest of Burns and Sims. Such occurrences cannot be approved of by those who, like ourselves, believe that moral means are the only effectual ones against slavery.

That they will be severely commented on by journals South and North, is sufficiently obvious. We hope, however, that the former will not forget the case of Mr. Hoar, at Charleston, S. C., nor the latter, all that they have said, when abolitionists were the sufferers, about those being responsible for results, who unduly provoke public sentiment and outrage men's moral sentiments.

This occurrence may have one good effect, however. Joined with other evidences, it may help to remind statesmen and politicians that some remorse must be had, when measures are proposed, to the state of feeling at the North as well as at the South. Why should it always be assumed that a great deal is to be conceded to the 'sensitiveness' about slavery, and nothing to sensitiveness about liberty? We believe that the continuance of the Fugitive Slave Law is fraught with more of the elements of excitement and agitation than would ever have resulted from Northern non-interference, not to pass it. The effort has been simply to transfer the excitement from one part of the country to the other; with what result we are only beginning, as yet, to see.

We hope that those who comment upon 'the doings of those abolitionists at Worcester' will remember also another fact, viz: that those to whom Butman was indebted for his freedom, and perhaps were all of those prominent abolitionists.—N. Y. Christian Inquirer.

THE LIBERATOR.

No Union with Slaveholders.

BOSTON, NOVEMBER 17, 1854.

TRUMPET OF 'KNOW-NOTHINGISM.'

The annual State Election took place in this Commonwealth on Monday last; the result of which demonstrates that, previous thereto, in one sense at least, 'know-nothingism' was a universal infirmity; for who was so wild, or so enthusiastic, as to dream that a party unheard of at the last election, with a self-conceit as ridiculous as satire itself could invent, operating through invisible agencies, avowing no other object than that of proscribing men on account of their foreign birth and peculiar religious faith, afraid or unwilling to hold a single public meeting, and burrowing in secret like a mole in the dark, would suddenly spring up, snap asunder the strongest ties of party, enlist under its banner the most incongruous elements, absorb the elective strength of the State, and carry every thing before it with the sweep of a whirlwind, leaving only the smallest fragments of the three parties which were struggling for supremacy? Yet such is the literal fact. Nothing like it can be found in the political history of the country. Even now, with the figures starting up in the face, it seems almost incredible. The Whig party is utterly broken—the Democratic party annihilated—and the Free Soil party no where—we mean, distinctively and independently, without concealment and without compromise. The 'Know-Nothings' have succeeded in electing their candidate for Governor, H. J. Gardner, by a vote (in round numbers) of 81,000, against Washburn, (Whig,) who received 27,000—Bishop, (Dem.) 18,000—and Wilson, (Republican alias Free Soil,) 7000—with 1200 scattering votes. Of State Senators, they have elected 39—ALL. They have also elected 351 Representatives, to 6 Whigs, 1 Democrat, and 1 Republican. All their Congressional candidates have been elected, as follows—

- 1—Robert B. Hall, of Plymouth, Whig.
- 2—James Duffington, of Fall River, Whig.
- 3—Wm. S. Durrell, of Delham, Free Soil.
- 4—L. B. Comins, of Roxbury, Free Soil.
- 5—Anson Burlingame, of Cambridge, Free Soil.
- 6—Timothy Davis, of Gloucester, Democrat.
- 7—N. P. Banks, Jr., of Waltham, Democrat.
- 8—Charles L. Knapp, of Lowell, Free Soil.
- 9—Alexander De Witt, of Worcester, Free Soil.
- 10—Henry Morris, of Springfield, Whig.
- 11—Mark Trafton, of Westfield, Free Soil.

In Boston, the vote for Gardner was 7661; Washburn, 4196; Bishop, 1262; Wilson, 401; Scattering, 29. Last year, Washburn received 7700; Bishop, 2455; Wilson, 1404; Wales, 811.

The Evening Telegraph claims that 'this remarkable revolution has given to the members of the late Free Soil party a majority in both branches of the Legislature, a large and resolute Maine Law majority also, and a Maine Law and Northern Rights Governor.' (1) It also says that 'seventy-seven per cent. of the Free Soilers have disappeared—[a curious method of securing a Free Soil majority in both branches]—62 per cent. of the Bishop Democrats, and 55 per cent. of the Whigs.'

What the cause of those in bondage has to expect from this 'Know Nothing' party may be inferred from the articles we have inserted this week in the 'Banner or Oppressor,' from various journals assuming to be the organs of that party. If any thing more pro-slavery in spirit can be found in any of the Southern newspapers, we should like to see it. And yet this is the party to which the Free Soilers of Massachusetts have gone over almost in a body—Henry Wilson leading off in a warm congratulatory speech in view of its success! So much for political abolitionism! Was there ever such whiffing as this?

GRANVILLE SHARP, THE PHILANTHROPIST.

On Monday evening last, the opening lecture of the course to be delivered before the Boston Mercantile Library Association was given in the Tremont Temple, by Hon. CHARLES SUMNER. Every thing conspired to make it a most unpropitious evening for securing a full attendance—the long-protracted rain-storm still continuing, and the excitement being returned in the city to obtain the earliest election returns—yet the spacious Temple was entirely filled by an intelligent and highly appreciative audience. On Mr. Sumner taking the platform, he was greeted with repeated rounds of applause, indicative of the enthusiasm which his manly conduct at Washington has kindled in the breasts of Northern freemen. With admirable judgment and tact, he chose for his theme the life and services of GRANVILLE SHARP, the British philanthropist, to whom the world is wholly indebted for the irrevocable decree, that the slave who sets his foot on British ground becomes that instant free; who preceded CLARKSON and WILBERFORCE in seeking the abolition of slavery and the slave trade, and surpassed them in clear-sightedness and fidelity to principle; who, though first put up as an apprentice to a Quaker linen-draper, and afterward filling a subordinate station in the Ordnance office, became a proficient in Greek and Hebrew, which languages he skillfully employed in the field of theological controversy, and also learnedly wrote on the English tongue; whose philanthropy was neither technical nor exclusive, but broad and comprehensive; and whose love of liberty was a religious principle, not to be compromised or held in constraint, even to avoid poverty on the one hand, or the charge of disloyalty on the other—for he took sides with our revolutionary fathers as soon as the news of the battle of Bunker Hill reached London, and resigned his place as clerk in the Ordnance office, in order not to be implicated in any manner in the military preparations against the colonies. Mr. Sumner managed his subject in a manner most creditable to his head and heart; and though he was careful 'to keep within the open field of history and philanthropy, on neutral ground,' still, it was impossible for the dullest mind in the assembly not to perceive the bearing of his theme, with all its adjuncts and illustrations, upon the state of things in our own country at the present time, in reference to the execrable Fugitive Slave Bill, and the prevailing pro-slavery of the land. The analogy was exact, the parallel was startling; and while it was as much as the conservatism in the hall could endure without visible torture, it was in happy accordance with the prevailing spirit of the crowded audience, whose applause was frequent and hearty. The lecture (the delivery of which occupied one hour and a half) appeared in full in the Evening Telegraph of Tuesday.

The poem delivered on the occasion by FRANCIS M. FISKE, Esq., of Ithaca, N. Y., was well received, and indicated the possession of a fine poetic taste.

It was a humiliating as well as singular commentary upon the noble effort of Mr. SUMNER in behalf of freedom and humanity, to hear it announced that the lecturer for Monday evening next would be the Rev. ORVILLE DEWEY, the upholder of the Fugitive Slave Bill, who is ready to send his mother or his brother into slavery, if necessary to preserve the blood-stained American Union. That such a man is selected as worthy of countenance and patronage is a reproach to the Mercantile Library Association, and a sad indication of the lack of true manhood in the city of Boston. Certainly, we shall not be among his auditors.

THE HUTCHINSONS.

Those inimicable vocalists, the HUTCHINSONS, have given several concerts in this city, within the last ten days, to crowded and delighted audiences, and never have their voices seemed more charming. Their last concert is to be given this (Friday) evening, at the Mezzonoon, and no doubt will draw an overflowing house. Their songs combine wit, humor, pathos, with a prevailing reformatory spirit—and are made nobly subservient to the cause of freedom, peace, temperance, and human brotherhood. Go and hear them.

'A SOUTH-SIDE VIEW OF SLAVERY.'

Such is the title of the Reverend Nehemiah Adams's new book, recording the impressions and suggestions of three months recently spent at the South, and written with the benevolent purpose of relieving the minds of those Northern people who are distressed about slavery. To those who do not know the writer, it may be said that he is a popular preacher, pastor of the Essex St. Church in Boston, and a very thorough specimen of the Class Priestly, Genus Hunter, Species Orthodox, Variety Solemn. Of course, with such claims, he was long since decorated with the designation D.D.

The Doctor's modesty has somewhat interfered with his accuracy in this book, for although his life, conversation, preaching and praying have always been consistently pro-slavery, he thoroughly identifies his own previous position with that of the persons whom he has undertaken to admonish, and says, penitently, 'We are verily guilty concerning our brother,' the slaveholder; 'we have been most singularly failed in our plans and purposes with regard to the removal of slavery from this country; we have legislated and protested, prayed and preached about the extension of slavery; we have become educated to a more intense interest in the black man than in all other races put together.' Probably Dr. Adams's congregation would desire him to speak for himself, but not for them, in this last specification; but he goes still further. 'We have not treated the South as we would desire to be treated; we have been the assailants.' Nay, more! he is so willing to share in an odium which just now falls upon the shoulders of his order, that he not only confesses his signature to the New England clerical remonstrance against slavery in Nebraska, but declares that he 'had assisted in framing that remonstrance.'

Those who have been accustomed to attend the dramatic performances at the Boston Museum for a few years past, will remember that the 'overtures' were played, though composed by Rossini, Haydn or Mozart, were always 'arranged' by T. Comer. As Mr. Comer's arrangement consisted in cutting down the parts which had been written for the best and largest orchestras of the world, to the number and capacity of his small company, so, probably, Dr. Adams's assistance to the Nebraska remonstrance was by amputation or emasculation, preventing some more substantial and manly aspect in which it might otherwise have appeared.

Dr. Adams's special business at the South was the care of an invalid. His idea of slavery had been formed (if we believe his own statement) from 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' and other similarly exaggerated descriptions of slavery, therefore, in his first city view of it, it was as surprising as delightful to him, and he was perfectly enchanted with the happiness of the slaves and the kindness of the masters. But he prudently thought—Perhaps it may be different on the plantations—and so suspended his judgment.

A little further on in his experience, the Reverend Doctor was greatly astonished to find the music of a military company on parade performed by slaves, and the business of dragging and pumping the engines at a fire also performed by them. And what think you, good reader, was his reflection on the fact that the masters chose to have these two kinds of fatiguing and disagreeable labor performed for them by slaves? Even this? 'These two instances of confidence and kindness gave me feelings of affection for the blacks, and respect for their masters.'

We next have a methodical enumeration of the 'favorable appearances in Southern society, and in slavery.' The first of these is 'Good order.' On inquiring the cause of such quietness at evening in the streets, the Doctor is informed that 'Our colored people cannot be abroad after 8 o'clock without a written pass, which they must show on being challenged, or go to the guard-house. The master must pay fifty cents to release them.' Dr. Adams thinks this rule 'a great protection to the slaves, as well as to the public peace,' and characteristically adds, 'In attending public worship, in visiting at any hour, a written pass is freely given; so that, after all, the bondage is theoretical.' And in the next paragraph, he intimates his desire that the same rule could be applied to 'certain youths' in Boston, 'especially on Sabbath evenings.'

His next favorable impression sprung from the respectable appearance of the slaves 'in their Sabbath attire,' and he now understood why the Southerners used the word servants instead of 'slaves' in their private conversation.

In the section entitled 'Labor and Privileges,' Dr. Adams represents the first as quite moderate, and the last as very numerous; though he candidly admits that 'Life on the cotton plantation is, in general, as severe with the colored people as agricultural life at the North.' Also, that the negro cabins 'will strike every one disgustfully at first.'

Under the head of 'Personal Protection,' we are informed that 'a strong public sentiment protects the person of the slave against annoyances and injuries.' In proof of this, Dr. Adams states that when a slave was sentenced, in the Mayor's Court, to be whipped for some alteration in the street, his master challenged the Mayor. This is no doubt a gratifying fact as far as it goes, but the slave would probably deem it more consequence to be insured against whippings from the master than from the Mayor. Many a truckman who beats his horse savagely would be very indignant at another person who should take that liberty; the well-known American privilege of 'every man lappinging his own nigger' cannot be extended to other people's niggers without the risk of a challenge.

The next relief which our anxious minds receive from Dr. Adams is the information that 'Prevention of crime among the lower class of society is one striking feature of slavery; from which we may probably infer that the higher class monopolizes the commission of crime' as well as the power of inflicting punishment. The Doctor not only assumes that 'a large amount of crime is prevented by the personal relation of the colored man to a white citizen,' but infers that 'It would be a benefit to some of our immigrants at the North, and to society, if government could thus prevent or reach disturbances of the peace through masters, overseers, or guardians.'

It is no less surprising that delightful to read, among Dr. Adams's 'favorable appearances in Southern society,' that 'one consequence of the disposal of the colored people as to individual control is, the absence of mobs.' How strangely we have been misled by popular rumor! Many people have received the impression that the tearing open and burning the U. S. mails in the public streets with impunity, the destruction of the press of C. M. Clay, the expulsion of Mr. Hoar and his daughter from Charleston, and of Mr. Hubbard from New Orleans, the hanging of certain gamblers at 'Vicksburg,' the dogging of Amos Dresser at Nashville, Tenn., the ducking and half-drowning of Rev. Edward Matthews in Kentucky, the mobbing of Rev. C. Bacon in Virginia, his tarring and feathering of Robert Edmund in Carolina, and the recent burning alive of negroes at Fort Meigs, Alabama, and at Dandridge, Tennessee; for murders, were performed by mobs. But no doubt we ought to consider that these things were done, not by the 'lower class,' but by slaveholders, who claim the right, not only to take the existing laws 'into their own hands,' but to make new ones, on the spot, for any emergency; so that all the above transactions, and many similar

The editor of the New Orleans True Delta is responsible for the statement, that in that city, there occurs one murder for every 'eight hours' the year round. That is, one person in every hundred is cut off in New Orleans by murder every year.

In reference to this dreadful affair, the Macon (Alabama) Republican says—'Light wood knots (which when rich and split up, ignite almost as instantaneously as gun powder) were piled up around him; these and the clothes he had on were saturated with spirits of turpentine, and the whole set fire to.'—See &c.

The Athens Post says—'He suffered at the stake by the torch. About one thousand citizens were present, and the execution was performed coolly and deliberately; and in the large assembly there was not a dissenting voice to the execution.'

ones that are perpetrated every year in the slave States, may be regarded as strictly 'legal.'

Here is the correction of another popular error.

'The personal liberty of the slaves is in contrast with the notions that many (i. e. abolitionists) hold. The feeling of masters is, that they will not keep a servant who is not willing to remain with them.' What think you, intelligent reader, is the meaning of this? Is it that the master says to Sambo or Dinah, 'If you don't like my service, go to the North, or where you please, and here are your free papers?' Not at all! Read a little further. 'If on fleeing they are pursued, it is to recover them as property; but they are almost invariably disposed of.' Who can doubt, after this, that the slaves are well cared for in point of 'personal liberty'?

Other 'favorable appearances in slavery' are the 'absence of popular delusions,' and the existence of 'a far more faith in the South, taken as a whole, than with us,' the 'absence of pauperism,' a mere liberal allotment and a juster distribution than at the North of the 'wages of labor,' and a fuller extension to the laboring classes of 'religious instruction, the pure, simple gospel of Jesus Christ.' On this last topic, as might be supposed, our pastor is eloquent. He triumphantly asks, 'How frequently at the North, for example, can we find a house like this? A Christian master, surrounded every morning by fifty laborers in his employ, hearing the Bible read.' If any fanatic should suggest that Northern laborers are better off in having Bibles of their own, with the right and the ability to read them, the Doctor retorts upon him, 'The negroes are made to commit passages of Scripture more generally than in our Sabbath schools,' which of course settles the matter.

As Dr. Adams gets forward in his three months, however, he does discover some 'revolting features of slavery.' Among these are public slave auctions, the 'coffee' of the inter-state slave-trade, the separation of families, punishment by whipping, and violations of the law of chastity. On each of these subjects, however, he has 'a word in season,' suited to 'relieve those whose minds have been distressed about slavery.' One of these matters is so easily and elegantly disposed of, that we cannot forbear to quote it—

'The charge of "wily multiplying negroes in Virginia" is one of those exaggerations of which this subject is full, and is reduced to this—that Virginia, being an old State, fully stocked, the surplus black population naturally flows off where their numbers are less.' Exactly! slaves, like water, tend towards a level, and the 'coffee' aforesaid are the sluices through which they flow off to find it. The whiteness of the Virginia slaves is accounted for by their more northerly climate; and the fact that, after so many years of flowing off, Virginia remains 'fully stocked,' results from—much the same reason.

Dr. Adams considers the Abolitionists responsible for the continuance of slavery, as well as for the few actual severities that are practiced under it. He assumes that the South was just on the eve of abolition when the Anti-Slavery movement commenced, but, becoming indignant at the approval of their design by a certain proportion of their Northern brethren, they got 'mad,' (as wise men will do under oppression,) immediately proceeded to bite their own noses off, and have ever since acted directly contrary to their own views of their own interest.

The Doctor vehemently deprecates our religious and social divisions. He assures us that 'there is real respect for the North, and attachment to it, on the part of the South, when they are not reminded of differences of opinion about slavery.' He mourns that 'the privileges of our sea-shore retreats, so highly prized by Southerners, are not enjoyed by them as formerly,' and states 'cases of real suffering, in which many people at the South feel themselves debarr'd from our Northern means of health and comfort.'

His remedy for all the troubles connected with this subject may be briefly stated: We must 'return to the Constitution.' While it remains, all our appeals to a 'higher law' are fanaticism. Our only way of benefiting the slave is through his master. Let us then think of that great body of Christian men at the South, who are perfectly competent to manage this subject, and meet their accountability to God without our help; men who know more than we can tell them about the evils of slavery; who are incapable of being seduced or overruled by wickedness; who are fully competent to struggle with the evils of the system, and to reform them, without one word of exhortation or advice from us; and whose daily prayer, with regard to us, is, that if there be any consolation in Christ, if any bowels of mercies, we would let them alone!

Dear, suffering, pious souls! we are not yet quite ready to let you alone.

Dr. Adams is very desirous that, however the abuses of slavery may be attacked, nothing should be said against the relation of master and slave. He finds nothing against this in the Bible, and supposes that Paul would say nothing against it if he lived in our day. He considers 'the principle of ownership' to be defended by both the Old and the New Testament, and slaveholders more faithful in their religious duties to their dependants than any other employers of laboring men, esteems the slaves to be gainers by their servitude in relation both to this life and that which is to come, wishes all Africa to be brought into the same position, questions whether the institution of slavery is ever to cease, and does all this with the assumption that he is a minister of Christianity, speaking in its name, and for its advancement!

A useful thing for us, and for all opponents of slavery, both in this country and in England, now to observe, and, 'when found, make a note of,' is, how far Dr. Adams is sustained in these positions by his own particular church, by the orthodox churches generally, by the ecclesiastical bodies of that connection, and by the (so-called) religious press.

A VALUABLE CONVERT.

We understand that HENRY WARD BEECHER opened the Lyceum course at Worcester last Friday with his new lecture on 'Patriotism'; and took occasion to avow himself a convert to the doctrine of 'women's voting!' He then justified his position at some length, meeting in his own powerful way the arguments against this reform. So far from its producing greater confusion at the polls, he declared that the presence of women was the only thing that could make them decent places. The American respect for woman, he thought, would show itself instantly there. 'Let a son walk to the ballot-box with his mother, fearlessly and with dignity, or a husband with his wife—and men would fall back to let them pass; and if any one interfered to molest them, the crowd would instantly swallow him up, as the whale swallowed Jonah.'

Finally, he predicted, that though he might not live to see this reform, it was as certain to come as the earth to continue its motion.

The only inconsistency in his remarks was his expressing a hope that his wife and sisters would never wish to speak in public, though he would oppose it if they did. Probably, however, this remark will do good, by making the rest of his statement more palatable to his hearers. Women need no one to assert their right to speak in public, for they have secured that already. But his voice, in asserting their right to the elective franchise, is worth a good deal to them.

Our friends who made pledges to the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society at its Annual Meeting in January last, or previously, are requested to send the amount of the same, as soon as convenient, to the Treasurer, SAMUEL PILLSBURY, or to the General Agent, SAMUEL MATY, Jr., 21 Cornhill.

A new and very neat edition of the 'DIARY OF REV. SOLOMON SITTLE,' with striking illustrations, has just been published by William White, 4 Spring Lane, Boston. It is limited in its way. Read it, ye smokers, snuff-takers, chewers of tobacco, and forever repudiate the nasty and poisonous weed!

LABORS IN WESTERN NEW YORK.

ORLANDO, CANTON, N. Y., Nov. 16, 1854.

DEAR MR. GARRISON:

After our meetings at Syracuse, I proceeded to Ontario county, to hold a series of anti-slavery meetings, and closed my labors in that vicinity on Sunday evening, Oct. 22d.

My meetings there were generally well attended, and in some instances there was a decided manifestation, as the people seem ripe for a decided change of the question, although but few are prepared to copy any higher anti-slavery position than that



