National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXI. NO. 36. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 19, 1861. WHOLE NO. 1,076.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,
AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
At its Office, No. 5 Beekman Street, New York,
AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE
PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
107 N. Fifth St., above Arch, Philadelphia.

Letters for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "EDITOR OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, NEW YORK:" Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business affairs of the paper, should be addressed, "PUBLISHER OF THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD, NEW YORK."

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

Pro-Slavery.

In this Department we give place to such extracts from the Pro-Slavery Press, North and South, as we deem necessary to illustrate the character of Slavery and the spirit of its friends, and advocates.

ATHEISM TAUGHT FOR CHRISTIANITY.

A DEFENCE OF SLAVERY FROM A NORTHERN PULPIT.

What! preach and kidnap men!
Give thanks, and rob Thy own afflicted poor?
Talk of Thy glorious liberty, and then
Bolt hard the captive's door?

Priests and Herod friends!
Chief priests and rulers, as of old, combined!
Just God and holy! is that Church, which binds
Strength to the spoiler, Thine?—WHITTIER.

My brain took fire: "Is this," I cried, "the end of prayer and preaching?
Then down with pulpit, down with priest, and give us Nature's teaching!
Fool shamed for one pretence of it who turn the good to evil,
And steal the Bible from the Lord, to give it to the Devil!
Than garbled text, or parchment law, I own a nobler manhood,
And God is true, though every book and every man's a liar!"—IBID.

We have before as a Sermon, entitled, "*The Character and Influence of Abolitionism*," preached on Sunday, December 9th, 1860, by the Rev. HENRY J. VAN DYKE, Pastor of the First Presbyterian (O.S. School) Church in Brooklyn, N. Y. It has been published not only in pamphlet form but in many influential pro-slavery journals, and is regarded by the enemies of Abolitionism as a triumphant vindication of their principles on Bible grounds. Mr. Van Dyke, probably, is not inferior in standing and influence to any minister of the Old School Presbyterian Church. We may regard his sermon, therefore, as an illustration of the popular Christianity of the United States—the Christianity for which Abolitionists are denounced as infidels. We shall therefore treat our readers to liberal extracts.

Mr. Van Dyke takes for his text 1 Timothy vi. 1-5, and opens thus:

> I propose to discuss the character and influence of Abolitionism. With this view, I have selected a text from the Bible, and purpose to adhere to the letter and spirit of its teaching. We acknowledge, in this place, but one standard of appeal, and but one authoritative and infallible rule of faith and practice: for we are Christians here; not blind devotees, to bow down to the dictation of any man or Church; not heathen philosophers, to grope our way through the fog and gloaming of the light of nature; not modern infidels, to appeal from the written law of God to the corrupt and fickle tribunal of reason and humanity; but Christians, on whose banner is inscribed the sublime challenge, "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."
>
> Having quoted Rev. Albert Barnes, Dr. McKnight, Dr. Adam Clarke, Br. Doddridge, Dishausen, and Dr. Gill in support his exposition of the text—an exposition which gives to slavery the sanction of Christianity—he proceeds:
>
> The text, as thus expounded by the concurrent testimony of all the commentators, is a prophecy written for these days, and wonderfully applicable to our present circumstances. It gives us a life-like picture of Abolitionism in its principles, its spirit, and its practice, and furnishes us with plain instruction in regard to our duty in the premises. Before entering upon the discussion of the doctrine, let us define the terms employed. By Abolitionism, we mean the principles and measures of Abolitionists. And what is an Abolitionist? He is one who believes that slaveholding is sin, and ought therefore to be abolished. This is the fundamental, the characteristic, the essential principle of Abolitionism—that slaveholding is sin—that holding men in involuntary servitude is an infringement upon the rights of man, a heinous crime in the sight of God. A man may believe, on political or commercial grounds, that slavery is an undesirable system, and that slave labor is not the most profitable; he may have various views as to the rights of slaveholders under the Constitution of the country; he may think the law that lays the upon the statute books of the Southern States is wrong; but this does not constitute him an Abolitionist; to be entitled to this name, he must believe *that slaveholding is morally wrong*. The alleged sinfulness of slaveholding, as it is the characteristic doctrine, so it is the strength of Abolitionism in all its ramified and various forms. It is by this doctrine that it lays hold upon the hearts and consciences of men, that it comes as a disturbing force into our ecclesiastical and civil institutions, and by exciting religious animosity (which all history proves to be the strongest of human passions), imparts a peculiar intensity to every contest into which it enters. *And you will perceive it is just here that Abolitionism presents a proper subject for discussion in the pulpit; for it is one great purpose of the Bible, and therefore one great duty of God's ministers in its exposition, to show what is sin and what is not.*
>
> Those who hold the doctrine that slaveholding is sin, and ought therefore to be abolished, differ very much in the extent to which they reduce their theory to practice. In some this faith is almost without works. They content themselves with only voting in such a way as in their judgment will hasten the ultimate triumph of their views. Others stand off at what they suppose a safe distance, as Shimei did when he stood on the opposite hill to curse King David, and rebuke the sins of others with Divine judgments upon the sinner. Others, more practical, if not more prudent, go into the very midst of the alleged wickedness, and teach "servants under the yoke" that they ought not to obey even their own masters worthy of all honor—that liberty is their inalienable right—which they should maintain, if necessary, even by the shedding of blood. Now, it is not for me to decide who, of all these, are the nearest to their own principles. It is not for me to decide whether the man who preaches this doctrine in brave words, amid applauding multitudes in the city of Brooklyn, or the man who in the midst of the mob, and in the face of the law's terrors, goes to practise the preaching at Harper's Ferry, is the most consistent Abolitionist, and the most heroic man. It is not for me to decide which is the most important part of a tree; and if the tree be poisonous, which is the most injurious, the root, or the branches, or the fruit. But I am here to-night, in God's name, and by His help, to show that this tree of God's name, and by His help, to show that this tree of Abolitionism is evil, and only evil—root and branch, flower, and leaf, and fruit; that it springs from, and is nourished by, an utter rejection of the scriptures; that it produces no real benefit to the race, and is the fruitful source of division and strife, and infidelity, in both Church and State. I have four distinct propositions on the subject to maintain—four theses to nail up over this pulpit, and defend with the "word of God, which is the sword of the Spirit."
>
> 1. Abolitionism has no foundation in the Scriptures.
>
> 2. Its principles have been promulgated chiefly by misrepresentation and abuse.
>
> 3. It leads, in multitudes of cases, and by a logical process, to utter infidelity.
>
> 4. It is the chief cause of the strife that agitates, and the danger that threatens, our country.
>
> I suppose on this first proposition, Van Dyke appeals "to the tribunal of that law which God promulgated, amid the solemnities of Sinai," to "that peculiar people for whose institutions he has assumed the responsibility." He quotes Lev. xxv. 44-46: "Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids which shall be of the heathen that are round about you. Of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you—of them shall ye buy and of their families that are with you, which they beget in your land; and they shall be your *possession*. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to *inherit them for a possession*; they shall be your *bondmen forever*." Mr. Van Dyke proceeds:
>
> There it is, plainly written in the Divine law. No legislative enactment, no statute framed by legal skill, was ever more explicit and incapable of perversion. When the Abolitionist tells me that slaveholding is sin, in the simple form in which it is in the Holy Scriptures, I point him to this sacred record, and tell him, in all candor, as my text does, that his teaching blasphemes the name of God and his doctrine. When he begins to dote about human rights and attempt to prove, appealing to the Declaration of Independence, and asserting that the idea of property in men is an enormity and a crime, I still hold him to the record, saying, "God has made them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession." When he waxes warm, as he always does if his opponent quote Scripture (which is the great test to try the spirits whether they be of God—the sword of Ithuriel to reveal their true character)—when he gets angry, and begins to pour out his evil surmisings and abuse upon slaveholders, I obey the precept which teaches us, "from such withdraw thyself;" and I parley with this thought: that the wisdom of God is wiser than men, and the kindness of God kinder than men. Philosophers may reason, and reformers may rave till doomsday; they never can convince me that what is in the Levitical law, or in any other law, sanctioned sin; and as I know, from the plain passage I have quoted, and many more like it, that he *did* sanction slaveholding among his ancient people, I am shut up by the logic of that faith which believes the Bible to be his word, that slaveholding is not sin.
>
> We have spoken from the Old Testament branch of the argument for slavery in the teachings and example of Christ and the Apostles. We have room only for brief extracts.
>
> It is a historic truth, acknowledged on all hands, that at the advent of Jesus Christ slavery existed all over the civilized world, and was intimately interwoven with its social and civil institutions. In Judea, in Asia Minor, in Greece, in all the cities where where the Savior or his Apostles preached the gospel, slaveholding was just as common as it is to-day in South Carolina. It is not alleged by any one, or, at least, by any one having any pretension to scholarship or candor, that the Roman laws regulating slavery were even as mild as many worst statutes which have been passed upon the subject in modern times. It will not be denied by any honest and well-informed man, that modern civilization and the restraining influences of the gospel, have shed ameliorating influences upon the relation between master and slave, which were entirely unknown at the advent of Christianity. And how did Jesus and his Apostles treat this subject? Masters and slaves met them at every step in their missionary work, and were present in every assembly where they preached. The Roman law, which gave the full power of life and death into the master's hand, was familiar to them; and all the evils connected with the system surrounded them every day, as obvious to the light of heaven. And yet, it is a remarkable fact, which the Abolitionist does not, because he cannot deny, that the New Testament is utterly silent in regard to the alleged sinfulness of slaveholding. In all the instructions of the Savior; in all the reported sermons of the inspired Apostles; in all the epistles they were moved by the Holy Spirit to write, for the instruction of the churches—there is not one distinct and explicit denunciation of slaveholding, nor one precept requiring the master to emancipate his slaves. Every acknowledged sin is openly and repeatedly rebuked. Idolatry, fornication, uncleanness, Drunkenness and adultery, theft and murder—all the moral wrongs which ever have been known to afflict society, are forbidden by name; and yet, according to the teaching of the Abolitionists, the greatest of all sins—this sum of all villainies—is never spoken of except in respectful terms. How can this be accounted for?
>
> But the Apostles were much further than to abstain from preaching against slaveholding. *They admitted slaveholders to the communion of the Church.* In our text, masters are acknowledged as "brethren, faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit." If the Apostle Paul cautioned Timothy to be received as a faithful history, no man was ever elected by the Apostolic Church upon the ground that he owned slaves. In the Epistle to Philemon, he is commended as a faithful slaveholder, just as he would be expected now to commit adultery, or murder, or cruelty, he was rejected for these crimes, but as he was consistent, he availed himself of the authority conferred by the Roman law to commit adultery, or murder, or cruelty, he was rejected for these crimes, but as he was consistent, he availed himself of the authority conferred by the Roman law to commit adultery, or murder, or cruelty, he was rejected for these crimes, just as he would be rejected now for the same crimes committed in the Church in our Southern States.
>
> Multitudes of pious souls suffer their children to grow up in filth and ignorance; and the details of the divorce cases with which our Northern newspapers have been reeking for months past, are enough to poison the fountains of virtue in every family where they are read. But is any honest man and woman, who live together according to God's ordinance, to be charged with the iniquity of the statute book of Illinois, or the infamy of the Five Points? Neither is any honest slaveholder in Virginia to be charged with all the alleged or real evils connected with the system of slavery. And how will this correct the evil complained of? By railing at the whole system as an iniquity? By joining the advocates of Woman's Rights, in their crusade against the divine law upon the subject? By denouncing the Church of God as "the sum of all villainies?" You acknowledge the relation as lawful, and seek to throw around it, and into the hearts of those who sustain it, the sanctifying influences of the blessed gospel. Just so, the Christian minister is endeavoring to remove the evils connected with slavery in our Southern States. The gospel does not sanction either the *system* of American marriage or the *system* of American slavery (if by the system you mean everything connected with the practical workings of the two relations); but then it *did* sanction both marriage and slaveholding under a code of laws, which, in the condition of the slave, worse than now exist in either New York or Charleston. The apostles did not indorse wicked laws in regard to slavery: they gave both master and slave the law of God, which they did not sanction licentiousness or cruelty in any social relation; but sought to throw over all the sweet and sanctifying influences of the truth as it is in Jesus.
>
> We pass on to the third allegations in support of his second proposition, quoting as much as our space will allow:
>
> Abolitionism is abusive in its persistent misrepresentation of the legal principles involved in the relation of master and slave. Its teachers reiterate, in a thousand exciting forms, the assertion that the idea of property in man blots out his manhood, and degrades him to the level of the brute. "Domestic slavery," says Dr. Wayland, in his work on Moral Science, "supposes, at best, that the relation between master and slave is not that which exists between man and man, but is a modification, at least, of that which exists between man and the brutes." Do not these Abolitionist philosophers know that, according to the laws of every civilized country on earth, a man has property in his children, and a woman has property in her husband? The statutes of the State of New York, and of every other Northern State, recognize and protect this property and our courts of justice have repeatedly sustained its value. If a man is killed on a railroad, his wife may bring suit, and recover damages for the pecuniary loss she has sustained. If one man cities away the daughter of another, and marry her, while she is still under age, the father may bring a civil suit for damages for the loss of that child's services, and the pecuniary compensation is the only redress he has for his injury. The common law of Christendom, and the statutes of our own State, recognize property in man. In what does that property consist? Simply *in such services as a man or a child may properly be required to render*. This is all that the Levitical law, or any other law, means when it says, "Your bondmen shall be your possession, or property, and an inheritance for your children." The Apostle recognizes, not the right to treat the slave like a brute, but simply in a legal claim for such services as a man in that position may properly be required to render. And yet Abolitionists, in the face of the divine law, persist in denouncing the very relation between master and slave "as a modification at least, of that which exists between man and the brutes."
>
> This, however, is not the worst or most prevalent form which their abusive spirit assumes. They mode of arguing the question of slaveholding, by a process which, to my mind, is a tissue of misrepresentation from beginning to end. Let me illustrate my meaning by a parallel case. Suppose I undertake to prove that "marriage is a crime in the sight of the city of New York. In this dissension suppose the Bible is excluded, or, at least, that it is not recognized as having exclusive jurisdiction in the decision of the question. My first appeal is to the statute law of the State.
>
> I show there enactments which nullify the law of God, and make divorce a marketable and cheap commodity. I collect the advertisements of your daily papers, in which lawyers offer to procure the legal separation of man and wife for a stipulated price; I say nothing in this sacred place, of other advertisements with which they fill the columns of your journals, in turn to the crimes of our criminal courts, and show that every day some cruel husband beats his wife, or some unnatural parent murders his child, or some unnatural parent murders his child, or some unnatural mother kills her husband, and seeks the dissolution of the marriage bond. In the next place, I turn to the orphan asylums and hospitals and show what is the direct and immediate tribunal to which the deserted and children maimed by drunken parents. In the last place, I go through our streets, and into our tenement houses, and count the thousands of ragged children with neither parents nor friends to care for them, or training for the prison and gallows.
>
> Summing all these facts together, I put them forth as the fruits of marriage in the city of New York, and a proof that in itself is evil. If I were a novelist, and had written a book to illustrate this same doctrine, I would call this array of facts a "Key." In this key I say nothing about the sweet sympathies and affections that flourish in ten thousand homes, not a word about the multitude of loving kindnesses that characterize the daily life of honest people, about the instruction and discipline that are training children at ten thousand firesides for usefulness here and for glory hereafter: all this I ignore, and quote only the statute book, the newspapers, the records of criminal courts, and the scenes of the abodes of poverty. Now, what have I done? I have not mistated or exaggerated a single fact. And yet, am I not a falsifier and a slanderer of the deepest dye? I am a virtuous woman and an honest man in this city, whose cheeks would not burn with indignation at my one-sided and injurious statements? But this is just what Abolitionism has done in its treatment of the subject. It has attempted to illustrate its cardinal doctrine in works of fiction; and then, to sustain the creation of its fancy, has attempted to underpin it with an accumulation of facts. These have been collected in precisely the way I have described. The statute books of slaveholding States are searched, and every wrong enactment collated, newspaper reports of cruelty and crime are collected, and all the instances of wicked masters are classified, all the outrages that have been perpetrated "by lewd fellows of the baser sort"—of whom there are plenty, both North and South—are eagerly sought and recorded; and the mass of vileness and filth, collected chiefly from the kennels and sewers of society, is put forth as a faithful exhibition of slaveholding. Senators in the forum, and ministers in the pulpit, have repeated the story, and the more refined slander, "that Southern society is essentially barbarous, and that slaveholding had its origin in hell." Legislative bodies have been solemnly asked and

mind of another piece of tardy justice, too long delayed. Michael Hoke considers himself ill used by being turned out of the United States Senate in 1859, Mr. Sumner thinks what he can to repay the favor, and then Winthrop should stand wrong by comparison. In fact, places should be given to men of position. In fact, places should be given to men of position for all such men. I recommend my friend, Mr. Boutwell, one of the representatives, who is a man who would do honor to any place, and who is a man of intimate acquaintance, and who is a citizen who have the place for which I am here and am ardently aspired. I don't know what can be done for Mr. George T. Curtis, the ablest money man of the lot, but perhaps the Secretary of the Treasury should resign, the President might be induced to put Curtis on the bench, in place of Judge Andrew's action? He and Wilmot should immediately abdicate, and let Wilmot and Sumner, Chase and Fessenden fill the vacancies. *The Courier and Post* should be made the official organ of the State government, and, if necessary, supported at a reasonable expense. The office of publication of all acts, proceedings, and resolutions should, in future, be done by a stamp duty on all public papers, for the special benefit. I doubt, however, whether even this would compel the people to vote on. I might mention various other reforms, but I forget them. Oh, yes, we once get under way, and see how easy it will be found useful and necessary to abolish the Supreme Court entirely, and enact that the United States Senate commissioners do our business, and, when we are getting to be a nation of twenty millions, the Senate should be abolished as soon as possible. In fact, one amendment, a Convention should be held to amend the Constitution so as to establish the whole government on a sound Democratic basis. Then we shall be all right. But we cannot do everything. Congress will take hold and help us. Several amendments of the Constitution are needed. Instead of the half-way provision that the President shall be a native of the United States, it should be stipulated that he shall be a native of a slaveholding State and a holder of slaves. It might be well to provide that no man should be a Senator unless he had served an apprenticeship as an assemblyman, and, as an apprenticeship, a large property qualification (say 1,000 slaves) ought to be required for judges of the United States Supreme Court. The skin of a flayed negro might be substituted for the Constitution, or what such a thing is the venerable grannies now wear. The capital should be removed to Charleston, without delay; that port, with Savannah, Wilmington, Mobile, New Orleans and Galveston should be made the authorized ports of the country. New York, Boston and Philadelphia being closed and blockaded, at least until they change their politics. But I will not bore you further with my programme. You see I go further than Mr. Curtis, Judge Shaw, E. R. Winthrop and Mr. Sumner, and even beyond Tom Corwin. But half-way measures will do no good; I am satisfied of this. We must go the entire swine, or we shall never have peace and quietness. In my footprints Mr. Delano's mounted cavalry into the subject of our recovering Fort Moultrie, with this heading, "A Massachusetts man making trouble." This is the right spirit. If any one undertakes to inquire into the condition of the public defenses, he should be denounced as a pernicious intermeddler, at once. It may be necessary to resort to tar and feathers if this thing is not stopped.

I shall not give-up the Union until Mr. William Appleton leaves Washington, for I see by *The New York Express* that "he will remain there as long as he can be of any service in saving the Union"! The same authority says "he is giving his days and nights to the preservation of the government." I fear this is the preservation of the government in Appleton's position, but we have reason to hope for great results. I don't think we need to despair so long as Appleton sits up nights, Tom Corwin cracks jokes, and John J. Crittenden sheds tears—all for the Union and the preservation of slavery. When Appleton takes his portmanteau and leaves for Boston, we may know it is "all up."

SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD

In the United States Senate, Jan. 12, 1861.

MR. PRESIDENT: Congress adjourned last summer amid auspices of national abundance, contentment, tranquility and happiness. It was reasonable that the nation in the enjoyment of the benefits of business, and disturbance of public as well as private credit, and in the face of seditious combinations to overthrow the Union. The alarm is spreading, and we are not more the body than in the soul of the nation. The American citizen has been accustomed to believe the Republic immortal. He shrinks from the idea of the calamities inseparable from death. The report of our condition has gone over the seas, and we who have so long, and with much complacency, admired the lessons of the history of society in the Old World, believing ourselves exempt from such disturbances, now, in our turn, seem to be falling into a momentous and disastrous revolution.

We know how difficult it is to decide, amid so many and so various counsels, what ought to be and what even we can be done. Certainly, however, it is time to inquire ourselves exempt from such disturbances, now, in our turn, seem to be falling into a momentous and disastrous revolution.

We know how difficult it is to decide, amid so many and so various counsels, what ought to be and what even we can be done. Certainly, however, it is time to inquire ourselves exempt from such disturbances, now, in our turn, seem to be falling into a momentous and disastrous revolution.

Senator to declare himself in favor of the Union (the Senator, John Crittenden, one of the representatives, who is a man who would do honor to any place, and who is a citizen who have the place for which I am here and am ardently aspired. I don't know what can be done for Mr. George T. Curtis, the ablest money man of the lot, but perhaps the Secretary of the Treasury should resign, the President might be induced to put Curtis on the bench, in place of Judge Andrew's action? He and Wilmot should immediately abdicate, and let Wilmot and Sumner, Chase and Fessenden fill the vacancies. *The Courier and Post* should be made the official organ of the State government, and, if necessary, supported at a reasonable expense. The office of publication of all acts, proceedings, and resolutions should, in future, be done by a stamp duty on all public papers, for the special benefit. I doubt, however, whether even this would compel the people to vote on. I might mention various other reforms, but I forget them. Oh, yes, we once get under way, and see how easy it will be found useful and necessary to abolish the Supreme Court entirely, and enact that the United States Senate commissioners do our business, and, when we are getting to be a nation of twenty millions, the Senate should be abolished as soon as possible. In fact, one amendment, a Convention should be held to amend the Constitution so as to establish the whole government on a sound Democratic basis. Then we shall be all right. But we cannot do everything. Congress will take hold and help us. Several amendments of the Constitution are needed. Instead of the half-way provision that the President shall be a native of the United States, it should be stipulated that he shall be a native of a slaveholding State and a holder of slaves. It might be well to provide that no man should be a Senator unless he had served an apprenticeship as an assemblyman, and, as an apprenticeship, a large property qualification (say 1,000 slaves) ought to be required for judges of the United States Supreme Court. The skin of a flayed negro might be substituted for the Constitution, or what such a thing is the venerable grannies now wear. The capital should be removed to Charleston, without delay; that port, with Savannah, Wilmington, Mobile, New Orleans and Galveston should be made the authorized ports of the country. New York, Boston and Philadelphia being closed and blockaded, at least until they change their politics. But I will not bore you further with my programme. You see I go further than Mr. Curtis, Judge Shaw, E. R. Winthrop and Mr. Sumner, and even beyond Tom Corwin. But half-way measures will do no good; I am satisfied of this. We must go the entire swine, or we shall never have peace and quietness. In my footprints Mr. Delano's mounted cavalry into the subject of recovering Fort Moultrie, with this heading, "A Massachusetts man making trouble." This is the right spirit. If any one undertakes to inquire into the condition of the public defenses, he should be denounced as a pernicious intermeddler, at once. It may be necessary to resort to tar and feathers if this thing is not stopped.

I shall not give-up the Union until Mr. William Appleton leaves Washington, for I see by *The New York Express* that "he will remain there as long as he can be of any service in saving the Union"! The same authority says "he is giving his days and nights to the preservation of the government." I fear this is the preservation of the government in Appleton's position, but we have reason to hope for great results. I don't think we need to despair so long as Appleton sits up nights, Tom Corwin cracks jokes, and John J. Crittenden sheds tears—all for the Union and the preservation of slavery. When Appleton takes his portmanteau and leaves for Boston, we may know it is "all up."

SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD

In the United States Senate, Jan. 12, 1861.

MR. PRESIDENT: Congress adjourned last summer amid auspices of national abundance, contentment, tranquility and happiness. It was reasonable that the nation in the enjoyment of the benefits of business, and disturbance of public as well as private credit, and in the face of seditious combinations to overthrow the Union. The alarm is spreading, and we are not more the body than in the soul of the nation. The American citizen has been accustomed to believe the Republic immortal. He shrinks from the idea of the calamities inseparable from death. The report of our condition has gone over the seas, and we who have so long, and with much complacency, admired the lessons of the history of society in the Old World, believing ourselves exempt from such disturbances, now, in our turn, seem to be falling into a momentous and disastrous revolution.

Whatever the exhibitions of spirit and resolution here, as elsewhere, have been chiefly made on the side of disunion. I do not mean to impute to any one disloyal motives, but I do mean, that it must plainly reveal itself before its presence can be realized. I like heat, also, the courage that rises slowly and firmly in the presence of danger. It is not in me to be a Christian duty to forgive to the stranger even seventy times seven offenses, it is the highest patriotism to endure without complaint or passionate vaporing even a long and even so long as there is hope that they may come to a better mind.

I think it is easy to pronounce what measures or conduct will not save the Union. I agree with the honorable Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Clingman), that mere eulogiums will not save it. Yet I think that as prayer brings us nearer to God, though it does not move him toward us, so eulogy of the Union and saying virtue in every word of devotion to the Union that is spoken, and in every sigh, that its danger draws forth, I know, at least, that, like prayer, it will bring us nearer to God, and preventing the act that is committed, and every blasphemous phrase that is uttered against it.

The Union cannot be saved by mutual criminations concerning our respective shares of responsibility for the present evils. He whose conscience acquits him will naturally be slow to accuse others whose cooperation he needs. History only can adjust the great account.

A continuance of the debate on the constitutional power of Congress over the subject of slavery in the Territories will not save the Union. The opinions of parties and sections on that question have become dogmatical, and it is this circumstance that has produced the existing alienation. A cessation of that debate, during the debate on the Union, is essential to reconciliation.

The Union cannot be saved by proving that secession is illegal or unconstitutional. Legal or illegal, constitutional or not, it will not stand long enough on forms of law to be dislodged: and loyal men do not need such narrow ground to stand upon.

I fear that little more will be gained from discussing the right of the federal government to coerce seceding States to obedience. It disunion is to go on, this question will give place to the more practical one of how many or what seceding States may be right to coerce the remaining members to acquiesce in a dissolution.

I dread, as in my innermost soul I labor, civil war. I do not know what the Union would be worth if saved by the use of the sword. Yet, for all this, I do not agree with those who, with a desire to avert that great calamity, advise a conventional or unconventional, legal or illegal, with a view to what they call a reconstruction. It is enough for me, first, that in this plan, destruction goes before reconstruction; and secondly, that the strength of the vase in which the hopes of the nation are held consists chiefly in its remaining unbroken.

Congressional compromises are not likely to save the Union. I know, indeed, that tradition favors this form of relief. But it is essential to success, in any case, that there be found a preponderating mass of citizens, so far neutral, on the issue presented, that, when they can interpose, they can dictate down clashing weapons, and compel an accommodation. Moderate concessions are not cost-marily asked by a force which is conscious of its power, nor are liberal concessions made by a party which is not confident of its own right and its own strength. I think, also, that there is a prevailing conviction that legislative compromises would shortly become dangerous expedients, while they anticipate future exigencies, even if they do not assume extra-constitutional powers, are less sure to be maintained even than laws, they are certain to produce ultimately even greater dangers.

Indeed, Mr. President, I think it will be wise to discard two prevalent ideas or prejudices, namely: first, that the Union is a Union of States, considered in particular; and secondly, that it is to be saved by some cunning and insincere compact of pacification. I shall endeavor to show, that this is not the case, but this here so long ago as 1850 and afterward in 1854.

The great danger disclosed itself in this form. Discontented citizens have always found it easy to find certain States, and they are using this authority to overthrow the Federal government. They delude themselves with a belief that the State possesses the power of secession, enables them to discharge themselves of allegiance to the whole Republic. The honorable Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas) says we have a right to coerce a State, but we cannot coerce a State. He says that no State has a right to secede, but we have no constitutional power to make war against a State. The dilemma results from an assumption, which, in such a case, not against the Federal government, but lawfully as a State; although manifestly they have perverted the power of the State to an unconstitutional purpose. A class of politicians in New England set up this theory and attempted to practice upon it in our war with Great Britain. Mr. Webster did not hesitate to say the States must be kept within its constitutional sphere by impulsion, if they could not be held there by attraction. Secession was then held to be inadmissible in the face of a public enemy. It is equally inadmissible in one case, it is necessarily so in all others. I fully admit the originality, the sovereignty, and the independence of the several States, within their sphere. And the Federal government is equally original, sovereign and independent within its sphere. And the government of the State can no more succeed in peopling Union, than the government of the Union can absolve them from allegiance to the State. The people of the United States, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are the supreme law of the land, paramount to all legislation of the States, whether made under the Constitution of the United States, or under State conventions. The Union can be dissolved, not by secession, with or without armed force, but only by the voluntary consent of the States of the United States collected in the manner prescribed by the Constitution of the United States.

Congress, in the present case, ought not to be impassive. It ought, if it can, to redress any real grievance of the political states, and then it ought to supply the President with all the means necessary to maintain the Union in the full exhibition and discharge of its powers. Congress can do this with the proper activity on the part of the Executive, the responsibility of saving the Union belongs to the people, and they are abundantly competent to discharge it.

Congress, therefore, with great deference, to address myself to the country upon the momentous subject, asking a hearing and less from the people of the United States, and the adhering States.

Union is an old, fixed, settled habit of the American people, confirmed by their convictions of its necessity, and therefore not likely to be hastily discarded. The early Colonies, were existing as Colonies, were accustomed to, though imperfectly, though a common allegiance to the British Crown. When that allegiance ceased no one was so presumptuous as to suppose political existence could continue, except in the form of a single State compatible with disunion; and, therefore, the people proclaimed themselves sovereignty independent, they proclaimed themselves also confederated States. Experience in war and in peace proved, in the year 1787, confidence in war and in peace proved, in the year 1787, confidence in war and in peace proved, in the year 1787, confidence

Our Washington Correspondence.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 14, 1861.

The secession movement goes on at the South, without the slightest symptom of a reactionary feeling among those who have been guided into revolution. The wealthier class in the cotton States were quite as much for secession, as the poorer class, opposed to secession, but fell into the trap set for them by the rabble, and are now bitterly cursing themselves. These men more bitterly than ever regret the condition of the South, but the masses, the rabble, are for disunion. It is easy to see that the majority of the Southern members of Congress deprecate the secession movement, yet they are too much afraid of their constituents not to bow to their will. In the course, such men as Jeff. Davis, Wigfall, Toombs and Iverson are sincerely in favor of disunion, and they present Confederacy. I am not sure that Davis ought to be included in this category, for, running through his entire speech, there was a piteous plea for compromise, and, if that were impossible, *for peace*. "Give us our rights," he said to the Republicans; "give us a compromise; but if you will not do that, don't make war upon the new slaveholding confederacy. Davis and Hunter undertook to turn up the spoons of peace. Representing the land of the South as the bower-bird, of street rows and private bitcheries, these Senators plead for a higher civilization than obtains anywhere on the face of the globe. "Shall we make a contest of brute force, like dogs?" asks Mr. Hunter. Why this peaceful policy just now from the lips of violent men? Just because *they fear the aroused and indignant North*. Meantime these fellows go on, all the while secreting government property, actually appropriating gold and silver belonging to the United States. It is precisely the cry of the street thief, of peace, not-coercion, when the constable is after him.

I was saying that most of the Southern Congressmen regret this secession movement. I believe that nearly all the Alabama delegation desire to remain here. Some of them, I know, feel like death at the prospect before them. The same is true of the Georgia delegation in Congress. Several of the members of the last Legislature of Georgia before this revolution is ended. Cobb, Brown, of Mississippi, was packing up his things to go home to Mississippi on Saturday, and the most of the day his wife was in tears at the prospect before them. Those who are intimate with the Governor say that he goes back to his native State a good deal more in sorrow than in anger. He is not half so angry with the Abolitionists as he is sorry to leave the Senate, and witness the dismember of the Union.

The Northern Democracy can thank itself for the present state of things. Presidents Pierce and Buchanan have deliberately patronized and encouraged the Southern Disunionists. Pierce took Jeff. Davis fresh from a gubernatorial contest in Mississippi, in which he ran openly as the disunion candidate. That was the direct issue, and Davis was beaten. Yet, without a sentence of disavowal, Pierce made this traitor his Secretary of War! The same policy was pursued in other portions of the South. The Disunionists were given the pick of the offices, and in this way the Disunion party was fostered by Pierce and Buchanan, until it now masters the entire people of the South.

The Secessionists have received something of a check in the Virginia Legislature, which refers the question of secession to the people. If the State Convention should pass such an act. In Tennessee the same provision has been made by the Legislature. Yet, notwithstanding the Secessionists, for it delays action, which is what they fear most. Not that there is any hope of preventing Virginia from seceding eventually, but it postpones the act till after Lincoln's inauguration. The Virginia Convention meets on the 13th of February, and it cannot get a vote upon the secession question within a week or two, for the delegates from Western Virginia will bitterly oppose disunion, and will discuss the question before it is put to a vote. Then the question of the question to the people for final ratification postpones the decision too late to suit the fiery spirits of the Old Dominion. The grand object of the Secessionists is to get Virginia out of the Union before the 4th of March. This will be a difficult matter, but it may be attained. If Maryland secedes at all, it is now evident that it will not be before the middle or end of March. The same is true of Kentucky and Tennessee. This will give Mr. Lincoln a chance to develope his policy before the border slave States are all out of the Union, and also allow an opportunity for a reaction at the South. This is really all the hope there is of the present Union. The policy of the Republicans seems to be to keep the seat of government at Washington at all hazards, no matter if Maryland secedes, and to collect the revenues at Southern ports upon the decks of our men-of-war. But there are almost insuperable obstacles in the way of this. In the first place, if Maryland leaves the Union, the Capital will be one hundred miles in an enemy's country. How is the line of communication between the Capital and the loyal States to be kept open? It would take 50,000 soldiers to protect the railway from this city through Baltimore to the Pennsylvania line. Civil war would break forth here in all its horrors. Maryland and Virginia would doubtless be devastated, and slavery driven out from both these States. But in the event of a compromise, separation of the slave from the free States, treachery would undoubtedly show itself in the army and the navy. Under such circumstances as these, would it not be best for the free States to recognize the successful revolution and withdraw to a Northern city, to prepare the Northern Confederacy for a tremendous struggle with the hosts of darkness? This course, very likely, would avert the war. The South, seeing that we were fully prepared to meet them upon the sword, that we would be pretty severe to offer very fair treaties. The North would not return runnaway slaves any more; and if the South saw fit to demand it, as the price of a commercial treaty, then she might take the alternative of a war which would not end till slavery was abolished with the sword. I know that a good many American members of Congress begin to look more favorably upon a peaceable separation. The worst danger to be apprehended from this policy is, that Buchanan and his crew might seduce a majority of the States into a reconstruction of the Union upon the basis of the Crittenden proposition. That is what Douglas is now after—peaceable separation, and then reconstruction. He says, very truly, that after a war between the sections, a reunion will be impossible. He very well knows that if the government remains here, and enforces the laws at the hazard of a war with the slave States, it will result either in the subjugation of those States to live under the present Constitution, unamended, or a final separation. I do not believe, however, that the North will make concessions to a set of rebels. If the slave States all secede, it will be too late for such degradation on the part of the North. Even the doughfaces will ask, What good will it do?

The probability of the secession of Maryland from the Union is very strong, since the somerset performed by Senator Pearce of that State. He has all along stood by Governor Hicks, who refuses to call the Legislature together. The Secessionists have been at work upon Pearce, until he has written a letter, from which I make a brief extract:

"There was no authority for the public report which you refer to, that I had fully informed Governor Hicks of my views. Source, inasmuch as I had not proclaimed my opinion on the subject. But I do not hesitate to say to you, that when the demand was made upon him for a call of the Legislature, I was not satisfied of its necessity. I preferred that time should be given to Congress to accomplish an adjustment, which I hoped the patriotic and conservative feeling of the country would sanction, and indeed require. In this hope I have been disappointed, and the prospect of such an adjustment becomes more faint, while the progress of events is rapid and threatening that I now think that the Legislature ought to be soon called. We cannot, by remaining quiet, escape the storm which now seems likely to burst upon us. Anxious as I am for the preservation of the Union, the value of which to all the States has been immense and most precious, I think that the dangers which threaten us may be best averted, if, at all, by the action of the people through their representatives. I hope, therefore, that the Legislature will be called together by the Governor, whose sincerity I do not in the least question. If Congress cannot accomplish some adjustment to the conventions of the States, I shall fear the disruption of the Union, unless the people of the States, in their conventions, can find that remedy for which Congress is at a loss.

I believe that the South would accept the propositions submitted by the other Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Crittenden), whose noble character is a guaranty of his honest and patriotic purposes. If the representatives here of the non-slaveholding States will do nothing to allay the agitation which distracts the country, our only hope is in the people of their States acting through other representatives.

This letter will show you that one of the most ardent and anxious of the Compromisers in Congress has given up his hopes of any important concessions from the North. This is the general opinion here. I am not doubt that there are members of Congress enough who personally desire a compromise and who would vote for one if the act concerned only themselves, but they fear their constituents.

I know scarcely what to say of Mr. Seward's speech. You will make your own comments upon it. Here the criticisms upon it are conflicting. Some Republicans assert that, in reality, there is no compromise in it. Most of the Southerners here say the same. But there are some Republicans who like the speech, and claim that Mr. Seward is, at heart, in favor of compromise. You can judge best of the speech, removed as you are from the excitement and enthusiasm raised here by its delivery. For no other man and no other speech has created such a wonderful enthusiasm in Washington. Thousands of people were unable to gain admittance to the Senate galleries, and yet remained outside to learn, as quickly as possible, the substance of the speech. The Southern Senators and Representatives listened to every word of it in breathless silence, and some of them were deeply impressed by it. The picture of the war between the sections, to result from disunion, seemed to appal the more thoughtful of the Southern Congressmen, and their faces were solemn as the grave. It was somewhat singular to see Senator Crittenden, for he was entirely overcome by the speech, and cried over portions of it like a child. That shows how deeply perceive in disunion the utter destruction of the South, and especially of slavery, is certain. A few hotheads in the cotton States imagine that they can meet the world in arms, but the intelligent people of the South do not think so. When the secession epidemic shall have abated in its violence, the South will find, *too late*, that she has consummated her own ruin, and, to spite the anti-slavery conscience of the North, *has herself abolished slavery!* AVON.

DR. CHEEVER AND THE AMERICAN ABOLITIONISTS.

On the 16th of November last, Dr. Cheever met the members of the Edinburgh Ladies' Emancipation Society, the room being crowded to excess by a deeply interested audience. After receiving an address of sympathy and welcome, Dr. Cheever made some remarks, a report of which we find in *The Caledonian Mercury*, and copy below. We are glad to put on record this hearty and unqualified testimony to our cause, to the character of its supporters as men of integrity and Christian spirit, to the corruption of the American Churches, and to the slanderous character of the charges and imputations against Abolitionists:

"Dr. Cheever, in returning thanks, spoke of the grounds of effort which had been alluded to—namely, those springing from love to God and obedience to his Word and Spirit, and from the heart. The warrior in this cause must be pious and religious, for no political movement could reach the great evil of American slavery. The great Republican party meant to try to prevent the extension of slavery into fresh Territories, and, as a party, would not object to the Fugitive Slave law; but the Church of God sought to abolish slavery at once, and from the place where it is at present. Dr. Cheever then commended to the sympathy of his hearers the Church Anti-Slavery Society, which has recently been formed in America to promote a more fresh agency the great anti-slavery movement. Organized as it had been on such a basis as to afford no ground of exception to any, yet it was met with so little sympathy from the Churches of America that it was unable to sustain even one agent in the field, the point of stumbling among the professing Christians of America being the declaration in the Constitution of the Society that slavery was a crime, and slaveholding, in itself, a sin against God. This was a striking illustration that it was not because of any error of Abolitionists that sympathy was withheld from anti-slavery effort, but because of the "cross" involved in adopting anti-slavery principles in America—because of the sacrifices, commercially and otherwise, which those must make who freely espouse the slave's cause. He had expected that he would be left to sympathy nearly for him in this country, but he found these influences had extended even here. He attributed them to the commercial and social relations that exist with America. He had found a cautious and timidity of the grossest description prevailing—more, in fact, than he could have supposed possible. He would say, as a general rule, that it was the Christian Church that stood against Abolitionists as perfectly nutrue. It was certainly the case, as those present were aware, that mixture had taken place with Dagon at Aholiban had been in the anti-slavery ranks, where persons had sometimes uttered sentiments offensive to Christian sense and feeling; but for such sentiments as these the Abolitionists could not be blamed, and the wonder was it had not made more infidels than were to be found in America from its unfaithfulness to its own mission. He (Cheever) had a very noble tribute to Mr. Garrison, with whom he had held many long and earnest conversations. He could testify to his being anything but an infidel; on the contrary, to be the man who had lived in the fear of God, and the love of Christ as his Savior—who led a pure, and blameless life, and was an earnest and fearless friend of the slave. He had recently attended the last anniversary meeting of the New England Abolitionists, where he had heard no sentiments but such as any Christian could have listened to with interest; and he had felt that the spirit, and the sympathy it evinced, had been of great value, and would tend to convert the union of all who were earnest for the abolition of slavery. He then gave a lucid sketch of the difficulties in the Church of the Puritans, and sought the sympathy of friends in this country. His address throughout was deeply interesting and improving, and a hope was expressed that, as numbers could not gain admittance to the meeting, an early opportunity would be afforded of hearing him."

MOBOCRACY AT ROCHESTER.

THE faithful friends of freedom now engaged in holding a series of Anti-Slavery Conventions in the interior of the Empire State, are beset, it seems, by a mobocratic spirit, which has broken out just now as a weak echo of the Revolutionary disturbances at the South. The following letter to *The Tribune* was written, we presume, by Aaron M. Powell:

ROCHESTER, Monday, Jan. 14, 1861.

The Anti-Slavery Convention has been in session in this city for three days past. It adjourned sine die last evening. As it was the first meeting held during its sessions, this Convention has been the occasion of much excitement throughout the city. On Friday morning, a flag, with the following inscription, was displayed in the meeting-hall bearing the motto, "*No compromise with slaveholders*," was ordered down by the Common Council, on account of the strong feeling it excited among the citizens. The Convention assembled in Corinthian Hall, in the afternoon, without disturbance. An audience of several hundred persons was present at that session, and listened to addresses by Susan B. Anthony, who presided, by the Rev. Samuel J. May, and A. M. Powell. Resolutions of an ultra tone were introduced. Meanwhile a meeting of the Common Council was in session, with a protracted discussion upon the question as to what should be done in the evening, as rumors of mob violence were rife. It was finally decided that the Convention should be protected, and free speech maintained. A large audience assembled in the evening, made up of several hundred intelligent citizens, and of a few of the rowdies of the evening, and several hundred more of the dregs, similar in character to those of the recent mob in Boston—with "intensely loyal" sentiments, Democratic leaders and ugly "roughs," hand in hand, shoulder to shoulder.

Attempts were made in vain for a hearing by Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Abby Kelley and Powell. The Sheriff, Mayor, several Aldermen, and Chief of Police, with a strong force were in attendance, but seemed powerless to quell the mob in the name of "rights of property and standing." After a period of wild and boisterous excitement and confusion, the Chief of Police declared the meeting adjourned till Friday afternoon, at which announcement the mob sent up a torrent of triumphant yells.

On Friday afternoon a large and orderly meeting was held, at which the Anti-Slavery Society adopted a more effectual than the evening previous. There was a large delegation of turbulent spirits present at that session, but in the evening they rallied again in full force by many hundreds. They were mostly, however, outside of the hall, the price of admission for mob having been raised to a fifty cent piece. Desperate efforts were made to force an entrance to the hall, but they were effectually resisted by the police. The discussions within were uninterrupted and listened to by a good-sized audience.

The proprietor of the hall, under very threatening pressure from the mobocracy, was constrained to cancel his contract for the Anti-Slavery Society, so the Convention adjourned to meet in Zion's Church (colored), where two sessions were held. Large audiences were in attendance, with the Mayor, several of the Aldermen, Chief of Police, with an efficient force. Many threats were abroad that the building would be demolished, etc., but the inalienable rights of free speech prevailed, and the Convention adjourned *sine die* at a late hour last night. P.

THE SPIRIT OF PENNSYLVANIA.—In the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania, on Monday last, Mr. Williams, of Allegheny, made a powerful speech, averring the right of coercion, opposing compromise, advocating a vigorous exercise of the powers of the government to suppress secession by force; assailing severely the petitions for the repeal of the 55th section of the Penal Code; holding all attempts at compromise futile, past compromises having been failures; saying that the Union must be reconstructed ultimately by the reaction of the conquered provinces; and that the shedding of a small amount of blood now would save oceans hereafter. There were vast numbers present, and applause from the galleries was frequent.

THE TWENTY-SEVENTH NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY SUBSCRIPTION-ANNIVERSARY.

THE claims of this anniversary can hardly fail at the present hour, to be recognized. Its funds are devoted, not to African colonization; not to political partisanship; not to theological and metaphysical polemics; not to the separate education or religious instruction of persons of color; not to the fomenting of sectional prejudice, civil war, or bloody insurrection; not to the relief or redemption of individuals.

These subscriptions have always been appropriated to the work of awakening the public conscience, enlarging the popular heart, and enlightening the national mind, that, by the practical application, through legitimate channels, of the acknowledged religious and political principles of this country, slavery might be abolished and the whole land made happy and united; which would proceed emancipation, but by voluntary enfranchisement.

There is no longer any need of defining or describing the brutal system of slavery that, since 1789, has been demoralizing the country. A lifetime—under violence, loss, and continual annoyance—has been spent in doing *that*. The people know, *none*, that it is no distant, imaginary evil, but one that overshadows every life with danger and disquiet. Without a single exception, it is the duty of humanity to any perishing fellow-creature who has taken refuge in the sanctuary of their own homes, their whole nature is outraged by the thought that he may be mercilessly seized as a slave, from the very hearth. They cannot protect a hunted child from a fate worse than death, without the risk of being themselves broken down for life by fine and imprisonment.

Good institutions, like good men, have their seasons. Now, the time is ripe for the Northern population to obey such diabolical mockeries of Constitutions and laws, with the simultaneous determination of slaveholding ones at the South never to permit their amendment, necessitates revolution. And now, no qualified observer, surveying the country, can hesitate to acknowledge the great work already done by the American Anti-Slavery Society. It has enabled the Northern populations to meet the present crisis with calm and intelligent resolution; and if the American Anti-Slavery Society had been earlier sustained, to diffuse its deep human feelings, its true counsels and accurate knowledge, more extensively, the masses of the people would betimes have been so warmly and wisely devoted to this magnificent cause, that revolution would have been purely moral, and no disturbing crisis like the present could have occurred.

But the wrong a few just and generous persons have been unable to prevent, may still, by timely compensation with them, be retrieved.

In the very nature of things as they here exist, it will always rest with disinterested persons in private life to initiate every change for the better. Under its present constitution, the country must always look beyond its Church and State dignitaries, its political and ecclesiastical servants, for the previous preparation indispensable to national progress; for how can a Governor, a Senator, a Judge, a minister of any denomination or religious society, take the lead? Every such public functionary is engaged by the people not to lead, but to serve; not to make creeds and constitutions, but to administer under them; not to make things what they should be, but to take them exactly as they are.

Hence the need of an auxiliary private, voluntary service, like that which for the last seven and twenty years the American Anti-Slavery Society has by this anniversary helped to fulfil. Its claims to popular support begin to be felt. The moral vanguard of the people, whether in a sovereign or a functionary capacity, begins to see the mistake of sending a noble servant to reap where no generous and voluntary service has thoughtful man has previously sowed. Let all now unite to sustain such a service—the only possible means of peaceful national progress—the only possible condition of national growth or guaranty for continued national existence.

After having for a life-time done what we could in this behalf, have we not established its claim upon every thoughtful and generous heart? We will such we cordially and confidently rely for both moral support and pecuniary aid. *Both* will be afforded by the act of subscription to which we now invite.

We entreat our friends to remember that, however advantageous and indispensable the largest sums subscribed, none confer on us a higher obligation than the smaller one which the guest offers, regretting that it is the largest in his power.

Copies will first be invitations at the Anti-Slavery Standard Office, New York, and at the Anti-Slavery Office in Philadelphia.

In behalf of the Twenty-seventh National Anti-Slavery Subscription-Anniversary,

MARIA WESTON CHAPMAN.

COVENANTERS' TESTIMONY VS. PRESIDENT BUCHANAN AND GOV. FAIRBANKS'S FAST.

TORPHAM, Vermont, Jan. 8th, 1861.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

HEREWITH I send you the testimony of an anti-slavery meeting, composed mostly of Covenanters, held in this place on Friday the 4th inst., afternoon and evening. The resolutions, which were discussed spiritedly during both sessions and until a late hour in the evening, were passed as reported by the Committee, except the clause in parenthesis in the 5th resolution, which, by a small majority, was stricken out in accordance with the views of some who thought the language stronger than is justified by the language of the Constitution.

I should add that three of the series of resolutions were not voted upon, but were laid on the table to be discussed at a subsequent meeting to be held on the 18th inst. These resolutions bear principally on the proslavery character of the Churches, and they are expected to call out the opinion of members of pro-slavery Churches, especially the Methodists, and a hot time is expected. Let it come. Our hope, under God, is in that truth whose faithful utterance agitates "workers of iniquity" and their allies.

1. Resolved, That though we believe nations and civil rulers, under extraordinary circumstances, may authorize a day of fasting, yet the proclamation of Governor Fairbanks, and the official call of the President of the United States to have this as a day of fasting as at all binding upon us, *first*, because the United States Government, of which he is the chief executive, is not the moral ordinance of God, and wholly violates and practically opposed to the Christian. *Second*, because James Buchanan is not our Prest—we do not acknowledge him as our agent to execute law, or our ruler to whom we owe any conscientious obedience. *Third*, because he does not call the nation to repentance for the real causes of God's displeasure, such as sins, such as Atheism, infidelity, rejection of King Jesus, and most cruel oppression, those very things which the President deprecates as evils are rather called for by God and those worshipings for whose preservation he asks us to pray, we would rather see destroyed.

2. Whereas, President Buchanan, in his recent message, advises to amend the Constitution so that it may recognize the right of property in slaves in those States where it now exists or may hereafter exist, and thus by more effectually pledge and secure the surrender of fugitive slaves as well as to make all Personal Liberty laws of the Northern States null and void:

Whereas, he believes that these proposed amendments are necessary to the preservation of the Union, and in his proclamation asks the people to pray for the preservation of the Constitution and the Union, thereby asking prayer that such infamous amendments may be made so as to save the Union:

Whereas, the President, having laid the blame of the present troubles in the country to "the violent agitation of the slavery question at the North," now proclaims a fast that we Abolitionists, may confess our faults to God:

And, whereas, the Governor of Vermont unites with the President in proclaiming a fast day:

Be it therefore, Resolved, that we cannot comply with the call of Gov. Fairbanks, but hereby testify against his conduct in the premises as unworthy of the chief executive of a State that has declared that "every person that has been held as a slave within this State shall be free;" and

3. Resolved, That the great sins for which God has a controversy with the nation are, disregard to the divine authority—disregard of his Son and of his law—the organization of a Union and Federal Government into which slaveholding States were admitted and in which slaveholders are eligible to office—the adoption of a Federal Constitution which gives property representation in Congress, (compels the shooting down of slaves rising for liberty,) and requires the delivering up of slaves escaping from their merciless oppressors—the increase of slave territory—the wicked use of wars to recover lost slave property or to obtain more slave territory—the unjust and cruel legislation in support of slavery and against freedom, especially the enactment of Fugitive Slave laws—the formation of organized faith in the surrender of territory secretly pledged to freedom, as is the Kansas-Nebraska act—the possession of all manner of wrongs and cruelties, imprisonments, exile, or death of Northerners guilty only or no crime—the election of slaveholders, individuals ungodly or hostile to office—the profanation of the Lord's day by the Post Office department—the hatred of and injustice done to the African race, as if possessed of no rights which white men are bound to respect—the continuation of the foreign and inter-state slave trade—and the inhuman chattelization and most cruel oppression of four millions of God's unoffending children.

6. Resolved, That these sins are chargeable upon all citizens of the government, and indirectly upon all members of those Churches or denominations that fellowship slaveholders or allow their members to vote for them or to sustain this anti-christian and slaveholding confederacy.

7. Resolved, That they are the true and most consistent friends of the country who refuse to sustain this guilty government, and who testify against its atheism and oppression; and we do most earnestly beseech our fellow-countrymen, and especially all fearers of God and haters of despotism, to come out from this blood-stained Union and help us to reform the people and the government, and thus save their own souls from death and the nation from the desolating judgments of God.

8. Resolved, That the FAST which God has chosen is "to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free and to break every yoke"; therefore for such a fast we will labor and pray.

THE TWENTY-SEVENTH National Anti-Slavery Subscription-Anniversary.

THE Ladies who have for so many years received the subscriptions of their friends to the Cause, ask the favor of their company as usual, at their rooms, on

Wednesday, the 23d of January, Day and Evening,

IN THE MUSIC HALL, BOSTON.

As accidental omissions are almost unavoidable, even of those whose company is most desired, the Ladies hasten to say, that all who hate slavery, and wish to become subscribers to the funds for its peaceful, immediate abolition, without exportation, may expect special invitations (without which no one is ever admitted) at the Anti-Slavery Office, 221 Washington street, and of the Ladies at their respective homes.

MARIA WESTON CHAPMAN,	LYDIA D. PARKER,
MARY MAY,	ELIZA F. EDDY,
LUCINDA LORING,	SARAH P. REMOND,
L. MARIA CHILD,	SARAH SEWALL,
HENRIETTA SARGENT,	MARY KELLEY,
ANNE WARREN WESTON,	ABBY KELLEY FOSTER,
MARY GRAY CHAPMAN,	SARAH H. SOUTHWICK,
HELEN ELIZA GARRISON,	EVELINA A. S. SMITH,
SARAH SHAW RUSSELL,	ANN REBECCA BRAYSHALL,
FRANCES MARY ROBBINS,	AUGUSTA G. KINO,
ELIZABETH PEABODY,	ELIZABETH VON ARNIM,
ANNA WARREN WESTON,	ANNA SHAW GREENE,
MARY WILLEY,	ELIZA APTHORP,
SARAH BLAKE SHAW,	MARY ELIZABETH SARGENT,
SUSAN C. CABOT,	MATTIE GRIFFITH,
SARAH P. ATKINSON,	ANNE LONGDON ALGER,
ELIZA ANDREW,	MARY E. SPEARS.

The friends of the Cause in distant cities, or in country towns, with whom we have been so long in correspondence, are earnestly entreated, by the sacred ties of the Cause, at the moment of hope and cheer, when the very evidences of progress make it difficult to raise money in large sums—*to take up collections* in their respective neighborhoods; using all diligence to make the amount of smaller subscriptions supply any deficiency the hard times may possibly occasion in the larger ones. *Now*, as the very time for the most efficient expenditure, should be the time of most devoted effort. It is to be hoped that not a town in any State where we have had our correspondence, nor an individual whose heart is in union with ours, will be found, when the roll is called, wanting to our list. We have ample opportunity to know that there are many such at the South as well as at the North, for we are not exclusively of Northern birth, nor all free from the condemnation of having once been slaveholders. We hope to welcome as many as possible at the evening reception; at all events, to receive their subscriptions by letter. Some of the ladies will be ready, while directing the arrangements for the evening reception, to welcome and receive the subscriptions of all their friends who prefer to make their calls during the day.

The Germania Band will fill the pauses of conversation in the evening. The guests may leave cloaks and shawls in the care of the attendants at the entrance and in the anterooms.

Each invitation must be countersigned by the guest, as last year, before presenting it at the door.

Boston, December 25, 1860.

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR AND NATIONAL BAZAAR.

THE Twenty-fifth Annual Fair was held in two spacious saloons of the Assembly Building, on the 11th, 12th, 13th, and 14th of January, and, 1,721 55, though not so great as in some former years, are considered large in view of the pressure in the money market, and the alarmed state of the community.

Beside the tables furnished by friends in the city, there were others supplied by Newtown and Makefield, Chester County, Abington, Byberry, Bristol, Mullica Hill, and Upper Dublin.

Contributions were received from Milton, Williamsport, Christiana, Downingtown, Darby, Newtown Square, Warwick Furnace, Norristown, Chelton Hills, and Ann Arbor, Michigan; also a very acceptable donation of £10 from a friend in London.

A box of goods, which we were advised by our earnest and faithful colaborers abroad would be shipped from Galway in ample time to reach us before the Bazaar, has not yet arrived.

The *Twenty-fifth Annual Fair*, has been held at a period of intense excitement in the community, on the question which Abolitionists, for more than a quarter of a century, have been laboring to bring before the public mind, so long cold and indifferent to the wrongs of the slave.

The first manifestation of this excitement threatened to be disastrous to his rights and in opposition to our conscientious demands for their recognition.

In obedience to the call of Southern trading merchants and time-serving politicians, organized bands of ruffians menaced disturbance. Advice was received from official quarters to discontinue our Fair, and timid friends urged us to "Wait for a more convenient season." Your Committee the more deeply felt that, "—" so many voices were raised on behalf of the rights of property, that those who had so long and so dared to speak for the slave should not now be silent; the more should they plead his cause before an awakened people. We persevered in our plans, and carried them successfully through, raising our voice for "the suffering and the dumb" in the midst of proslavery clamor. The result has proved, as it did last year under somewhat similar circumstances, that our duty demands a firm and unyielding support of our position, doubting not that our principles will finally triumph.

One very noticeable feature of the time was the quiet, earnest devotion of the many young persons who had come to labor with us. When the expectation prevailed that a mob would attempt to break into our rooms, they calmly and firmly awaited the event; showing their appreciation of the momentous struggle now going on in our nation, and their resolution to abide by the right, "come weal, come woe." They could, with us, adopt the language of our noble pioneer, whose words spoke fittingly from the first banner that met the sight on entering the large saloon:

"I am a slaveholder!
I grow in the name;
Though now by slavery's minions hissed,
And covered o'er with shame,
It is a spell of light and power,
The word of the free;
Who spurns it in the hour
A craven soul is he."

With full reliance on the principles and measures which we have hitherto advocated, we address our successors as follows:

SARAH PUGH.	MARGARET J. BURLEIGH,
HARRIET D. PURVIS.	SARAH A. MCKIM.

Philadelphia, Dec. 1860.

Note.—The box of goods from Galway has arrived in New York.

MASSACHUSETTS.—The portion of Governor Andrew's message referring to the Personal Liberty law has been referred in the Legislature to a Committee of Ten. The Chairman of this Committee is Mr. E. F. Stone, of Newburyport, who is believed to be opposed to repeal. Messrs. Albee of Marlboro', Pierce of Dorchester, Slack of Barnstable, and perhaps one or two others, are firm friends of the bill.

OBITUARY.

DIED, in the city of Philadelphia, at her residence, on the 21 inst., of consumption, after a lingering and painful illness, MARTHA H. BOND, wife of Josiah Bond, in the 54th year of her age. The remains were taken on the 5th inst. to Longwood Cemetery, in Chester County, where the company were met by a number of friends and a religious meeting held in the Longwood meeting-house.

"Spirit, thy labor is o'er,
Thy work of probation is done;
Thy steps are now planted upon the calm shore,
And the song of immortals begun."

Peace to the memory of this humble, Christian woman.

J. A. D.

NO SLAVE-HUNTING IN THE EMPIRE STATE

THE time has arrived when the friends of freedom in the Empire State are called upon to make a new and vigorous effort to procure the enactment of a statute that shall interpose an effectual barrier to the incursions of the Southern slave-hunter upon their soil. It is the more important that this effort should be made now, in view of the insolent demands of the Slave Oligarchy for the repeal of the Personal Liberty laws of other States, and of the disposition evinced by weak-kneed and weak-backed Republicans to offer the required sacrifice, in the hope of thereby smoothing the way to offices long coveted and now almost within reach. These Republican doughfaces must be made to understand that they cannot, with safety even to their own interest, trifle with the earnest, heartfelt anti-slavery sentiment of the North; and there is no better way of enforcing this lesson than by a general uprising of the people to demand the enactment of new safeguards against slave-hunting.

We subjoin a form of petition which we wish might, within the next six weeks, be presented to the members of every household in the Empire State. We are confident that, if proper efforts are made, ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND signatures may be very easily obtained.

PETITION.

To the Honorable Senate and Assembly of the State of New York:

The undersigned, citizens of —— State of New York, respectfully ask you to put an end to SLAVE-HUNTING, in New York, by enacting that no person, who has been held as a slave, shall be delivered up, by any officer or court, State or Federal, within this State, to any one claiming him on the ground that he owes "service or labor" to such claimant, by the laws of one of the slave States of this Union.

SEWARD'S SPEECH.—We have spoken our mind in regard to this speech in another column, but we cannot refrain from calling attention to a single passage, in which Mr. Seward exalts the Union above Liberty—the Means above the End. In the paragraph immediately preceding his enumeration of the concessions he is willing to make, he says:

"Beyond a doubt the Union is vitally important to the Republican citizens of the United States; but it is just as important to the whole people. Republicanism and Union are, therefore, not antagonistic principles. Republicanism is subordinate to Union, as everything else is and ought to be—Republicanism, Democracy, every other political name and thing; all are subordinate—if they ought to stand at the peril of the overthrow of great question of Union. So far as I am concerned, it shall be so."

By Republicanism Mr. Seward must here mean the anti-slavery principles professed by that party. His declination, therefore, that "Republicanism is subordinate to Union, as everything else is and ought to be," and that, "so far as he is concerned, IT SHALL BE SO," is an open betrayal of liberty to save the thing which was ordained only as a *means* of preserving it! And this is what is called statesmanship!

That Mr. Seward's speech is unworthy of a statesman representing the Free North in such a crisis as the present, is sufficiently apparent in the fact, that even his friends find it impossible to say with certainty what he means. It is the speech of a man willing, if not anxious, to serve God, but more afraid of offending the Devil; anxious to please the friends of liberty, but wishing to conciliate the slaveholders and their tools. An apostle has said with truth, "A double-minded man is unstable in all his ways."

FREE SPEECH IN NEW YORK.—One day last week, Mr. Hinton Rowan Helper, formerly of North Carolina, but for some time a resident of this city, was announced to deliver a lecture on slavery in Clinton Hall. In consequence of a violent storm, few persons came to hear him, and the lecture was not delivered. There were, however, some indications of a purpose to disturb the lecturer, and the rioters, after the audience had voted to adjourn, assembled in a corner and passed a series of Union-saving resolves. Last Monday evening was fixed as the time for the delivery of Mr. Helper's lecture, and the police, we understand, made ample provision to defend his right of speech; but the managers of the Hall, having a little fear of the rioters, broke their engagement and compelling Mr. Helper to forego his purpose of speaking. The rioters assembled in front of the building in great force, and it is said that many of them were armed as if for a desperate encounter. One of the ringleaders was taken to a station-house, where, to his great mortification, he was compelled to pass the night. This effort to put down the freedom of speech in this city, however annoying it may be for a time, must fail in the end.

MR. ADAMS AND HIS CONSTITUENTS.—An excellent article, well thought, well studied and well felt, in the Boston *Atlas and Bee* of the 9th inst, assures us that the constituents of Hon. Charles Francis Adams are astonished at his course in the recent compromises. The people of Massachusetts, it seems, will not consent to have their own homes, or any other men's homes, violated by slave-hunting and slave-breeding, for just as long a time as the slaveholder thinks fit.

Speaking of Mr. Adams reminds us that we inadvertently omitted to correct the error of our Washington correspondent in saying that Mr. Adams had not "the taint of Old Whiggery in his blood," but was one of "Liberty party men." Mr. Adams was a Whig till the nomination of Gen. Taylor in 1848—a "*Conscience* Whig," to be sure, but never a Liberty party man.

NO NEED OF STRIFE.—Not long ago, Senator Seward declared that there was, in the nature of things, an "irrepressible conflict" between slavery and freedom. In contrast with this self-evident truth, now absurd, cowardly and false in his lips, he remark in his speech, recently: "The different forms of labor" (i.e., the "form" (!) of working men under the lash, without compensation, and the "form" which recognizes the humanity of the laborer in the payment of wages), "if slavery were not perverted to purposes of political ambition, *need not constitute an element of strife* in the Confederacy !!!! In other words, there is no necessary conflict between slavery and freedom! What has changed the great leader of the Republican party from a lion to a mouse?

LIBERTY AND THE UNION.—Mr. Seward tells us that "publicliberty, our own peculiar liberty, must languish for a time, and then cease to live," if the Union of the North with Southern man-stealers is dissolved. He goes on: "And such a liberty! *free movement everywhere through our own land* and throughout the world: *free speech, free press, the freedom of every subject to vote on every law, and for or against every agent who expounds, administers, or executes.*" That is to say, our rights in these various particulars depend on our being confederated with men and communities that systematically deny and trample upon them, and who hang or tar and feather us on the bare suspicion that we intend to exercise them! Is this statesmanship!

THE MEN FOR THE CRISIS.—The Washington correspondent of *The Times*, having alluded to the fact that the Hon. Owen Lovejoy of Illinois is expected soon to address the house on national affairs, tells the following story: "Some one asked Lovejoy what he thought of a certain speech (Seward's) noted for its conciliatory tone: "We want, said Lovejoy, 'no Melancthons now; we want Martin Luthers. We want no one to write essays upon the Union and the sin and disasters of secession, but some one to throw the inkstand right at the head of the Devil."

MICHIGAN STATE CONVENTION.—The Abolitionists of Michigan are invited to meet in Convention at Ann Arbor on Saturday and Sunday, the 26th and 27th inst. Parker Pillsbury, Josephine S. Griffing, Giles B. Stebbins, and other speakers will be present.

CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.—We learn that there will be a Convention of the friends of the Church Anti-Slavery Society on Wednesday next morning, afternoon and evening, at the Church of the Puritans. The Convention will be opened at 10 o'clock, A. M., with an address by Rev. Henry T. Cheever, and the afternoon and evening assemblies will be addressed by Rev. Messrs. Nathan Brown, Rev. J. R. W. Sloane, H. Mattison, G. H. A. Bulkley and others.

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Receipts for The Standard from December 1, 1860, to January 1, 1861.

1089	E. Haskell, Foxcroft, Maine,	$1 00	
1123	A. E. Stevens, Portland, Maine,	2 00	
1084	Sarah P. R. Goodwin, Portsmouth, N. H.,	2 00	
1098	David Scott, Great Falls, "	1 00	
1072	Amos Boutchellet, Plaistow, "	1 25	
1124	Jos. Perry, Keene, "	2 00	
1092	Miss Lodge, Boston, Mass.,	4 00	
1126	W. I. Bowditch, Boston, Mass.,	2 00	
1038	Miss Henrietta Sargent, Boston Mass.,	2 00	
1091	Azariah Smith, Middlefield, "	1 00	
1120	Dr. Jos. Wistarie, Fall River, "	2 00	
1124	Phillip A. Chase, Lynn, "	2 00	
1124	Charles T. Canfield, Uxbridge, "	2 00	
1124	Samuel Shuttleworth, Dedham, "	2 00	
1124	Alex. Metcalf, West Haven, Conn.,	2 00	
1073	E. Wood, Sharon, "	1 24	
1092	Geo. Doughty, Queen's, Long Island,	4 00	
1066

Miscellaneous Department.

THE PRIVATE OF THE BUFFS.

BY SIR F. H. DOYLE.

[illegible] "The Buffs, having remained behind with the [illegible] in the hands of the Chinese. On the next morning they were [illegible] by the authorities, and conducted to prison. The Sahibs obeyed: but Moyse, the English soldier, declaring that he should not prostrate himself before any Chinaman, was shot down on the spot, and his comrades dragged by [illegible] on beyond—*Extract Correspondent of The London Times.*

Last night, among his fellow roughs,
He jested, quaffed, and swore:
A drunken private of the Buffs,
Who never bended before.
To-day, beneath the captain's frown,
He bends his knee in abject fear,
And in presence of his foes falls down
Before—he knows not what or whom.

Perhaps, some cool, calm, stockborn, untaught,
Reproved, shamed, cursed, or spurned, or smote,
A Roman with English instinct fraught,
He, serene, calmly, stood,
Amid the howling, jeering throng,
Amid the [illegible] of his own kind,
Unmoved, unaided, unemboldened by wine:
Or, if he felt the throb of pride,
Or, if he felt the throb of shame,
He felt it but for one short hour,
Then, as he felt it, he forgot it.

Yes, I could fancy this could shame him scorn'd,
Like Gordon, to come and go;
Bright Napoleon's eagle pinion gleam'd,
Of victory, dazzling snow;
This man, whose life his father's door,
Unfettered, unassailed, had trod,
Must see, ere yet, which it rise no more,
Dismay'd by himself, so young?

Yes, I could well with strength like steel
He, as Gordon, would have stood;
Let dusky Indians shine and kneel:
An English lad must die.
And there, with arms that never yet
Were forced to remembrance,
Unfaltering, unappalled, unwrung,
Twice he met death head-on.

Vain, ridiculous, facts, of iron framed;
Vain, those all-shattering guns;
Those, proud, fearless, kept, untamed,
Thousands to one of her sons,
So, by its name through Europe ring—
A name of warm estate,
Who died, as sum as Sparta's king,
Because his soul was great.

—*Macmillan's Magazine.*

THE CONSERVATIVE.

A DISCOURSE,

Delivered in Cincinnati, December 16, 1860, by

M. D. CONWAY.

[Communicated for The Standard.]

"I have kept the faith," says Paul. I have not thought, in the course of these studies of Pauline Christianity, to vindicate him from the charges of antinomianism and criticisms which the unreserved freedom of his life and speech has called upon him. Since the publication, by an old Anglican, of the work entitled "Not Paul, but Jesus," there has been a perpetual muttering against the Apostle to the Gentiles. Jesuitism does not like him, because he taught the doctrine of predestination in the Epistle to the Romans; the Judaizers did not and do not like him, because he classed the Sabbath day among heathen and unchristian observances; Radicals do not like him, because he did not hesitate to circumcise a youth after he had renounced Judaism; the Conservatives object that on Mars Hill he quoted the sentiment of a heathen Greek as sound Christianity; the social economists say that his views of marriage the social economists say that his views of marriage would be subversive of society. All these objectors have fixed upon one bold utterance of Paul as a fatal one to him; that, namely, in which he said, "I am made all things to all men." It is well known that Jesuitism took this sentiment, *Omne omnibus*—all things to all men—as its motto; and that under it the Jesuit missionaries regarded themselves as warranted in all manner of temporizing, in fostering every error in order to make themselves acceptable and gain a foothold, where a plain avowal of their real views would at once have excluded them. Under the principle of "all things to all men," their missionaries dressed, it is said, as Confucian priests, and bowed to idols in China; and they are said to have recommended to the savage Indians the Sioux recommended to the savage Indians the Sioux man as a brave warrior who had in one day scalped ten thousand of his enemies. It is maintained that he is thus the father of the bad proverb, "In Rome do as Rome does"; and that his principle would make every man a traitor to his country, and that he happened to be, dapper to circumstance, not outspoken; in short, Jesuitical.

It must be acknowledged, however, that Paul's life contradicts the interpretation thus put upon his words. Wherever he went he was regarded as a dangerous innovator. It is utterly inconsistent with the idea that he practised concealment and a time-serving policy, that he should have aroused more opposition than all the other apostles! In that city Corinthians should regard him as too daring for them; that at Ephesus, when he came there, the makers of Diana's shrines and images should cry, "Our trade is in danger"; that at Athens he should be arrested as a setter forth of strange gods; that his own fellow-laborers, Peter and others, should have withstood him as too radical; that his friends, Demas and others whom he names, should forsake him, because he called them to too great sacrifices—all this is manifestly inconsistent with the idea that Paul was the apostle of a mean expediency. His Paul was the apostle of a mean expediency. His history proves that, whatever may be meant by his being made all things to all men, he certainly did, under all trials, finish his course, and, under all exigencies, keep the faith. To my mind, his being made all things to all men was a glorious and transcendent significance. It means simply the working of the principle which we have before considered; that when a man takes his course of thought and belief, as it seems to him true, and, like Paul, *finishes* belief, as it seems to him true, and, like Paul, *finishes* that course—carries it to its consistent results, evading none of its conclusions—that truth will be found in harmony with all other truths, wherever and whenever held. He must be a very stupid man who could believe that the various great religions of the world—the Hebrew, the Greek, the Oriental—were utterly and absolutely false, that they contained no truth whatever; that the grand old temples of ancient worship, reared through slow centuries out of the most sacred materials of the human heart, had not one stone in them but what was a lie. And when Paul found that the truth which he aspired to bear through the world found some related truth in all men and nations; when he could find Christianity in Judea, under a Jewish rite or a Greek form, so that he could, on such a point, be a Jew to Jews and a Greek to Greeks, it only proves that he took a larger and more universal view of his faith than those who could not see that religion was an essence underlying, not see that religion was an essence underlying, not higher or lower forms, and that God had revealed Himself not only to one single nation. Paul's being made all things to all men proves, then, exactly the opposite of the Jesuitical interpretation; proves that he had so finished his course, so broad and developed his faith, which is the only way to keep it, that it brought him to a higher standpoint, from which he saw God as the Father of all men, Jew and Gentile, circumcision and uncircumcision, bond and free; also that all religions had been trained as branches, fitted for the grafting on of the loftier truth and life which Christianity offered each of them. He could thus appeal to Jews, *as Jews*, to accept the flower now blooming on their stem; to Greeks, *as Greeks*, to receive a faith which harmonized with the insight of Cleanthes and Aratus, and fulfilled the recorded prophecies of Plato and Socrates. When Tyndal published his volume, "Christianity as old as the Creation," in which he traces the fundamental precepts of Christianity under all religions that ever existed, it was not supposed that he was a timid time-server who would bow to the superstitions of any country in which he happened to be; but rather that he was a brave man, who proved, by maintaining that Christendom did not monopolize God's favor—subjecting himself thereby to the charge of infidelity—that wherever he was, he would keep his faith, speaking the truth. Not let us judge Paul.

"I have kept the faith," said Paul. Last Sunday we considered the Pilgrim's Progress; to-day we consider the Pilgrim's Conservatism. The true Christian is progressive; he is also conservative. "To conserve" is a Latin phrase, and means "to keep"; a serve is a Latin phrase, and means "to keep the faith. I say genuine conservatism is to keep the faith. I say *genuine* conservatism; for we all know that there is a counterfeit conservatism trying to mix with our Christian conservatism trying to mix with our Christian conservatism. This spurious thing is that which would pervert the faith, and, in the name of faith, not suffer any sense man to hold on to the mere forms of faith; not to keep the faith, but the mere carcase of faith. If the faith goes into other forms, let it go, it says; our business is to hold on to the institutions, rites and ceremonies in which the faith once dwelt. Such conservatism is that which builds the tombs of the prophets and garnishes their sepulchres, then goes out to stone the prophets who are not yet in their sepulchres. In the name of Washington it mobs freedom; in the name of Moses it crucifies Jesus, carrying out Moses's work; and in the name of Jesus it curses Luther and Parker, for having brought the faith to delivered and carrying on the work he inaugurated. To keep the faith is a very different thing from this; it is