

TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The Twenty-Second Public Anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society will be held at the METROPOLITAN THEATRE, (on the site of the late Metropolitan Hall, above Beekman street,) in the city of New York, on WEDNESDAY, May 9th, at 10 o'clock, A. M. The meeting will be addressed by some of the most distinguished advocates of the Anti-Slavery Cause, whose names will be hereafter announced.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, President.

THE LORING CASE IN THE SENATE.

We take the following abstract of the debate in the Massachusetts Senate, on the removal of Judge Loring, which took place on Thursday last week, from the Boston Courier:

The special assignment—the report and address for the removal of Judge E. G. Loring—was taken up at 12 o'clock. Mr. DAWLEY of Bristol read a short speech in favor of the removal, containing that the Legislature have the power of removal, and that the forfeiture of office by Judge Loring rendered sufficient ground for that purpose. Judge Loring should have resigned before consenting to act as Commissioner under the act of 1850, and not having done so, he was justly liable to removal.

Mr. DAWLEY contended that the removal of Judge Loring was a matter of public opinion. Mr. DAWLEY contended that the removal of Judge Loring was a matter of public opinion. Mr. DAWLEY contended that the removal of Judge Loring was a matter of public opinion.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Hampden, also read a speech in favor of the removal. His principal argument was, that the office of State Commissioner and that of Judge of Probate were too important to be held by one man.

Mr. WHITE of Norfolk, followed in a very elaborate argument, hostile to Judge Loring, and in favor of his removal from office. He said, that Judge Loring was a man who was not fit to hold the office of State Commissioner.

Mr. WHITE contended, that the removal of Judge Loring was a matter of public opinion. Mr. WHITE contended that the removal of Judge Loring was a matter of public opinion.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of the American Anti-Slavery Society desire to express their thanks to Messrs. JAMES P. JENNETT & Co., of this city, for their generous donation to the Society of the stereotype plates of Mrs. H. B. STOWE'S tract entitled 'THE TWO ALTARS,' and of three hundred copies of the tract itself. The tract has been incorporated in their series for gratuitous distribution.

STATE OF THINGS IN KANSAS.

LAWRENCE, (Kansas Territory), April 7th, 1855.

Mr. GARRISON: Permit me once more to address you, from this far-off country. Various persons at the East wish to know my opinion respecting the propriety of emigrating to Kansas this spring.

I have now before me a letter from A. Wilson, and another from J. P. Harriman, which I will answer thus publicly, and save myself the trouble of writing to each individual. Mr. W. wishes to know if I consider it a safe undertaking for himself and family to emigrate here.

I dislike exceedingly to advise any person upon this matter. The best I can do is to narrate a few facts, and leave every one at liberty to judge for himself. I came out here last October, with a party of 238 persons. We experienced various delays on our journey.

I find it now a very good claim, four or five miles from here; or you can 'jump' one staked out by somebody else, but not occupied. My claim is considered worth one hundred dollars. It is four miles from here, and has a rude house upon it, worth about five dollars. In order to hold it, I must live upon it, so that I cannot keep it unless I abandon my residence here. I shall probably hold on to the claim.

There is now a pretty sure prospect of an adjustment of the rival claims to this magnificent city. I wish I could say as much of the 'vexed' pro-slavery question. From present appearances, I fear that Mr. Garrison's prophesy respecting the future of this fair territory will prove true.

About four weeks ago, it was decided by the citizens of this place to return to bondage a slave woman who had been brought into the place about a week previously, by an Anti-Slavery man. She was about twenty years of age, and was said to be worth \$1200.

Mr. DENNISON and HIS SLAVE ROSETTA—INDIGNATION MEETING. The meeting of sympathizers with Mr. Dennison, whose slave Rosetta was taken from him and freed while passing through Ohio, was held at Jeffersonville, Ky., on Wednesday last.

THE LIBERATOR.

For those acts, Robinson has pursued me, and still continues to pursue me, with relentless hate.

I now come to the last act in the pro-slavery drama, that our rulers have been playing before the nation the last twenty years.

Many weeks ago, evidence was brought to our notice of the bad character of the individual, John Marshall, referred to in the subjoined notices; and we determined to warn our readers and the public to be on their guard against him.

It becomes my duty to put the public on their guard against a set of knaves among our colored population, who are obtaining money on various false pretences, by appealing to the sympathies of anti-slavery men.

The Governor has granted certificates to nine Councilmen, all pro-slavery but one, and has suspended action in regard to three, and rejected one entirely. He has given three representatives certificates, all pro-slavery, and suspended two, and rejected eight. For the latter, a new election is ordered. The eight include our three representatives. These returns have just been received from the Governor, so that they are correct.

LETTER FROM H. C. HOWELLS. R. B. U. PRATT AMBOY, April 8th, 1855. My DEAR FRIEND AND BROTHER,—Enclosed you will find \$2 for the LIBERATOR. This old tried friend to justice, mercy and truth, I am always glad to see, and to read in it the signs of the times.

THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE, censuring him very mildly for voting for a Nebraska-Bill man at the last election. For those acts, Robinson has pursued me, and still continues to pursue me, with relentless hate.

THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE, censuring him very mildly for voting for a Nebraska-Bill man at the last election. For those acts, Robinson has pursued me, and still continues to pursue me, with relentless hate.

THE LIBERATOR.

Corning, (N. Y.) April 18—Terrible Hall Storm.—A terrible hall storm visited us this morning, and did much damage.

The Slave Girl.—The slave girl who escaped from Richmond in the steamer Jameson, and came to this city, was not recovered by the captain.

CAUTION NECESSARY. Many weeks ago, evidence was brought to our notice of the bad character of the individual, John Marshall, referred to in the subjoined notices; and we determined to warn our readers and the public to be on their guard against him.

BEWARE OF SWINDLERS. It becomes my duty to put the public on their guard against a set of knaves among our colored population, who are obtaining money on various false pretences, by appealing to the sympathies of anti-slavery men.

NOTICES OF MEETINGS, &c. PENNSYLVANIA YEARLY MEETING OF PROGRESSIVE FRIENDS. Again this Religious body sends paternal salutations to the friends of Truth, Liberty and Progress, in every part of the land.

JOHN MARSHALL. It is well known to the friends of freedom in many places east and west, that a colored man bearing the above name has for several years been engaged in the character of a lecturer.

PREMIUM TRACTS. Some time in December last, a premium was offered, by Thomas Boardman, of Fall River, Mass., for the best tract upon 'The Scriptural and Political Rights of the North in the present crisis of Slavery.'

KANSAS MATTERS. We have received the Kansas Herald of Freedom of the 7th inst., which contains many matters of interest in the relative to progress which is being made in the settlement of the territory.

THE LIBERATOR.

THE NEW ENGLAND. SONS OF NEW ENGLAND. HAVE scattered to the remotest quarters of the Union, but wherever they are, they will never forget the scenes of their nativity.

MRS. HARRIET BEECHER STOWE. This volume contains a fund of description, of humor and pathos, that would insure its hearty reception, even if it came from an unknown writer.

HOPEDALE JUVENILE AND COLLEGIATE HOME SCHOOL. HOPEDALE, MILFORD, MASS. DESIGNED FOR YOUTH OF BOTH SEXES. Sanctioned by the Authorities of the Hopedale Community.

PHYSICAL HEALTH AND DEVELOPMENT, MENTAL DISCIPLINE, CULTURE OF THE AFFECTIONAL NATURE. The first Summer Term, consisting of twenty-two weeks, will commence Thursday, May 3, 1855.

NOTICES OF MEETINGS, &c. PENNSYLVANIA YEARLY MEETING OF PROGRESSIVE FRIENDS. Again this Religious body sends paternal salutations to the friends of Truth, Liberty and Progress, in every part of the land.

THE NEW ENGLAND. SONS OF NEW ENGLAND. HAVE scattered to the remotest quarters of the Union, but wherever they are, they will never forget the scenes of their nativity.

THE NEW ENGLAND. SONS OF NEW ENGLAND. HAVE scattered to the remotest quarters of the Union, but wherever they are, they will never forget the scenes of their nativity.

THE NEW ENGLAND. SONS OF NEW ENGLAND. HAVE scattered to the remotest quarters of the Union, but wherever they are, they will never forget the scenes of their nativity.

THE LIBERATOR.

THE NEW ENGLAND. SONS OF NEW ENGLAND. HAVE scattered to the remotest quarters of the Union, but wherever they are, they will never forget the scenes of their nativity.

MRS. HARRIET BEECHER STOWE. This volume contains a fund of description, of humor and pathos, that would insure its hearty reception, even if it came from an unknown writer.

HOPEDALE JUVENILE AND COLLEGIATE HOME SCHOOL. HOPEDALE, MILFORD, MASS. DESIGNED FOR YOUTH OF BOTH SEXES. Sanctioned by the Authorities of the Hopedale Community.

PHYSICAL HEALTH AND DEVELOPMENT, MENTAL DISCIPLINE, CULTURE OF THE AFFECTIONAL NATURE. The first Summer Term, consisting of twenty-two weeks, will commence Thursday, May 3, 1855.

NOTICES OF MEETINGS, &c. PENNSYLVANIA YEARLY MEETING OF PROGRESSIVE FRIENDS. Again this Religious body sends paternal salutations to the friends of Truth, Liberty and Progress, in every part of the land.

THE NEW ENGLAND. SONS OF NEW ENGLAND. HAVE scattered to the remotest quarters of the Union, but wherever they are, they will never forget the scenes of their nativity.

THE NEW ENGLAND. SONS OF NEW ENGLAND. HAVE scattered to the remotest quarters of the Union, but wherever they are, they will never forget the scenes of their nativity.

THE NEW ENGLAND. SONS OF NEW ENGLAND. HAVE scattered to the remotest quarters of the Union, but wherever they are, they will never forget the scenes of their nativity.

POETRY.

For the Liberator.

SONNETS ON NEGRO SLAVERY.

America's fair daughters, read ye not, With glowing hearts, your sisters' noble deeds?

Ministers of the Gospel! glorious name! The highest title that man dares assume!

O, ye true-hearted, who have firmly stood, By evil or by good report unshaken,

No man can serve two masters. Choose between God, who makes all men brethren, gives his earth

O men, that hold your brother man a slave, Do ye forget to whom the earth belongs?

What mock respect to call God's Christ your Lord, That Christ who bade—'As ye would have men do

EMPLOYMENT.

Employment! employment! Oh, that is enjoyment!

Their work, uncomplaining, God's will— Their work not hasting, God's time never wasting.

SONNET.

Thy 'perfect music, set to noble words, In brave appeals for Freedom's sainted cause,

REFORMATORY.

JOHN W. WEBSTER, THE MURDERER, AND JOSEPH EVELETH, THE HANGMAN:

A LETTER

TO REV. LYMAN BEECHER, D. D.

BY HENRY C. WRIGHT.

STATE HOUSE, Boston, February, 1855. TO THE REV. LYMAN BEECHER, D. D.:

SIR—You are at this moment pleading for the gallows as a means of grace, and the hangman as a minister of God for good, to Church and State.

John W. Webster, M. D., killed George Parkman, M. D., Nov. 23, 1849. Joseph Eveleth killed John W. Webster, —, 1850. You call Webster, a murderer, and Eveleth 'a minister of God for good.'

1. THE ACT WAS THE SAME; each killed a man. The manner of killing was different—one breaking the head, the other the neck, of his victim.

2. THE MOTIVE WAS THE SAME. The hangman's motive—what was it? What is the sole end of government, as defined by the Constitution of Massachusetts?

To secure the existence of the Body Politic—to protect it, and to furnish the individuals composing it, with the power of enjoying, in safety and tranquillity, their natural rights, and the blessings of life.

The people of the United States say—'We do ordain and establish this Constitution, (form of government), to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.'

This, then, is the end for which governments are instituted, maintained and administered: The good of those who form them. But what is a Body Politic, or Government! The Constitution of Massachusetts thus defines it:—

'The Body Politic is formed by a voluntary association of individuals. It is a social compact, by which the whole people covenants with each citizen, and each citizen with the whole people, that all shall be governed by certain laws for the common good.'

This, then, is the fact—the people of Massachusetts decide to punish murder with death; and seize, try, condemn and execute the murderer, solely to secure their own safety and happiness.

Two facts are settled—(1) that Eveleth, in killing Webster, embodied and acted for the whole people, as their 'substitute or agent'—(2) that the people, embodied, and acting in and through the hangman, killed Webster solely with a view to their own 'safety and happiness.'

Two facts are settled—(1) that Eveleth, in killing Webster, embodied and acted for the whole people, as their 'substitute or agent'—(2) that the people, embodied, and acting in and through the hangman, killed Webster solely with a view to their own 'safety and happiness.'

Two facts are settled—(1) that Eveleth, in killing Webster, embodied and acted for the whole people, as their 'substitute or agent'—(2) that the people, embodied, and acting in and through the hangman, killed Webster solely with a view to their own 'safety and happiness.'

Two facts are settled—(1) that Eveleth, in killing Webster, embodied and acted for the whole people, as their 'substitute or agent'—(2) that the people, embodied, and acting in and through the hangman, killed Webster solely with a view to their own 'safety and happiness.'

Two facts are settled—(1) that Eveleth, in killing Webster, embodied and acted for the whole people, as their 'substitute or agent'—(2) that the people, embodied, and acting in and through the hangman, killed Webster solely with a view to their own 'safety and happiness.'

Two facts are settled—(1) that Eveleth, in killing Webster, embodied and acted for the whole people, as their 'substitute or agent'—(2) that the people, embodied, and acting in and through the hangman, killed Webster solely with a view to their own 'safety and happiness.'

Two facts are settled—(1) that Eveleth, in killing Webster, embodied and acted for the whole people, as their 'substitute or agent'—(2) that the people, embodied, and acting in and through the hangman, killed Webster solely with a view to their own 'safety and happiness.'

Two facts are settled—(1) that Eveleth, in killing Webster, embodied and acted for the whole people, as their 'substitute or agent'—(2) that the people, embodied, and acting in and through the hangman, killed Webster solely with a view to their own 'safety and happiness.'

Two facts are settled—(1) that Eveleth, in killing Webster, embodied and acted for the whole people, as their 'substitute or agent'—(2) that the people, embodied, and acting in and through the hangman, killed Webster solely with a view to their own 'safety and happiness.'

Two facts are settled—(1) that Eveleth, in killing Webster, embodied and acted for the whole people, as their 'substitute or agent'—(2) that the people, embodied, and acting in and through the hangman, killed Webster solely with a view to their own 'safety and happiness.'

Two facts are settled—(1) that Eveleth, in killing Webster, embodied and acted for the whole people, as their 'substitute or agent'—(2) that the people, embodied, and acting in and through the hangman, killed Webster solely with a view to their own 'safety and happiness.'

Two facts are settled—(1) that Eveleth, in killing Webster, embodied and acted for the whole people, as their 'substitute or agent'—(2) that the people, embodied, and acting in and through the hangman, killed Webster solely with a view to their own 'safety and happiness.'

Two facts are settled—(1) that Eveleth, in killing Webster, embodied and acted for the whole people, as their 'substitute or agent'—(2) that the people, embodied, and acting in and through the hangman, killed Webster solely with a view to their own 'safety and happiness.'

Two facts are settled—(1) that Eveleth, in killing Webster, embodied and acted for the whole people, as their 'substitute or agent'—(2) that the people, embodied, and acting in and through the hangman, killed Webster solely with a view to their own 'safety and happiness.'

Two facts are settled—(1) that Eveleth, in killing Webster, embodied and acted for the whole people, as their 'substitute or agent'—(2) that the people, embodied, and acting in and through the hangman, killed Webster solely with a view to their own 'safety and happiness.'

ly and deliberately plan and execute death upon Webster, and for this you applaud them.

'MALICE PREPENSE'—Malice aforethought! The advocates of the death penalty say, in the murderer, the forethought was accompanied by malice—but in the State, not. The indictment says Webster killed Parkman with 'malice aforethought.' Malice and forethought are coupled as essential to the existence of murder, and the malice is inferred from the forethought.

But forethought does not necessarily presuppose malice. If so, hatred and malice must be attributed to the hangman, the jury, the judge, and the Body Politic, whose substitutes they are.

But you and the advocates of death penalty insist that forethought does imply hatred in one, but not in a million.

If it necessarily follows that one man hates another, because he kills him deliberately, and with calculating forethought, the same hatred must be attributed to a million, when they kill in the same manner; though, in fact, one or one million may take life with 'prepnese,' 'forethought,' and for their own benefit, yet without hatred or malice. But the courts always infer malice when one man takes life with forethought, and with a view to his own benefit; but they do not infer malice when, with the same forethought, and for their own benefit, a million take life.

East's Crown Law, chap. 5, sec. 2, as quoted by Judge Shaw, in his charge on the trial of Webster, says—

'Murder, in the sense now understood, is the voluntary killing a person under the king's peace (under the protection of the State) of malice prepense or aforethought, either express or implied by law; the sense of which word malice is not confined to a particular ill-will to the deceased, but is intended to denote, as Mr. Justice Foster expresses it, an action flowing from a wicked nature, a thing done, malo animo, where the fact has been attended with such circumstances as carry in them a plain indication of a heart regardless of social duty, and fatally bent on mischief. And, therefore, malice is implied from any deliberate cruel act against another, however sudden.'

Thus, according to the decision of Judge Shaw, in his charge to the jury on the trial of Webster, the fact that the act against another is 'deliberate and cruel,' implies malice. He says, also, that malice is not 'confined to any particular ill-will to the deceased.' So that 'malice prepense,' or 'malice aforethought,' only means to kill with cool deliberation and calculating forethought.

True, he says it is intended to denote an 'action flowing from a wicked motive.' What makes the motive wicked? The fact that it relates solely to self. The fact that one takes life for his benefit makes the motive wicked, according to human laws. Does not the same fact in regard to the motive of a million make it wicked also? If Webster's motive was wicked because he killed a man for his good, then is the motive of a million wicked when they do the same act for their good?

4. THE EXERCISE OF DISCRETIONARY POWER WAS THE SAME. One million, calling themselves a Body Politic, assume the right to kill men. Who is to decide for what, on whom, when and how, they may use this power? They who assume it must decide for themselves, for what and on whom death shall be inflicted.

The people decide that murder shall be punished with death. They give their own definition of murder, and then decide who is guilty. They decide that Webster was a murderer, and deliberately and intentionally killed him, for their benefit, because he, with the same forethought and discretion, killed Parkman for his benefit.

DISCRETIONARY POWER OVER LIFE is assumed and exercised by the murderer and the hangman. Webster, acting on his own judgment and responsibility, and instigated by the promptings of his own soul, killed a man. A million, instigated by the promptings of their own souls, and acting on their own discretion and responsibility, do the same deed. While you condemn and punish one as a murderer for thus doing such a deed, you honor a million for doing the same act in the same way.

Thus, then, the conclusion is unavoidable, that in killing men, the act, the motive, the forethought, the exercise of discretionary power in the murderer and hangman are precisely the same. Keep in mind, that, by hangman, I mean not Eveleth the individual man merely, but also Eveleth the State.

Thus far, we find no difference between the murderer and the hangman. They are precisely the same, except that the murderer acted alone, and the hangman was composed of one million acting together.

But you and your coadjutors in support of the gallows say—The million composing the Body Politic have a penal power, which no one individual has. Do you mean to say that to-day, acting separately, and on personal responsibility, not one of the million has power to kill men at his discretion and for his benefit, but to-morrow, having entered into a 'voluntary association,' and called it the 'Body Politic,' they have acquired the power?

How did they get it? You will not pretend that men, having in themselves no power to inflict death on their fellows, at discretion, and for their own peace and happiness, acquire it merely by entering into a 'voluntary association,' by whatever name they call it. Men cannot bring into a voluntary association a power which they did not possess before. No other association, such as banks, railroads, churches, &c., are supposed to have any powers not possessed by the individuals who compose them. Why except Bodies Politic? No reason can be given why they should not stand on precisely the same ground, in this respect, on which other 'voluntary associations' stand.

But you say, God ordained civil governments, and did not ordain banks, railroads, &c. What is the fact touching the Body Politic, or Government of Massachusetts? The people have declared it to be a 'voluntary association of individuals'; and they 'ordained' it for a given purpose. The simple truth is, God had no more to do in forming the 'Body Politic,' or Government of Massachusetts, than he had in forming the 'Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company,' or the 'Sims Brigade.' They are all what Burke declares civil governments to be, 'contrivances of human ingenuity for human convenience.'

But you say the million, acting as a Body Politic, derive their power to hang the murderer direct from God. Where do you find authority for saying God has given power to Bodies Politic, which he denies to the individuals composing them? The true God speaks to men and legislators, and never as banks, railroads, churches, States. These are all contrivances of men, (whether good or bad is not the question,) for their own convenience and happiness, and they have no rights, no powers, except such as are derived from the individuals composing them.

As to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, there can be no mistake as to the source of its powers. The people themselves have settled that 'All powers reside originally in the people, and is derived from them.'

Whatever power is in the 'Body Politic' is originally in each individual composing it. If one million, as a State, have a right to kill at their discretion, and for their benefit, then each individual has the same right. Had the State a right to hang Webster? 'Yes, you say. Where did it get it? You and your coadjutors say, 'From God.' The State itself repudiates that, and makes no such claim for itself as you make for it. It claims to have derived the right solely from the people.

If, then, the State had a right to hang Webster, it got it from Webster, or from others. If it was derived from him, then he had a right to kill himself, or he never could have empowered the State to do it. If the State thinks Webster had that right, why did they not allow him to kill himself quietly in his cell, and avoid the pain and shame of a public trial and execution? But they would not thus let him end his life, and you would have pronounced him twice a murderer, if he had. Yet suicide is the basis of the death penalty—for, according to the Constitution of this State, the right of the million to kill Webster is based on his right to kill himself. In speaking of the right of the State to hang a man, you assume that he has a right to hang himself.

But you say, While he had no power to kill himself, others had a right to kill him, and he to kill others, under certain circumstances. Can it be that you, Sir, have more power over the person and life of another, than over your own? Will you say that God empowered Webster to do to you, and you to do to him, what it were a sin for either to do to himself? This has been a settled maxim of life with me: That it is a sin to do to OR FOR ANOTHER, WHAT IT WOULD BE A SIN TO DO TO OR FOR MYSELF. Is this God's truth? Then, until I get the right to hang myself, I can never have the right to hang another. Until I have power over my own life to authorize you and others to kill me, I cannot have power over another's life to authorize you to kill him. If it be a sin to kill yourself, it must ever be a sin for you to kill another. If it be a sin for you to authorize the State to kill yourself, it must ever be a sin for you to authorize it to kill another.

But, your reason and your conscience, your religion and your God, instigate you to do to and for others what you say it would be suicide—murder, in you to do to or for yourself. You say, God commands you to do to others what he forbids you to do to yourself, on pain of his eternal displeasure; for you have just asserted that 'no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him.' Webster killed Parkman, and you say God required you to hang him; but at the same time, that he would subject you to eternal suffering, were you to hang yourself, even were you under the same circumstances.

THE HANGMAN A MINISTER OF GOD!! You say that legislators, judges and magistrates, of every name and grade, are ministers of God. Yes, as you view it, Eveleth, in taking the life of Webster, was 'a minister of God for good' to the people of Massachusetts.

The million composing the 'voluntary association' called the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, emphatically deny that their agents, in managing their State affairs, are ministers of God. They distinctly affirm that 'All magistrates and officers vested with authority, whether legislative, judicial or executive, are their substitutes or agents, and are, at all times, accountable to them.'—[Bill of Rights, sec. 5.]

According to this, the legislators who enacted the death penalty, the judges who pass the sentence of death, and the hangman who executes it, derive their power to do these things, not from God, but from the people, and they are accountable to them, not to God, for the use of the power with which they are invested. God commissioning one of his children to hang another! It is monstrous. My soul cannot receive it.

Mark! I give the theory of government adopted by this State—not my own. I think that whatever is wrong in a private individual, is wrong in a legislator, judge or executioner. What is a sin without a commission from government, is a sin with and under a commission. The death-warrant from the people may screen the executioner from the charge of murder before their tribunal; but at the tribunal of a just and loving God, that warrant will be no excuse for that hidden, bloody tragedy. No commissions issued by men, as individuals or States, can make any deed right which had been wrong without them. But, you say that, acting under a license from the State, it is right for you to do that which would be robbery, murder and piracy to do without such license. Licensed by the body politic, and acting upon its authority and responsibility, you say you are a minister of God in hanging a man; but if you were to do the same on your individual authority and responsibility, and without such license, you would be a minister of Satan. Thus you make human government a contrivance to enable men to perpetrate every conceivable crime, without any responsibility.

The abolition of death as a penalty the destruction of all morality and order, and the forerunner of all crime and anarchy! Do you, Sir, really believe this assertion? Is it made as a mere rhetorical flourish!—a clap-trap appeal to popular prejudice? I am compelled to think you sincerely and honestly believe that, were the gallows abolished, all sense of truth, justice and honor would go with it; the bonds of conjugal, parental, filial, paternal and social affections and sympathy that now bind families, neighborhoods and peoples together, would be broken, and conscience and the last spark of divinity be extinguished in the human soul!

You are this moment referring us to the murders and anarchy of Paris, in 1792-3, as a warning to those who seek the abolition of the gallows, and to throw around human life the protection of absolute inviolability. You also refer us to the frightful increase of crimes against person and life, in New England, during the last fifty years. This, for the most part, you attribute to the sympathy shown to those who, by murder, subject themselves to the death penalty.

Sir, let every principle be answerable for its own natural and legitimate fruits. By their fruits, principles, as well as men, are to be known. Who are the investigators and perpetrators of crime?

RAPE! Who are they who do violence to woman? Are they those who believe in the absolute sacredness of her life and person, and who live according to their belief? Are they those, who, from a deep and holy conviction of the sanctity of life, seek the abolition of the death penalty? Search and see. We willingly abide the issue. No!—you will find that woman's holiest instincts are outraged and crushed only by those, who, in the legislative hall, in the court room, in the church, and at the foot of the gallows, have been taught that human life may be taken at the discretion of those who take it. Every personal outrage against woman has been committed by those who are in sympathy with you on the subject of death penalty; and they commit these outrages, because they have embraced your doctrine. Were they non-resistants, in theory and practice, holding that the per-

son and life of man should be sacred from the touch of violence, woman would be perfectly safe. It is your doctrine which subjects her person to outrage.

ROBBERY! And you refer the increase of this crime to the efforts made to abolish the gallows. If this be not your meaning, why do you refer to the fact as a warning against its abolition? When the robber holds the pistol to your heart, and says, 'Your money or your life!' he acts on the very principle, and assumes the very power, for which you plead. No man, who regards life and person as sacred, can be a robber. As well hold total abstinence responsible for an increase of drunkenness. All robbers are in perfect sympathy with you, in your support of the right to take life, and they cheer you on in your effort; for you lend your name and your power to sustain the principle on which their profession rests.

MURDER! This crime, you say, is also increasing. Bo it so. But who are the murderers? Are they those who hold to the absolute sanctity of life and person, and who, in order to inspire men, women and children with a tender, loving respect for the same, would have the Body Politic renounce the right to kill, and cease killing, and bend their energies to educate the people to mutual love and respect? You know that no murderers come from that class, except as they are induced by you and your coadjutors to abandon their principles, and embrace the doctrine that life may be taken at their discretion, and for their benefit.

No! Only those who receive and practice the spirit and principle of the death penalty can ever enter the temple of life, and there imbue their souls and their hands in a brother's blood.

Life in danger in proportion as it is respected! 'Murders increasing as life is being held sacred'! So, to secure life, and prevent murder, you would teach men that they may kill at their discretion, and for their benefit! To prevent lying, teach men it is right to lie! To secure liberty, teach them it is right to hold slaves! To inspire men with abhorrence for the sin of drunkenness, tell them it is their right and duty to get drunk, and to fill the land with alcohol, and license grog-shops, and teach all from infancy to drink and get drunk! And this is the hangman's philosophy of religion and morality. It is yours, when you think that, in order to inspire respect for life, we must kill men, and to diffuse a love of peace, we must prepare means of war, and maintain an army and navy!

A man is to be hung by you. A gallows is erected in front of the pulpit of the Old South Church. You take the victim upon the scaffold, tie the rope about his neck, bind him hand and foot, and launch him into eternity. It is Sunday; all the people are present to be benefited. There hangs their brother by the neck. You enter the pulpit, and, taking that hanging brother for a text, you preach on the sanctity and dignity of human life; then say, 'Father, forgive us as we have forgiven our brother.' Dare you do it?

PIRACY! Who is the pirate? Society is divided into two parties—those who claim and exercise the power of life and death over man, and those who disclaim the power, and eschew its exercise. There are two principles—one asserts that we may kill men at our discretion, and for our benefit; the other, that life and person are sacred. From which of these principles does piracy result? Is it the fruit of the death penalty, or its opposite? Do pirates come from those who oppose the principle of blood for blood, or those who practise it?

The pirate worships at the altar of blood. His god is a god of 'hot wrath,' and 'merciless vengeance.' How do his god and his worship differ from yours? Not a whit, in this matter; for you hold to a god and worship, which, as you are now telling us, teach the doctrine and practice of blood for blood.

You have this to reflect upon, and I speak it with sorrow: you have the support of all the ruffians, robbers, murderers, assassins, pirates, and men of valor and blood on earth. They assume, as you do, that life may be destroyed at their discretion, and for their benefit; and their life of crime and blood is but the natural and necessary fruit of the principle which you and they combine to uphold and live out, each in his own way, and as he understands it.

ANARCHY! You and the advocates of the death penalty consider it the basis, and its abolition the destruction of civil society. Is this a fact? The argument is: Let the government, by precept and example, inculcate on its subjects the absolute sanctity of life and person, and this would tend to throw off all restraints, destroy all respect for life, sap the foundations of all order, and end in anarchy, rapine and blood.

What is anarchy? A state of society where men have no respect for life and person. In proportion as this ceases, anarchy must ensue. The power for which you plead is based on the assumption, that each individual is vested with the right to kill each and every other individual at his discretion. On this principle, all the crimes against person and life, in a state of anarchy, have been perpetrated.

In proportion as men come to regard life and person as sacred, will the possibility of anarchy cease. No man can be an anarchist, who, ideally and actually, vindicates the sanctity of life. Anarchy would result from the abolition of the death penalty, as drunkenness would from the destruction of alcohol; as sickness and suffering would result from the abolition of all disease. LIKE BEGETS LIKE. Homicide begets murder. Killing in the State begets killing in individuals. The direct and unavoidable influence of the Body Politic is to destroy all loving and tender respect for person and life. Such is your influence. Who could hear you speak, as you are now speaking, and not have his respect for human life greatly weakened, if not destroyed? You are insisting on your right to strangle men to death. Instead of inspiring those who hear you with a tender regard for life and person, you are trying to convince them that God requires them to desecrate the persons and to destroy the lives of those of their fellow-beings whom they think ought to die.

Thus you would protect life, promote order, and sustain government. You insist that all who hold to the absolute sanctity of life and person are 'NO-GOVERNMENT MEN,'—while you, and those like you, who claim the right to 'kill, slay and destroy,' at your discretion, and for your benefit, are the supporters of law and order!

FRENCH REVOLUTION! You hold that up, in terrorism, over the Committee and the Legislature, to dissuade them from abolishing the gallows. I thank you for referring to it. Of all the arguments against the death penalty the world ever had, that Revolution is the most conclusive.

What principle underlay that tragedy! The very one for which you now plead. Every person sent to the guillotine, and every one hewed down by the myriads of the existing authorities, were slaughtered by the assumed right of the people to kill men at their discretion and for their benefit.

You say, 'They blew up the Bible, and, therefore, they fell into anarchy and blood.' But they

were careful not to blow up with it the doctrine of 'Blood for Blood,' which you say is there, and because it is there, they blew up that Bible, and in spirit and practice, adopted the principle of the sanctity of life and person, that bloody principle had never defiled the page of history. Through every blood in France had been burnt, not one drop of blood would have been shed, but for the doctrine of the most prominent and cardinal doctrine taught in that book. Of all men, you and your coadjutors in support of the death penalty are the last who should condemn the French Revolution; for, in all its bloody details, it was but the natural and necessary fruit of the principle for which you plead. All its bloody-minded actors were born and trained under the influence of a Bible and preaching, and in the bosom of a church whose teachings, as you assure us, were all in favor of the death penalty. However you may differ in other things, you agree in this—the right of the people to kill men at their discretion, and for their benefit.

But you say, they denied God as well as the Bible. What if they did? If they denied the doctrine, they did not deny that they were one of the most prominent attributes, i. e., Blood for Blood. Had they rejected God and the Bible, and rejected them the Blood for Blood principle which you say they both inculcate, and in their stead, adopted and lived out the principle that life and person are absolutely sacred, not one drop of blood had been shed, not one person, of man or woman, had been violated, and that colossal crime had not stained this fair earth. But God and the Bible, as principles, and the actors in that scene received and embraced them, can never thus consecrate and protect life and person; for they both invest man with discretionary power of life and death over man. With human beings get higher, more ennobling and more natural views of the life and person of man than God and the Bible, as you and your fellow-advocates of the death penalty receive and embrace them, such national tragedies will, from time to time, be enacted, to shake the faith of the weak and superficial in human progress and perfection.

The true history of the French Revolution is to be written. When its details of truth, and blood are traced to their source, they will be found to result naturally and necessarily from the principle that human beings may take life at their discretion, and for their benefit. And this principle, you say, is inculcated by your religion and your God.

My religion and my God teach me to regard the life and person of man as absolutely sacred. In you, can any one, show how energy can result from such a principle! When grapes grow from the vine, and figs thistles; when justice brings forth equity, and purity impurity, as natural and necessary fruits, then may pollution, anarchy and the flow from Non-Resistance.

THE INQUIRIES! I might cite you to that full page of history, and ask you—who established and administered that dark tribunal! On what principle was it founded! On the right to take life at their discretion and for the benefit of those who take it. They said:—

'If thy brother, thy son, thy daughter, thy wife, or thy friend, which is as thine own soul, come thee to go and serve other gods—these eyes shall not pity him, neither shalt thou spare, lest thou shalt kill him.' (Deut. 19:16, & 19:10.)

All the tortures and blood of that tribunal were the natural fruits of the doctrine for which you are now pleading—i. e., that life and person are not sacred—for great reasons of Church and State.

SLAVERY! The death penalty is the basis of that system of crime and woe. Not a human being could ever have been made a slave, had it not now been held as a slave an hour, but for the power for which you plead. In proportion as we come to respect person and life as sacred, the very spirit and basis of human slavery must cease. No man can be a slave, or a slaveholder, who respects person and life in himself and others as sacred.

It were needless to call your attention to the one hundred thousand poor, friendless old men and women, who, in one century, were put to death for witchcraft. I need not refer you to the bloody code of the Puritans, adopted in 1646, making fifteen crimes punishable with death. Nor to the innocent Quakers, hung on Boston Common, nor to the innocent men and women who were pressed to death for witchcraft in Salem and Boston. All these were but the natural fruits of the principle for which you plead.

But I forbear. The theme is deep and broad as life; momentous as human destiny in time and in eternity. The following positions I have advanced to establish; whether I have succeeded or not, be to each judge.

1. That the murderer and the hangman act on the same principle.

2. That that principle is—the right to take life at the discretion and for the benefit of those who take it.

3. That from this result all the crimes against life perpetrated by individuals and States.

4. That the doctrine of the SACRIFICE OF LIFE is the only principle that can save this world from violence and blood.

IN CONCLUSION, let me call your attention to the reproach you cast upon those who would abolish the Death Penalty. You reproach me for my sympathy for the murderer. It is very strange and very false that you should do so, and still profess to be a follower and a minister of Jesus.

Whom did he pity but the erring and the guilty? He was the friend of publicans and sinners—the outcast and the friendless of his day. He came to seek and save the lost; to heal the sick, to bind up the well. 'Who forgat even his own sufferings, the pity and sympathy for murderers? Jesus, the pity and sympathy for murderers?—and in the agonizing death, he forgot the victim, and his friends and relatives, in his tender sympathy for murderers; and he cried out, 'Father, forgive them, they know not what they do!' And you, Sir, and the Rev. Mr. Waterbury, and the Rev. Mr. Whiting, all professors of Jesus, reproach us, and even mock us for sympathizing with murderers. It was the poor, despised, outcast prodigal, and not the good, obedient son, for whom the fattest calf was killed. It was for his enemies, for murderers, that God gave his son to die.

The poor, guilty, blood-stained murderer is your enemy; love him as Jesus loved his enemies. He gave him one you and society the greatest wrong; for he gave him, as Jesus forgave his murderers. He has done to you a great evil; return to him good for evil, as Jesus did. He is sick; go heal him, as Jesus did, go find him, as Jesus did. He is your brother, lost, go find him, as Jesus did. He is your brother, the prodigal son of your father; go bring him home, as Jesus did, that your father may rejoice with you over him—saying, 'This my son, was lost, and is found; he was dead, and is alive. Let us kill the fatted calf, and rejoice, and be glad.'

Sir, will you stand aloof from this joy and gladness, and still cry out against your erring brother—'Hang him!'—BLOOD FOR BLOOD!

Sir, will you stand aloof from this joy and gladness, and still cry out against your erring brother—'Hang him!'—BLOOD FOR BLOOD!

Sir, will you stand aloof from this joy and gladness, and still cry out against your erring brother—'Hang him!'—BLOOD FOR BLOOD!

Sir, will you stand aloof from this joy and gladness, and still cry out against your erring brother—'Hang him!'—BLOOD FOR BLOOD!

Sir, will you stand aloof from this joy and gladness, and still cry out against your erring brother—'Hang him!'—BLOOD FOR BLOOD!